

Friday, January 20, 2023 A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service 10808 Foothill Blvd. Suite 160-446 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 (951) 567-1936

Charging Two Carter High School Vice Principals With Felonies Over One Student's Assaults Of Schoolmates Won't Fly In Her Courtroom, Judge Tells DA

San Bernardino County District Attorney Jason Anderson's bold and what many educators, healthcare professionals and legal scholars considered to be a gratuitously aggressive prosecution of two Rialto Unified School District assistant principals on felony child abuse charges stemming from a student's sexual exploitation of at least two of his schoolmates has hit

an apparent dead end. Superior Court Judge Corey Lee today, Friday January 30, dismissed felony child abuse charges against David Yang and Natasha Harris-Dawson, two assistant principals at Wilmer Amina Carter High School, telling Anderson and the prosecutor working with him on the case, Deputy District Attorney Morrissa Cardoza, they will need to con-

centrate on getting convictions on the two separate misdemeanor counts of mandated reporting failure that remain in play if they are yet convinced that Yang and Harris-Dawson should be held accountable for the atmosphere within the school in which an overly sexually aggressive male student forced himself on younger students.

Indications are that

the matter could go to trial as early as next month. Given the prosecutor's office's effort to ratchet misdemeanor Penal Code § 1166-M failure by a mandated reporter to report child abuse or neglect charges against Yang and Harris-Dawson into felony Penal Code § C273A(A)-F willfully causing or permitting any child to suffer charges, a question stands as to whether

Judge Lee is prepared to allow the defense to explore why the Rialto Police Department did not spread its investigative web wide enough to look at the activity of higher-ups in the school district and why the district attorney's office did not include a case against Wilmer Amina Carter High Principal Robin McMillon.

Some in the support network See P 3

17 Years Later, Redlands Residents Still Fighting City Over Live Oak Canyon Development

Controversy over what a vocal cross section of the Redlands community considers to be City Hall's too-aggressive land use policy has manifested once again.

Next week, the Redlands Planning Commission is slated to once again consider a 24-unit single family residential subdivision in Live Oak Canyon approved

in 2015, the tract map for which has twice expired.

In a deft move the city's critics say is intended to attenuate accusations that the city council is being far too accommodating of developmental interests, the planning commission on January 24 is to consider giving property owner/developer Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC a third one-

year time extension for project entitlements approved more than seven years ago.

Involved in the project as a representative of the developer is Pat Meyer, who on multiple occasions in the past has represented entities seeking project approvals on developments that have garnered considerable resistance from Redlands residents. At

issue in the project under consideration are what a segment of the community seeking to ultimately preserve the entirety of the just over 180 acres of natural open space in Live Oak Canyon directly adjacent to the Herngt 'Aki' Preserve, says are violations of both the spirit and the letter of Redlands Measure R. Over the decades, a multi-gen-

erational contingent of Redlands residents demonstrated themselves to be more committed than any other citizens within San Bernardino County's 24 municipalities to the concept of attenuating the tenor of development within their locality, as was evinced by the city's voters' passage of the controlled-growth or slow-growth Proposition R in 1978, See P 2

Amicable Departure Ends Rialto's Bridge To Progress Venture With Woke Palm Springs-Based City Manager

What Rialto municipal officials are saying were "management differences over the past several months," have prompted them to part company with Marcus Fuller, who was hired to serve as city manager of the 103,000-population city a little more than a year-and-a-half ago to what was an enthusias-

tic display of so-called woke temperament.

At this point however, Fuller is departing "amicably," all parties maintain, because of a "stark" difference in vision over the future and developmental potential in what is the sixth largest of San Bernardino County's 24 cities population-wise and its 17th largest in

terms of land area.

Fuller, who has a degree in civil engineering from Northern Arizona University and a master's degree in public administration from California State University, San Bernardino, began his career as a public official in 1995 with La Paz County, Arizona in the capac- See P 4

Henderson Back As Grand Terrace Solon After A Four-Year Hiatus

For the second time in less than six years, Ken Henderson will serve as Grand Terrace's stopgap city councilman.

In October 2017, after then-Grand Terrace City Councilman Brian Reinartz abruptly resigned from his post after being in place for less than a year, the four remaining members of the council

chose Henderson to replace him until a special election to fill Reinartz's slot for the remaining two-years of his term could be held in November 2018. Henderson competed in that contest, which was won by Jeff Allen.

Two-and-a-half months ago, incumbent Mayor Darcy See P 2

DNA & Other Evidence Examination Does Not Exonerate Cooper, Special State Counsel Says

By Mark Gutglueck

The sixth reexamination of the still extant physical evidence related to Kevin Cooper's 1985 multiple murder conviction ordered by Governor Gavin Newsom in May 2021 failed to establish that the now-67-year-old who has spent the last 39 years in pretrial custody and prison [did not exonerate him of] [demonstrate he was wrongfully convicted for] the

June 1983 murders of Doug and Peggy Ryen, their 10-year-old daughter Jessica and 11-year-old neighbor Christopher Hughes in Chino Hills, according to the special counsel to the California Board of Parole Hearings.

The latest examination included a DNA analysis of evidence that was not technically possible at the time of the murders and which

prosecutors resisted having performed. While lawyers who have long sought to have Cooper freed on the basis of their assertions that he was innocent and caught up in a frenzy of investigative and prosecutorial desperation to convict someone of the horrific and seemingly senseless slayings hoped the examination of the evidence would undergird their theories, the tests

instead showed that the evidence used to convince a jury of his guilt was both "extensive and conclusive," disproving his continuing claim that he was set up and convicted by the sheriff's department's planting of evidence to frame him.

According to a panel of attorneys with the San Francisco-based law firm of Morrison & Foerster, which in this instance served as the special

counsel to the California Board of Parole Hearings, "The DNA evidence corroborates the testimonial, physical, forensic and circumstantial evidence that was presented at trial, which was sufficient to persuade the jury of Cooper's guilt even without the DNA evidence that became available later," the report says. "Cooper has not established that the evidence of See P 2

McNeely To Reprise Role As San Bernardino City Manager

Former San Bernardino City Manager Charles McNeely will reprise his role as the county seat's top administrator, more than a decade after he resigned as the city was plunging toward its 2012 bankruptcy.

McNeely, who had previously been the city manager of Reno, Nevada, was recruited by San Bernardino as city manager in 2009. From the onset, McNeely's time in San Bernardino was made difficult by steep financial challenges, ones that had been touched off a decade-and-a-half previously by the Department of Defense's 1994 closure of Norton Air Force Base. In the intervening time, the local economy had contracted, such that throughout the first decade of the Third Millennium San Bernardino was engaging in deficit spending with each annual budget, depleting the reserves the municipality had built up over the course of nearly a century.

A major issue for the city was the exorbitant costs to the city from past concessions to the city's employees' unions. In particular, salaries and benefits paid to the city's public safety personnel – firefighters and police officers – stood at roughly 79 percent of the city's budget. Total personnel costs ran to more than 92 percent of the budget, leaving just over 7 percent of the city's available means for capital improvements and maintaining aging infrastructure in the 62.45-square mile city. This was exacerbated by the downturn in the U.S., California and local economy that See P 4

More Than 17 Years After City Residents Rejected Altering Live Oak Canyon's Agricultural Zoning, Redlands Officials Pusing Residential Development Project There *from front page*

Measure N in 1987 and Measure U in 1997.

Efforts by developers to convert much of the land within Live Oak Canyon stands in defiance of that sentiment. Development intention toward the property in question goes back decades. The property was slated for development nearly 18 years ago.

On April 19, 2005, the Redlands City Council gave the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust an entitlement to build, consisting of an approval to a final environmental impact report and general plan amendment and the granting of a conditional use permit and tentative tract map, for what was then referred to as the Covington Development Project, consisting of an 85 residential lot subdivision along with five common area/open space lots on 181.82 acres in Live Oak Canyon. That action removed property along a segment of Highview Drive from the city's agricultural preserve and changed its zoning from Agricultural (A-1) to Rural Residential.

Two groups – Citizens of Redlands for Redlands and Redlands Residents for Rural Living – formed in opposition to the project. Redlands Residents for Rural Living filed suit in San Bernardino Superior Court, challenging the city's approval. Simultaneously, Citizens of Redlands for Redlands proposed a referendum to stop the zone change. The divide in popular opinion within the city between the pro-development and anti-development factions strongly favored those objecting to the project. Though they were faced with the daunting task of gathering enough valid signatures of city voters in an abbreviated time-frame in order to qualify a referendum on the project for the November ballot, those objecting to the project were able to do so through a coordinated effort of creating flyers and door hangers and going door to door to obtain signatures. Upon encountering residents who were not home, they would leave literature on doorsteps and porches and return later. Redlands voters from all over the city proved eager to sign the petition, which forced the city into placing what was dubbed Measure R on the ballot, asking whether the city's residents were willing to approve the agricultural-to-residential zone change on the property.

With the initiative on the ballot, citizens from all parts of Redlands banned together in a concerted grass roots effort involving doorstep lobbying, door hangers, yard signs and a letter-writing campaign against supporting the zone change in Live Oak Canyon by rejecting Measure R.

Measure R, which would have allowed the project to proceed on the terms proposed by the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust and approved by the Redlands City Council on April 19, 2005, failed to pass, with 10,675 votes or 58.1 percent against it to 7,700 votes or 41.9 percent in favor of it. The property therefore remained, as it is yet today, zoned for agricultural use within the city's Agricultural (A-1) District.

Redlands Residents for Rural Living filed suit in San Bernardino Superior Court, challenging the city's approval.

The lawsuit, heard by Judge John Wade, ended with a stipulated judgment finalized in December 2006 that determined Mistretta Canyon Partners would be permitted to proceed with a planned residential development consisting of a "clustered" residential development not to exceed 36 residential lots/units, referred to as the "general plan alternative."

The clustering meant

that the units could be built on a confined portion of the 181.82 acres, with the remainder left as open space.

The project however remained dormant for seven years.

On January 29, 2014, a purchase and sale agreement was executed between the City of Redlands and Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, and Mistretta Family Partners, LLC, by which 60 acres of land to was conveyed to the City of Redlands, and required Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, and Mistretta Family Partners, LLC, to create a separate legal parcel, known as Lot C in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

According to the city's timeline with regard to the project history, on May 26, 2015 the Redlands Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 18845,

Conditional Use Permit No. 1036, and Variance No. 773 for the project.

According to the City of Redlands, on May 26, 2017, Assembly Bill 116 automatically extended the life of the Tentative Tract Map by two years to May 26, 2019. On April 9, 2019, the Redlands Planning Commission approved a time extension for the project's tentative tract map and conditional use permit to May 26, 2020.

On October 21, 2015,

younger citizen representatives to "take this city over." He said the 23-year-old Rasso fit that

Evidence Showed & Cooper Admitted He Holed Up In A House 375 Feet From Where The Ryens & Hughes Were Slaughtered *from front page*

his guilt has been fabricated or planted. The evidence, including the DNA evidence itself, dispels the contention that the evidence was fabricated or planted."

Cooper in 1985 was convicted and then condemned to die in the gas chamber at San Quentin, where he has remained

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

an amended stipulated judgment was filed with the Superior Court, which indicated that the City of Redlands had been conveyed approximately 60 acres of land and the development rights to 12 lots/units, from Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, and Mistretta Family Partners, LLC. Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, and Mistretta Family Partners, LLC, retained the remaining 121.82 acres (approximate) and the development rights to 24 lots/units.

On April 14, 2020, the planning commission approved a second extension of time for the project's tentative tract map and conditional use permit to May 26, 2021.

On May 26, 2021, Redlands planning staff claimed the city used Assembly Bill 1516 to automatically extend the life of the tentative

tract map and conditional use permit by 18 months to November 26, 2022.

According to Redlands residents opposed to the project, the city is using a flawed timeline and an invalid doubling of the permitted density for the project to allow the project to proceed in that the Mistretta entitlements to include the tentative tract map in fact expired on May 26, 2017, two years after the planning commission approval on May 26, 2015, since the two-year time extension to 2019 claimed by the city for the project is based on AB 166, which was only effective through 2013 and is therefore invalid for the Mistretta Tentative Tract Map which was not even approved by the Redlands Planning Commission until 2015.

Moreover, accord-
Continued on Page 12

Council Brings Henderson Back To Fill Its Ranks *from front page*

McNaboe lost to Councilman Bill Hussey in her bid for reelection. Hussey, who yet had two years left on his term as councilman, had to resign from his council post to move into the mayoralty. The council thus needed to fill that vacancy.

Henderson, Vincent Rasso and Daniel Torres applied to move into Hussey's former slot. In considering those applicants and their qualifications, Mayor Hussey and Councilmembers Sylvia Robles and Doug Wilson ultimately settled on returning Henderson to the

panel. Perhaps reflecting their 2018 electoral rivalry, Councilman Jeff Allen, who was reelected to a four-year term in 2020, voted for Rasso.

Henderson will serve on the council for nearly two years, until what had been Hussey's term as councilman lapses in 2024.

Henderson is a 38-year resident of Grand Terrace with a more-than-normal relationship to City Hall. Professionally employed as a municipal official, most notably as the director of economic and community development for the Town of Apple Valley from 1996 until 2008 and then as the assistant town manager overseeing economic and community development

from 2008 until 2014, Henderson was brought in to serve as Grand Terrace's interim city manager in January 2014, remaining in that post until January 2015.

Henderson thanked the council for the expression of confidence in him by granting him a second appointment.

"I look forward to working with all of you," he said. "I can't wait to get to work."

Allen said there was nothing personal or political in his advocacy of Rasso, who is nearly three decades younger than anyone else now on the council.

Allen said the city needs to do something about its geriatric leadership and should court

bill.

Henderson is to be sworn in at 6 p.m. Tuesday, January 24, at City

Hall, located at 22795 Barton Road at the center of the 3.5-square mile, 13,150-population city.

on Death Row for more than 38 years, having in the meantime launched a series of appeals, all of which were curtailed or failed to convince higher courts that he had been wrongfully convicted. Like his predecessor Jerry Brown before him and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger prior to that, California Governor Gavin Newsom is calling for a very deliberate process with regard to Cooper. While it is unlikely that Cooper will be executed by the state, which in the years since his conviction has changed its means of

putting the condemned to death and has not executed anyone since January 2006, if California revives the death penalty, Cooper would be among the first in the Golden State's penal system to meet that fate. Initial efforts to prevent Cooper's execution proceeded from the standpoint that his guilt was presumed but emphasized the lack of complete certainty thereto. Later efforts on his behalf sought to propound that he is innocent. Most recently, Cooper has applied for clemency, and it

Continued on Page 3

Prosecutor Kottmeier Alleged & Jury Believed Cooper Hatched, Knifed And Ice Pick Spiked The Four Dead Victims, Inflicting a Total Of 141 Wounds & Slitting The Throat Of The Lone Survivor *from front page*

is in accordance with that application that Newsom on May 8, 2021, called for the review of the investigative and evidentiary record to aid him in his decision. The application for clemency was a retreat by Cooper's defenders from the somewhat problematic assertions of innocence that had been posited on his behalf, and instead consisted of a return to the position that the case for his guilt is not airtight. That retreat was prompted by the consideration that DNA testing of evidence previously insisted upon by Cooper's defense team produced results that did not, as his lawyers had hopefully held, indicate his innocence, and instead seemed to shore up an element of the prosecution's

case for Cooper' guilt. If Cooper is innocent, his timing was the most execrable imaginable, and by his own actions he entangled himself in a set of circumstances which lend themselves to a logical conclusion that he murdered the Ryens and Hughes. Thrice convicted of burglary and imprisoned in Pennsylvania in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Cooper was released in 1982, to be shortly thereafter accused of kidnapping and raping an underage girl who had interrupted him during yet another burglary. Confined to a Pennsylvania psychiatric facility, Mayview State Hospital, he escaped, fleeing to Southern California where he used the alias David Trautman. In Los

Angeles County he was apprehended after committing two burglaries and was given a four-year prison sentence, which he began serving at the California Institution for Men in Chino in April 1983. Having been housed in the minimum security wing of that prison, Cooper on June 2, 1983 either scaled, or climbed through a hole in, the prison fence and made his way away from the prison west toward what was then the substantially rural and unincorporated community of Chino Hills. Cooper's escape from the Chino Institution for Men came within the same approximate time frame that Michael "Fast Horse" Martinez, one of the wards at Boys Republic, an institutional all-boys home and school in Chino Hills for displaced, wayward and troubled youths, took flight from that facility. There is no dispute that Cooper holed up in a Chino Hills home owned

by Larry Lease and brothers Roger and Kermit Lang where a tenant, Kathleen Bilbia, a school teacher, had lived previously and had temporarily vacated when she went on holiday following the end of the school year shortly before the murders occurred. Cooper spent at least a day-and-a-half there, sleeping in a closet in one of the house's bedrooms. Late in the morning of June 4, Virginia Lang briefly came into the Lease/Lang house to get a sweater, but Cooper withdrew toward the back of the house and managed to avoid her seeing him. The Lease/Lang home was some 375 feet distant from the home of Doug and Peggy Ryen, their 10-year-old daughter Jessica and their 8-year-old son Joshua. Phone records show that while at the Lease/Lang home Cooper made calls to two female acquaintances/friends, one in Pennsylvania and an-

other in Los Angeles, in an effort to get them to provide him with money or otherwise assist him in getting farther away, the last of which was made around 8 p.m. on June 4. He also smoked prison-issued Role-Rite tobacco rolled in prison-issued rolling papers, butts of which were left behind in the Lease/Lang house. On June 5, 1983, Bill Hughes, came to the Ryen home to pick up his 11-year-old son Christopher, who had spent the previous evening with the Ryen family attending a barbecue at another location and was going to sleep over at the Ryen home the night of June 4 through until the morning of June 5. The Ryen family station wagon was gone. He went around to the back of the house and looked through a sliding glass door into the master bedroom of the house. Visible were Douglas and Peggy and his son, all dead, and Joshua Ryen severely wounded.

Hidden from his view was Jessica Ryen, who lay dead in a hallway. The four deceased – the husband and wife, their daughter and his son – had been chopped with a hatchet, cut with a knife, and stabbed with an icepick, having sustained mostly to their heads, upper torsos or extremities, 37, 33, 46 and 25 wounds, respectively. Joshua Ryen was yet alive, his throat having been cut. The house phone was inoperable and Bill Hughes left to summon help at once. The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, after having Joshua Ryen transported to Loma Linda University Medical Center by helicopter, initiated an investigation that entailed deputies, detectives, sergeants, forensic specialists and department higher-ups including then-Sheriff Floyd Tidwell, traipsing all over the murder scene and its environs.

Continued on Page 5

In Grandstand Play, DA Hit Assistant High School Principals With Felonies For What He Called Inaction By Failing To Stem A Student's Sexually-Charged Interaction With Younger Pupils *from front page*

around Yang and Harris-Dawson, including others who are subject to the same mandated reporter requirement that the duo are alleged to have violated, believe that if defense attorneys take the somewhat uncommon but permissible step of calling Anderson to the witness stand and question him about his office's decision not to charge McMillon, he will enunciate, and in essence embrace, the theory of Yang and Harris-Dawson's innocence.

David Shenhan Yang and Natasha Harris-Dawson on February 23 were each hit with three criminal charges, those being a single felony Penal Code § 273 (A) filing, stemming from an incident occurring November 5, 2021; a misdemeanor Penal Code § 11166 filing, stemming from what was apparently the same incident; and another misdemeanor Penal Code § 11166 filing, stemming from an incident occurring on September 1, 2021. They were booked into and held at

the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, originally in lieu of \$150,000 bail, but released from custody the following day on their own recognizance. Yang was originally and is still represented by attorney Joshua Peter Visco. Harris-Dawson was initially represented by attorney Gregory Christopher Gardner, who has now been joined by Michael Scaffidi in constructing a defense for his client. Within two months of their arrests, both Yang and Harris-Dawson were provided with status tantamount to cite releases, meaning their continuing freedom would not be conditional upon the posting of a bond, a rare concession by authorities pursuing felony charges against defendants.

Shortly after the matter became public there were reports that a desperate effort was made by the Rialto Police Department, Rialto Police Chief Mark Kling and elements within the Rialto Unified

School District to contain what at one point threatened to be a scandal that would consume some of the Rialto community's most reputable, respected and highly thought-of personages, including McMillon.

Yang and Harris-Dawson were twice arraigned and bound over for trial as the prosecution, perhaps sensing it had bitten off more than it could chew with the felony filing, sought to save face by recontexting and reformulating its hastily drawn case against the two educators, while laboring to keep the felony charge against each intact.

Despite initial fanfare, the police department and the prosecutor's office has restricted information about what was turned up during the initial investigation into the matter and follow up inquiries.

Ultimately, based upon the police department's further gumshoeing, a counselor at the school, Lindsay Morton, was formally charged by the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office on March 7, 2022 with misdemeanor failure of a mandated reporter to report child

abuse or neglect, Penal Code § 11166, stemming from an event which the district attorney's office alleges occurred on November 1, 2021. Morton was arraigned before Judge Ingrid Uhler on April 25, 2022.

The district attorney's office, based upon what was brought to it by the police department, has capped the number of school district employees and official defendants at three. This is despite remonstrations lodged internally to the effect that if the same standard that was employed against Yang, Harris-Dawson and Morton were applied to others, McMillon, Superintendent Dr. Cuauhtémoc Avila and current board members Stephanie Lewis, Nancy O'Kelley, Joseph Martinez, Edgar Montes and former Board Member Dina Walker, extending even, perhaps, to Julian Hunter, the district's student board member, would be susceptible to similar criminal charges.

The board had met in closed session, with Board Member Walker declining to participate, to discuss the matter at its February 23, 2022 meeting. The record shows

that during that closed session the board engaged in the review of a liability claim, expulsion of a student, employee discipline, release, dismissal and reassignment. Involving the district's legal counsel in that discussion dressed the matter in the patina of attorney-client privilege, providing the board members and Avila with the grounds for avoiding having to make any response to questions pertaining to the matter.

Reportedly, the board was informed about rumors that had been making the rounds at the high school for over a month at that point, which were that a student had been either raped or sexually assaulted or otherwise subjected to sexual harassment by another student. The board during the course of the closed session reportedly settled upon a strategy of accepting that at least one district employee would need to function in the role of a scapegoat by being criminally charged, while the district made a public show of simultaneously cooperating with the ongoing investigation and, to divert attention from anyone else in the district, lionize one

district employee on the hope that a narrative in which she is represented as heroically wading into the situation to assist a student would satisfy the public curiosity as to what had occurred, hopefully stemming further examination of the action, or lack thereof, of a host of those involved in minimizing the sexual abuse of children in the community. On Wednesday, February 23, 2021, Yang and Harris-Dawson, both of whom were up to that point vice principals at Wilmer Amina Carter High School, were arrested and taken into custody by Rialto Police and booked into West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga on a single felony count each of child abuse under conditions likely to cause great bodily injury or death, and two misdemeanor counts each of failure to report child abuse or neglect. What was put out at that time was that both had temporized for nearly five months before reporting that a student they oversaw as educational administrators had raped a student in

Continued on Page 6

In His First Go-Round In SB, McNeely Was Thwarted By Political Clashes & City Employees' Unwillingness To Accept Pay Cuts To Avoid Bankruptcy *from front page*

lingered for more than six years and was dubbed the "Great Recession."

Then-San Bernardino Mayor Pat Morris, a former Superior Court Judge and before that a prosecutor with the district attorney's office, had reached the conclusion that the city could not sustain the burden of providing constant salary and benefit increases to the city's work force. He had assembled a bare 4-to-3 city council majority willing to resist pressure being brought upon the city to provide constant/nearly yearly salary increases to city employees.

In 2011, the effort to pull San Bernardino back from the financial abyss it was teetering over was shattered when John Valdivia, who represented himself as a fiscal conservative, managed to

defeat Third Ward Councilman Tobin Brinker in that year's municipal election. Brinker was a key Morris ally in the effort to control city employee salaries. In fact, Valdivia had been elected with heavy support from the police officers' and firefighters' unions based upon his commitment to them that he would work to undo the employee pay freezes put in place by the Morris coalition. Upon assuming office in the Spring of 2012, Valdivia declared there was no financial shortfall at City Hall. His presence on the city's decision-making panel cleared the way for the police and fire unions to demand and receive the wage and benefit increases that Morris's effort at fiscal austerity had been denying them. By April 2012, the writing was on the wall and

McNeely, not wishing to be at the helm when San Bernardino declared bankruptcy, resigned effective May 1, 2012. In August of that year, the city filed for Chapter 9 bankruptcy protection.

It is perhaps significant that McNeely is returning to San Bernardino no less than two months after Valdivia, who was elected mayor in 2018, left office after he was set aside by the voters in his bid for reelection last year. Valdivia was replaced by Helen Tran, a city resident who was a city employee under McNeely before she rose to become the city's human resources director and then departed in 2019 to become human resources director in the City of West Covina after Valdivia in his capacity as mayor involved himself in a series of disputes with approaching two dozen city employees, resulting in resignations and firings that have yet to fully untangle them-

selves, involving at least six still-unsettled lawsuits against the city in which inappropriate treatment of employees or wrongful termination is alleged.

Tran was favorably impressed by McNeely during the time she worked as an employee of the city while he was running municipal operations.

The city that McNeely is returning to has undergone some degree of change. It is no longer a full-service city as it was when he left. Of note is that the municipal fire department, in no small measure because Valdivia's arrival on the council resulted in pay and benefit increases for firefighters the city could ill-afford, was dissolved in 2015 in favor of the county fire department providing fire protection service to the city. Likewise, the city's sanitation division was closed out that same year and the city now has a franchise

trash hauler. In June 2017, the city emerged from bankruptcy after nearly five years.

The city still has unresolved financial issues.

The city council entered into a contract with McNeely to serve as city manager for six months or until a replacement for outgoing City Manager Robert Field is found. Field was the sixth city manager employed by San Bernardino since McNeely left, including Andrea Travis-Miller who held that interim position for ten months after McNeely's departure in 2012 and oversaw the city during its bankruptcy filing and returned to serve as city manager in 2018, and was ultimately terminated by the Valdivia-controlled city council in 2019.

The seven-member city council's vote to bring McNeely back was done in a closed session and was unanimous, including the eighth vote by Tran, who on most

issues has no vote, but is empowered to participate in votes pertaining to hiring the city manager and city attorney.

McNeely was the first and yet the only African American city manager in San Bernardino history.

According to the city, McNeely was considered along with 24 other candidates to fulfill the interim management post. He is being provided with a flat rate pay of \$137 an hour. Under the terms of his status as a retiree within the California Public Employees' Retirement System, he is eligible to work 960 hours per fiscal year, running from July 1 to June 30. Given that he is beginning after the mid-point of the current fiscal year, he will be able to remain as city manager from July 1 until December 31 if the need arises because the city cannot find a replacement for the full-fledged city manager position by then.

Enthusiasm For Fuller's Wokeness Was Unable To Sustain Him In Facing Down Rialto's Municipal Management Challenges *from front page*

ity of assistant engineer. He worked in the engineering department in La Quinta in Riverside County and was later hired as assistant city engineer. He started as an associate engineer with Palm Springs in 1999, promoted to senior engineer in 2001, and became the assistant public works director/assistant city engineer in 2005. Beginning in 2012, Fuller began seesawing in his professional assignments between Rialto and Palm Springs. In May of that year, he was hired as Rialto's public works director and city engineer. He returned to Palm Springs two years and six months later when he was offered the assistant city manager/chief operating officer position.

In June 2021, Fuller bounced back to Rialto as city manager. At that time, the Rialto City Council, composed of four Democrats and one Republican, voted unanimously to ratify a contract with Fuller that paid him a \$275,000 annual salary along with

benefits and perquisites of \$118,500 for a total annual compensation of \$393,500. A selling point for Fuller was that his lifestyle embraced perfectly the Democratic Party's consensus that diversity and inclusion should be driving forces in empowering those who embody what was previously termed "alternative lifestyles." Fuller said his acceptance by the Rialto would allow "the opportunity to continue delivering on Rialto's Bridge to Progress."

Fuller and his husband Noel have two children, Jordan and Jaidyn. Their household includes Noel's parents. Fuller in 2021 was the finalist in a recruitment that involved 85 applicants to take on the responsibility of running the blue collar Rialto, replacing Fire Chief Sean Grayson, who had served as the acting city manager since former City Manager Rod Foster was forced out from his position earlier that year after Mayor Deborah Robertson came to believe that

he was in some fashion involved the previous year in sparking an investigation into her use of her mayoral position to steer more than \$200,000 in city subsidizations to a nonprofit organization headed by Robertson's daughter.

Fuller's familial support network was a factor in his selection as city manager. His father retired from the Ventura County Sheriff's Department as assistant sheriff after a 30-year career, and his brother Jason is a member of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department in Thousand Oaks.

In recent weeks and months, Rialto, which lies between fast-growing Fontana to the west, the social problem-infested and financially-challenged county seat of San Bernardino on its northeast side and the transportation hub of Colton to its southeast with an open frontier at its northernmost end that is cut off by the 15 Freeway at its extreme tip, has been struggling with its identity. Last month, the city council approved a 45 day moratorium on truck traffic on seven street routes, a bold move given the degree to which the

logistics industry has had an important presence in the city.

In November of 2021 an incident took place that weeks later would make Rialto the object of international obloquy when two of its city firefighters/paramedics, citing concerns and what they said was a COVID-19 safety protocol, refused to enter a local care facility after they were dispatched there in response to a call for assistance for a man suffering cardiac arrest. The man died as a consequence of the delay in care.

That incident followed by just a few months the contretemps in Rialto that greeted Fuller shortly after he became city manager which grew out of Rialto City Councilman Ed Scott filing a \$1.15 million claim against the city alleging Rialto police officers and firefighters accessed the State of California's law enforcement database on multiple occasions to obtain confidential information which was used in an attempt to prevent his election and reelection to office as well as for political purposes in opposing the electoral or re-electoral efforts of other members

of the city council.

After becoming Rialto city manager Fuller continued his commitment to maintain his residence in Palm Springs instead of locating to Rialto, requiring a daily round trip commute of 129 miles, which some council members and residents felt detracted from the focus that Fuller needed to bring to his job. That, together with what appeared to be a cultural difference between the city manager and the 51.21 percent Latino, 22.27 percent African

American community, led to an untenable situation which resulted in Fuller electing to retire. He will now be eligible for a pension of roughly \$164,285 annually under the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Fuller said he is now content to leave his professional commitments behind him and devote himself to his family.

Assistant City Manager Aaron Brown is to serve as interim city manager as the process of finding Fuller's replacement takes place.

Cooper Left Chino Hills Around The Time Of Or Shortly After The Ryen Hughes Murders *from page 3*

In his testimony at trial, Cooper stated that he had left the Lease/Lang house after sundown on June 4 and had hitchhiked to Mexico. It is established with certainty that Cooper checked into a hotel in Tijuana, just across the international border roughly 130 miles south of Chino Hills, at 4:30 pm on June 5, 1983. A few days later, the Ryens' station wagon was

discovered in a church parking lot in Long Beach. Sheriff's investigators, after missing them in an initial search, eventually extracted from that vehicle and logged in as evidence cigarette butts consisting of prison-issued Role-Rite tobacco rolled in prison-issued rolling papers indistinguishable from those found at the Lease/Lang house. An all points bulletin identifying Cooper as a suspect in the murders was issued. From Tijuana, Cooper went to Ensenada, where on June 9 he made

Continued on Page 5

Evidence That Cooper Was At The Scene Of The Slaying Emerged Despite Sloppy Sheriff's Department Procedure That Allowed Some 70 Investigators and Observers To Track Through The Ryen Home In The Days After The Murders *from front page*

the acquaintance of an American couple, Owen and Angelica Handy of Humboldt County, who had come to Baja California on their 32-foot sailboat, the Illa Tika. Identifying himself as "Angel Jackson," Cooper persuaded them to allow him to accompany them as a deckhand as they headed back north up the California Coast, eventually anchoring in Pelican Cove off of Santa Cruz Island. Some seven weeks after the Chino Hills murders, during the last week of July, 1983, a 26-foot sailboat anchored near the Handys' boat. Its occupants, a couple from North Hollywood, invited the Handys and Cooper aboard their sloop to a fish fry, during which some alcohol consumption was involved. Well after midnight, Cooper returned to the 26-foot boat, where, armed with a knife, he raped the wife. Her husband reported the rape and accompanied his wife to Goleta Valley Hospital, where she was treated and released. The couple then went to the sheriff's office to provide a statement with regard to the rape. There the woman saw a "Wanted for Murder" poster/flier in the detectives' office bearing a photo of Cooper, whereupon Angel Jackson was identified as Kevin Cooper.

Cooper was taken into custody shortly thereafter by Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department deputies and Coast Guard personnel. Items from the Lease/Lang house were found by deputies searching the Handys' sailboat in the follow-up to the arrest. Then-San Bernardino County District Attorney Dennis Kottmeier prosecuted the case himself with the assistance of one of his deputy prosecutors, John Kochis. The case was tried not in San Bernardino County Superior Court but in San Diego Superior Court before Judge Richard C. Gar-

ner. Cooper was defended by San Bernardino County Public Defender David Negus. The trial lasted from September 1984 until June of 2005. Kottmeier and Kochis, though handicapped by an absence of any direct evidence linking Cooper to the killings, were nevertheless able to build a strong circumstantial case against the defendant. Kottmeier entered into evidence partial shoe prints found at the murder scene and at the Lease/Lang house, where Cooper admitted he had hid after his prison escape. Kottmeier and Kochis further used the cigarette butts consisting of the Role-Rite prison-issue tobacco and prison-issued rolling papers found in the Lease/Lang house and in the Ryens' abandoned station wagon to tie Cooper to the crime. Another damning piece of evidence was a spot of blood on the hallway wall of the Ryen house that was consistent with Cooper's blood profile. A bloody shoeprint made by a Pro-Ked Dude shoe, matching the type of shoes issued to prison inmates, was demonstrated as having been impressed on a sheet in the master bedroom of the Ryen house, along with a matching shoeprint on a spa cover outside the Ryen house, and another in the pool room at the Lease/Lang house. This was augmented with positive Luminol tests, demonstrating the presence of a quantity of blood in a shower in the Lease/Lang house.

A bloodstained hatchet from the Lease/Lang house found near the Ryen home along with the sheath from the hatchet found on the floor of the bedroom that contained the closet where Cooper had slept were presented as evidence to the jury, along with a button found in the Lease/Lang house that matched a prison-issue jacket. Some hunting knives and

at least one ice pick were missing from the Lease/Lang house. A strap fitting one of the missing knives was found in the same bedroom. Another piece of evidence to suggest that Cooper had made his way from the Lease/Lang house to the Ryen residence consisted of an empty beer can in the field between the two homes matching beer in the refrigerator at the Lease/Lang house. The prosecution demonstrated that there were two burrs adhered to the inside of Jessica Ryen's nightgown approximately ten inches up from the bottom hem. Kottmeier asserted to the jury that because the top of Jessica's nightgown did not have holes corresponding with some of Jessica's post mortem chest wounds, at some point the assailant had raised Jessica's nightgown, and, in the process of inflicting her chest wounds, deposited the burrs. The prosecution also presented evidence to show similar burrs were found on the inside of the Ryen station wagon and on a blanket found in the closet where Cooper slept on June 3. Plants producing the burrs grew in the field between the Ryen house and the Lease/Lang house. There were a total of 141 witness called, many of whom offered contradictory testimony. Some of the most dramatic, meaningful and important elements of the trial consisted of testimony from sheriff's investigators and hospital personnel at Loma Linda University Hospital where Joshua Ryen was flown by helicopter on June 5, 1983. Initially, in the presence of a sheriff's detective and a social worker, the eight-year-old indicated his attackers were three white men. In a second interview an hour later, Dr. Mary Howell, Joshua's grandmother, also testified that Joshua told Deputy Hector O'Campo that three Latinos were in the house when the family was killed. On June 15, Joshua told Reserve Deputy Luis Simo that Cooper was not the killer, saying "He didn't do it," upon seeing Co-

oper's photo on television during a newscast. Joshua Ryen's testimony at trial was provided via videotape, during which he said he could not remember much about his attacker or attackers and did not see his attacker directly but as "a shadow on the wall." Cooper testified for five days under examination by Kottmeier, during which he admitted to being in the Lease/Lang house immediately adjacent to the Ryen property, but did not waiver in maintaining his innocence to the murders, while acknowledging that he had stolen a purse from a woman in San Ysidro after hitchhiking there to make his way into Mexico. Cooper's attorney, San Bernardino County Public Defender David Negus, put on testimony by Edward Lelko, the bartender at the Canyon Corral Bar, located not far from the Ryen home, that he had served beer to three men the night of June 4, 1983. The men were not among his regular set of customers, which generally consisted of cowboys and nearby residents. They never returned to the bar. One of those men was "extremely drunk" and was subsequently refused service. The three wore light-colored T-shirts, similar to a bloodstained tan T-shirt found on June 7, 1983, beside a road near the bar. That shirt bore the blood of Doug Ryen, it was later determined. Based upon the circumstantial evidence he and Kochis had placed before the jury, Kottmeier convinced the jurors that there was full and convincing proof that Cooper committed the murders. Cooper was convicted on four counts of murder and one count of attempted murder. The jury recommended the death penalty and Judge Garner sentenced him to death in the gas chamber at San Quentin.

There followed reviews by and appeals to state and federal courts for more than 18 years. Cooper was scheduled to be executed on February 10, 2004. On January 29, 2004, then-Governor Ar-

nold Schwarzenegger denied a request that Cooper be granted clemency. On February 8, 2004, a three judge panel consisting of Judges Pamela Rymmer, Ronald Gould and James Browning heard Cooper's petition and rejected it by a vote of 2-1. Judge Browning, as the lone dissenter was able to assemble enough judges to get a judicial panel to block the execution to allow further DNA testing. Ultimately, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld the stay, effectively blocking the execution of the death warrant. The Campaign to End the Death Penalty, the ACLU and Death Penalty Focus took up Cooper's cause. Over the years, Kottmeier was supplanted as San Bernardino County district attorney by Dennis Stout, followed by Mike Ramos, and currently by Jason Anderson. The San Bernardino County sheriff at the time of the murders, Floyd Tidwell, was succeeded by Dick Williams, Gary Penrod, Rod Hoops, John McMahon and Shannon Dicus, with each successive administration considering the upholding of the integrity of the Ryen/Hughes death investigation and Kevin Cooper's conviction to be synonymous with the credibility of San Bernardino County law enforcement. The sheriff's department's handling of the case, which was already subject to criticism given the fashion in which more than 70 individuals, many of them sheriff's department personnel, had trampled evidence at the murder scene in the two days following the discovery of the bodies, had its reputation damaged further when what would later be represented as key evidence was mishandled or mislaid, lost or destroyed by the department. A tan-colored shirt with blood stains was found by sheriff's personnel not very distant from the murder scene beside Peyton Road. That shirt was logged in as evidence and is yet preserved, and was subject to the DNA testing ordered by Governor Brown just before he left office in 2018. Also

alongside Peyton Road, a local resident, Laurel Epler, came across a blue shirt which she said she believed had blood on it. She called the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department and reported the find. The sheriff's department misplaced that second shirt. A pair of bloody overalls alleged to have been worn by the man wearing the tan shirt, Lee Furrow, were thrown out without being examined by the sheriff's department's forensic experts, its scientific investigations division or its laboratory. The blue shirt, the tan shirt and the bloody overalls became objects of acute scrutiny and speculation as the post trial examination and re-examination of Cooper's guilt intensified. Those items and the goings-on at the Canyon Corral Bar became the core of an alternate murder suspect(s) theory centering around Furrow.

While the projection of Furrow as the possible perpetrator of the murders held promise for Cooper's legal team and can be credited with having kept Cooper from being put to death more almost 19 years ago, the succession of unlikely layers of happenstance this theory involves, when compared to the far more likely causal presumptions in the original prosecution's theory has created a level of skepticism about the defense theories and the assertions of Cooper's innocence, at both the governmental and public levels, that is militating against Cooper far more than in his favor.

Investigators working on behalf of the legal team seeking to keep Cooper from being executed explored in far greater depth the trail of testimony and evidence involving Edward Lelko, the bartender at the Canyon Corral Bar the night of the murders. Lelko's information explored at the trial proved to be a cul-de-sac for the defense at that time. Many years later, however, it loomed as a major boulevard toward what Cooper's advocates considered to

Continued on Page 11

Reports - Or Rumors - Of How Sexually Forward Some Carter High Students Could Be Were Widespread In The Community But Did Not Become An Issue For The Police Department Until One Student's Mothers Made An Issue Of It On The Tik Tok Social Media Platform *from page 3*

September, allegedly off campus, and then held off for three months before informing authorities about either the same or another student sexually assaulting another student in November. There were indications that a wider number of both high school and school district officials as well as members of the police department had the circumstance relating to at least one of the student offenders brought to their attention in the fall of 2021. As of February 15, 2021, the 17-year-old who engaged in the alleged sexual assault in November 2021 and another in January 2022 had been contacted by the police but not arrested. He was, by February 16, 2022 or shortly thereafter, instead given a citation and released to what the police department indicated were his parents. School district employees fall within the category of professionals such as social workers, physicians, teachers, educators or counselors who come into contact with what are termed "vulnerable elements of the population," and are accordingly under legal obligation to report to the appropriate state agency any objectively reasonable sign of child abuse or elder abuse that he or she sees or encounters. By late January 2022, there were reports extant in Rialto about sexual predators at large among the Wilmer Amina Carter student body and that Wilmer Amina Carter High School Principal Robin McMillon was being indolent in the face of what was occurring. Specific incidents were cited, including an alleged rape in September 2021, another sexual assault in November 2021 and a similar incident in January 2022, after which the names of students involved were being freely mentioned among students at the Wilmer Am-

ina Carter campus. Despite that, no police action was taken at that time. One rumor or point of speculation was that there was some order of personal involvement, perhaps a guardianship arrangement, between one of the vice principals or the school principal or an individual employed in the district superintendent's office and the alleged perpetrator. Another was that the vice principal that first heard about the sexual assault did not deem the report credible.

After a second report relating to a second victim implicating the alleged perpetrator was received two months after the first, followed by a third report, events overtook the high school and the school district when the police department assigned Lieutenant James Mills and Detective Agnes Watson to look into the matter. On February 20, 2022, Stephanie Olvera under the pseudonym "penelope_73" with the hashtag "justice for Johanna" posted a video to TikTok which captured both the visuals and audio of Olvera confronting Carter High School Assistant Principal Johanna Cuellar. "How dare you tell me I had nothing to worry about," Olvera can be heard saying to Cuellar. "You told me I didn't need to leave my job. How dare you? My daughter was traumatized by the time I got home." Cuellar can be heard on the video asking Olvera to identify herself, to which Olvera responds, "Who am I? Well, what type of mom are you? How dare you? How dare you not call the cops yesterday for her defense?" When Cuellar says, "I will call them," Olvera replies, "Oh, now you will. I called them already." During further exchange about her daughter, identified by Olvera as "Johanna," Cuellar can be heard saying, "Let me

tell you, your daughter begged me, 'Please, don't call...'" At that point Olvera and an unidentified man accompanying Olvera react strongly, their utterances drowning out Cuellar, who attempts to continue. "It doesn't matter," Olvera says. "She's a student." The man can be heard saying, "Your protocol is to call for her. You're not here to be her friend. You're here to do your job. That's it." With Olvera and the unidentified man, possibly Olvera's husband and Johanna's father, dominating the exchange with the school official, Olvera can be heard saying, "I heard you know about this student already, and nothing's been done." Accompanying the TikTok video was the blurb, "[P]lease help me share my daughter [J]ohanna[s] story[. S] he was sexually abused by a student in Carter [H]igh[S]chool and the school failed to contact me and the police to cover up for the student because he was considered a son to the vice principal[. S]o for that reason they convince[d] my daughter to keep quiet[,] if not she would be expelled[. T]hey failed to protect my daughter and she has not been herself ever since[. P]lease help me share so we can get all the staff involved to be accountable for failing to do their job protecting our children." Despite the rumblings about sexual predators on the Wilmer Amina Carter campus in January, the Rialto Police Department at this point maintains it did not get wind of the sexual assaults until February 16, 2022. At that point, the department was given an explicit report that a 15-year-old girl at Carter High had been sexually assaulted by a 17-year-old student on what the department later said was "several times over the past three months. When detectives investigated the allegations they learned there were two additional female students, ages 15 and 16, who were sexually assaulted by the same suspect." Within a week, the department assembled a case and took action against both Harris-

Dawson and Yang. The department did not include any other school or district personnel in its action plan, including McMillon and Cuellar, despite information that school staff at a level below Harris-Dawson and Yang had direct knowledge about the assaults on students and despite information to indicate that Harris-Dawson and Yang's superior at Wilmer Amina Carter, Principal Robin McMillon, as well as their colleague Cuellar, were within the loop and subject to the same reporting requirement that they were. A month previously, Wilmer Amina Carter High School students and parents of Wilmer Amina Carter High School students had been criticizing McMillon for her tolerance of the overly-sexually aggressive students active on the high school campus. In making the arrests of Harris-Dawson and Yang, the police department put out a statement. "As mandated reporters, both Harris-Dawson and Yang are required by California State Law to immediately alert law enforcement of child abuse or neglect," it pronounced. The police department statement did not mention McMillon.

In the weeks and months after the arrests of Harris-Dawson and Yang, the district removed any references to McMillon as Carter High's principal, purposefully courting a circumstance to suggest she was not affiliated with the school or no longer affiliated with the school. Cuellar was credited with being the school's interim principal.

After Morton was brought publicly into the matter with charges being filed against her, there was a general air of alarm among mandated reporters not just within the school district, not just within Rialto and not just within San Bernardino County but throughout all of California over how knowledge/grounds for suspicion about sexual abuse of children and other vulnerable members of the population was to be defined. The wider implication of the charges lodged against Yang,

Harris-Dawson and Morton were evinced in court filings by the legal representatives of KTTV, Fox News and other media outlets seeking permission to engage in video and other coverage of the court proceedings.

The circumstances of the case suggested that if convictions were obtained against Yang, Harris-Dawson and Morton, any so-called mandated reporters would be vulnerable to prosecution if it were to be demonstrated that someone with whom they had come into contact during the comportment of their professional duty had been sexually assaulted if the mandated reporters had failed to show a sensitivity to any indicator, no matter how nuanced or indirect, that a sexual assault had taken place.

That pushed open the possibility that lawyers for Yang, Harris-Dawson or Morton would explore the culpability of others at the district, including McMillon, Cuellar and even Avila and board members Lewis, O'Kelley, Martinez, Montes, Walker and Hunter, as a defense strategy.

When the police department was pressed as to why it had limited its referrals of criminal activity to Yang, Harris-Dawson and Morton, it put out a statement that it "will not comment on an ongoing sexual battery investigation involving children. Our department will continue protecting children and will not revictimize a child who reports sexual battery by commenting publicly."

When it was asserted that others beyond Yang, Harris-Dawson and Morton had contributed to a circumstance in which the victimization of children had gone unaddressed, an exasperated department member said, "a sufficient message was delivered with the three arrests. Anything further would put the whole staff and principal at risk or even the superintendent or school board. It's gone far enough."

It was suggested that the police department and the district attorney's office, unsure of the reach of the then-relatively new social media

phenomenon Tic-Tok, was seeking to douse the burgeoning conflagration of controversy over the sexual abuse of students within the school district by placating Olvera. Moreover, the observation was that Anderson knew he could not get felony convictions of Yang and Harris-Dawson, but pursued them "to make a statement."

When he was pressed on that issue precisely, Anderson tore into Harris-Dawson and Yang, saying that their failure to act destroyed "the trust that students and parents alike should have regarding the safety and protection of all the children in their care. Their failure as mandated reporters to notify law enforcement led to further victimization of two students, and the sexual assault of a third victim, which was preventable." Pointedly, however, Anderson ignored questions as to why he was not equally critical of McMillon.

Anderson found himself in the ethically uncomfortable circumstance of relying upon the pleadings contained in a civil lawsuit, CIVSB2210212 J.M. -v- Rialto Unified School District et al filed by attorneys Michael Alder and Samantha Hernandez-Ortega on behalf of Stephanie Olvera's daughter, Johanna, against the district, to justify his action.

According to that lawsuit, the day after she had been verbally and sexually assaulted by the 17-year-old male student on campus in November 2021, Johanna told Yang what had occurred. After having Johanna make a statement in writing, Yang had her wait outside his office, according to the lawsuit, while he conferred with Harris-Dawson, after which the two assistant principals sought to have her desist in the complaint.

In particular, according to Alder and Hernandez-Ortega, Harris-Dawson improperly suggested that Johanna

was responsible for provoking the young man's action. In Yang's office, Yang and Harris-Dawson stated or implied that Jo-

Continued on Page 11

Public Notices

AMENDED NOTICE OF HEARING RELATING TO DEFENDANT'S ES-TATE OR TRUST

ESTATE OF: FRED TROY WILLIS CASE NO. PROSB2100817

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

This notice is required by law. You are not required to appear in court, but you may attend the hearing and object or respond if you wish. If you do not respond or attend the hearing, the court may act on the filing without you.

Notice is given that LEHANNA LESHAN GRIMALDI has filed a petition, application, report or account: REPORT OF SALE AND PETITION FOR ORDER CONFIRMING SALE OF REAL PROPERTY (Filed 11/18/22) WITH SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT OF SALE AND PETITION FOR ORDER CONFIRMING SALE OF REAL PROPERTY.

A hearing on the matter will be held as follows: JANUARY 09, 2023 AT 9:00 in Department 37 at SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT - PROBATE DIVISION 247 W. 3rd STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0212.

If the filing described is a report of the status of a decedent's estate administration made under Probate Code section 12200, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO PETITION FOR AN ACCOUNTING UNDER SECTION 10950 OF THE PROBATE CODE.

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 30, 2022 and January 6, 13 & 20, 2023.

Public Notices

SINORE, CA 92532
This Business is Conducted By: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
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/AMY N QUINONEZ, Partner
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/29/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: NOVEMBER 28, 2007
County Clerk, J2286

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 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023 and 01/20/2023.

FBN20220011469

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: the table fellowship THE TABLE FELLOWSHIP 1318 W 9TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786, primarily in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY.

CANVAS CHURCH OF UPLAND, INC. 1318 W 9TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786

Mailing Address: 8413 ORCHARD ST. RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION

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

s/NATHAN LOBDELL, President

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/16/2022

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, J3108

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 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023 and 01/20/2023.

FBN20220011390

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PLUMBING 8378 BRITTANY LANE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701, primarily in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY.

PIPE DREAM ROOTER & PLUMBING, INC 8378 BRITTANY LANE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION registered with the STATE OF CALIFORNIA under the number 2505184

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/DANIELLE LEYTON, Secretary

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/14/2022

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, J3108

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).

FBN20220010950

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ANTHONYS TRUCKING 16404 EMBARK WAY CHINO, CA 91708, primarily in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: ANTHONY J OCHOA 16404 EMBARK WAY CHINO, CA 91708. This 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/ANTHONY J OCHOA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 11/30/2022

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, J2286

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 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023 and 01/20/2023.

FBN20220011783

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Q SCREW PRODUCTS 1512 E. FRANCIS ST. UNIT A ONTARIO, CA 91761, primarily in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY:

AMY N. QUINONEZ 28175 WELLS FARGO RD LAKE EL-SINORE, CA 92532

[and]

VICTOR R. QUINONEZ 28175 WELLS FARGO RD LAKE EL-

Public Notices

ness & Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023 and 01/20/2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ROBERT BISHOP CASE NO. PROSB2201737

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

THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted into 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 JANUARY 31, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S37 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.

Filed: December 22, 2022

Britney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk

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

Attorney for Trese Bishop: 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 January 6, 13 & 20, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ANGELINE LEDBETTER

CASE NO. PROSB2201711

Public Notices

January 6, 13 & 20, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOHNSON HEMBREE CASE NO. PROSB2201751

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

THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted into 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 FEBRUARY 8, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.

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

Attorney for Kapiolani Ann Castillo: ANTONIETTE JAU-REGUI (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 January 6, 13 & 20, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2223055

TO all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ANGELINE LEDBETTER

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by KAPIOLANI ANN CASTILLO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that KAPIOLANI ANN CASTILLO be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

Public Notices

TO all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ANGELINE LEDBETTER

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by KAPIOLANI ANN CASTILLO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that KAPIOLANI ANN CASTILLO 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 JANUARY 26, 2023 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

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

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 29, 2022

Attorney for Kapiolani Ann Castillo: ANTONIETTE JAU-REGUI (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 January 6, 13 & 20, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2223055

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner AN-DREA MARIE NUNEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JOSEPH RUBEN SERNA to JOSEPH MICHAEL NUNEZ
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: FEBRUARY 21, 2023
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.
Brian S. McCarville, Judge of the Superior Court
Filed: January 6, 2023
Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Brianna Johnson
Jacob Joshua Reyes, In Pro Per
Balfour Court
Redlands, CA 92374
(909) 557-6536

Public Notices

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner AN-DREA MARIE NUNEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JOSEPH RUBEN SERNA to JOSEPH MICHAEL NUNEZ

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: FEBRUARY 21, 2023

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.

Filed: 12/7/2022

Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Veronica Gonzalez
Andrea Marie Nunez, In Pro Per
11786 Cedar Avenue
Bloomington, CA 92316
(951) 204-4941

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2300040

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JACOB JOSHUA REYES filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JACOB JOSHUA REYES to JACOB JOSHUA DIAZ

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: FEBRUARY 17, 2023
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.

Brian S. McCarville, Judge of the Superior Court

Filed: January 6, 2023
Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Brianna Johnson
Jacob Joshua Reyes, In Pro Per
Balfour Court
Redlands, CA 92374
(909) 557-6536

Public Notices

jacobdiaz204@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2023.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME NOTICE

FBN 20220011076
The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as:

DAMION'S CONSTRUCTION SERVICES LLC 1649 MAGNOLIA AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 9241: DAMION'S CONSTRUCTION SERVICES 6709 LA TIERRA BOULEVARD #551 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

Mailing Address: 6709 LA TIERRA BOULEVARD #551 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202252019387

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/ DAMION WILLIAMS, CEO
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/05/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: September 28, 2022.
County Clerk, G8420

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious 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 01/06, 01/13, 01/20 & 01/27, 2023.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME NOTICE

FBN 20220011240
The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as:

CAR HAPPY AUTO SALES 170 NORTH ARROWHEAD AVE STE E-127 RIALTO, CA 92376: RAMI ENTERPRISE LLC 7054 HARVEST LN RIVERSIDE, CA 92506

Mailing Address: 7054 HARVEST LN RIVERSIDE, CA 92506

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202253317452

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/ JOSE A RAMIREZ, MANAGER

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/09/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: November 15, 2022.

County Clerk, G8420

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious 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 01/06, 01/13, 01/20 & 01/27, 2023.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME NOTICE

FBN 20220011240
The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as:

CAR HAPPY AUTO SALES 170 NORTH ARROWHEAD AVE STE E-127 RIALTO, CA 92376: RAMI ENTERPRISE LLC 7054 HARVEST LN RIVERSIDE, CA 92506

Mailing Address: 7054 HARVEST LN RIVERSIDE, CA 92506

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202253317452
Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information,

Public Notices

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/ JOSE A RAMIREZ, MANAGER

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/09/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: November 15, 2022.

County Clerk, G8420

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious 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 01/06, 01/13, 01/20 & 01/27, 2023.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 01/20/2023 09:00 AM Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 18 HYUN KMHGN4JE-5JU230866 7ZC8M893 CA To be sold by AIR EXPRESSWAY TOWING 17393 JASMINE ST VICTORVILLE CA 92395

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 January 13, 2023.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 01/27/2023 09:00 AM Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 17 NISS 3N1A-B7AP2HL646189 646189X CA To be sold by NINO'S NUMBER ONE457 W. 10TH STREET SAN BERNARDINO 92410

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 January 13, 2023.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 01/27/2023 09:00 AM Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 14 FREI 3AKJGLD57ES-FN2172 4QMN745 CA To be sold by CONTINENTAL RADIATOR 14601 VALLEY BLVD FONTANA 92335

Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 13, 2023.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): CIV SB 2209193

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): LA VERNE HOWARD, Individually and as Successor Trustee to the BEDFORD M. YOUNG AND LORENE H. YOUNG REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 1992

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): FLOYD WIRTHLIN, JR.

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

Public Notices

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/self-help), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), 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 formularios 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 extensos 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 desear el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección 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 dirección y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Public Notices

Philip H. Dyson, Esq. SBN# 097528 8461 La Mesa Blvd. La Mesa, CA 91942 Phone (619) 462-3311 DATE (Fecha): May 27, 2022

Clerk (Secretario), by Charlene Johnson, Deputy (Adjunto) Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel January 13, 20, 27 & February 3, 2023.

FBN 20220011500 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as MY MISSION 30833 LIVE OAK DRIVE RUNNING SPRINGS, CA 92382. MY MISSION LLC 30833 LIVE OAK DRIVE RUNNING SPRINGS, CA 92382 Mailing Address: 30833 LIVE OAK DRIVE 1755 RUNNING SPRINGS, CA 92382

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 20173110010.

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/ GLORIA WOLCOTT, CFO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/19/2022

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 J3108

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 January 13, 20, 27 & February 3, 2023.

FBN 20220011404 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as SUNDAYHAIRBAR 921 N MILLIKEN AVE #1016 ONTARIO, CA 91764. OZIOMA ODUNZE 921 N MILLIKEN AVE #1016 ONTARIO, CA 91764

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: DECEMBER 6, 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/ OZIOMA ODUNZE

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/14/2022

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 J3108

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 January 13, 20, 27 & February 3, 2023.

FBN 20230000107 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as PREMIER MARTIAL ARTS ACADEMY 9726 FOOTHILL BLVD/RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: PREMIER MARTIAL ARTS ACADEMY LLC 9726 FOOTHILL BLVD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Mailing Address: 7050 MARINO PL. RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91701

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered in California under the number 201725610416.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEPTEMBER 17, 2017.

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

Public Notices

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/ PETER LOPEZ, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 01/05/2023

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 J2108

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 January 13, 20, 27 & February 3, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: SALLY CANO OCHOA CASE NO. PROSB2300013

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of SALLY CANO OCHOA has been filed by PATRICIA ANN ARMENDARIZ in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PATRICIA ANN ARMENDARIZ be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted into 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 FEBRUARY 7, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: January 5, 2023 Nathaniel Johnson, 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

Public Notices

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: January 5, 2023 Attorney for Patricia Ann Armendariz:

R.SAMPRICESBN208603 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 January 20, 27 & February 3, 2023.

FBN 20230000267

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as RANCHO CUCAMONGA DEVELOPMENT COMPANY 10050 WILSON AVENUE ALTA LOMA, CA 91737: ALAN R TIBBETTS 10050 WILSON AVENUE ALTA LOMA, CA 91737 [and] PHILO BIANE 6 GOOSENECK ROAD ALTA LOMA, CA 91737 MY MISSION LLC 30833 LIVE OAK DRIVE RUNNING SPRINGS, CA 92382 Mailing Address: 492 W FOOTHILL BLVD CLAREMONT, CA 91711

The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEPTEMBER 25, 1979.

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/ ALAN R TIBBETTS, General Partner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 1/11/2023

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 J3108

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 January 20 & 27 & February 3 & 10, 2023.

FBN 20230000342 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as VENDIES VENDING 8320 VICARA DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA 91701: VENDIES VENDING LLC 8320 VICARA DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA 91701 Mailing Address: 492 W FOOTHILL BLVD CLAREMONT, CA 91711

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP registered with the State of California under the number 202253219069

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOVEMBER 11, 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/ JACQUELINE CHENG, Managing Member

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 1/13/2023

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 J3108

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 Bernardi-

Public Notices

no County Sentinel on January 20 & 27 & February 3 & 10, 2023.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- FBN20220011588

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: PET EMPIRE AND SUPPLIES, 7223 CHURCH ST, SUITE A3, HIGHLAND, CA 92346, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Mailing Address: , F & OC PET EMPIRE AND SUPPLIES INC., 7223 CHURCH ST, SUITE A3, HIGHLAND, CA 92346, State of Inc./Org./Reg. CA, Inc./Org./Reg. No.

Business is Conducted By: ORALIA LIZBETH CORTES

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/ORALIA LIZBETH CORTES, SECRETARY This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/21/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: 12/15/2022

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).

1/20/2023, 1/27/2023, 2/3/2023, 2/10/2023

FBN 20220011557 The following person is doing business as: ANTOJITOS LA VACUITA. 863 N. RANCHO AVE. COLTON, CA 92324-[MAILING ADDRESS 4462 HALFINGER WAY RIVERSIDE, CA 92509]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MA G VACA--MUNOZ 863 N. RANCHO AVE. COLTON, CA 92324. 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/ MA G VACA--MUNOZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 20, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023, 01/20/2023 CNBB522022021R

FBN 20220011719 The following person is doing business as: ZINUM SOLUTIONS. 4181 MOUNTAIN DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO YUSIMY J MUNIZ 4181 MOUNTAIN DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 26, 2016 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ YUSIMY J MUNIZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 28, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Public Notices

or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/30/2022, 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023, 01/20/2023 CNBB52202211R

FBN 20230000013

The following person is doing business as: MG AUTO. 408 S PERSHING AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAMIE M MORALES 408 S PERSHING AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408; JIMMY E ROMERO JR 408 S PERSHING AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408. 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/ JAMIE M MORALES, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 03, 2023

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

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023, 01/20/2023, 01/27/2023 CNBB1202328LD

FBN 20230000014 The following person is doing business as: HAIR BOSSES BARBER & BEAUTY BAR. 348 W HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAMIE M MORALES 348 W HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; THATTAS W CAMPBELL 348 W HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405. 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/ JAMIE M MORALES, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 03, 2023

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

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023, 01/20/2023, 01/27/2023 CNBB1202327LD

FBN 20220011769 The following person is doing business as: LAYELLA JR. 2454 SAINT ELMO DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO QUENTIN J UWEH 2454 SAINT ELMO DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: DEC 25, 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/ QUENTIN J UWEH, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 29, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/06/2023, 01/13/2023, 01/20/2023, 01/27/2023

Public Notices

CNBB1202325MT

FBN 20220010623
The following person is doing business as: PANCHO'S KITCHEN, 27141 E BASELINE ST HIGHLAND, CA 91786; MAILING ADDRESS 722 EMERALD ST UPLAND, CA 91736; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CIZO LOGISTICS, LLC 722 EMERALD STREET UPLAND, CA 91786

FBN 20220011747
The following person is doing business as: MARCEL PRIME, 276 SOLANA ST SAN JACINTO, CA 92582 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE DERRICK M LAMPKIN 276 SOLANA ST SAN JACINTO, CA 92582

FBN 20220011746
The following person is doing business as: DUCK DOWN, 276 SOLANA ST SAN JACINTO, CALIFORNIA 92582 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE REGINALD D MONTGOMERY 276 SOLANA ST SAN JACINTO, CA 92582

FBN 20220011731
The following person is doing business as: DOUBLE ZERO BARBERSHOP, 891 HARRIMAN PL STE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DOUBLE ZERO BARBERSHOP LLC 891 HARRIMAN PL STE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Public Notices

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20220011683
The following person is doing business as: CAZARES EXPEDITED SERVICES, 12424 14TH ST YUCAIPA, CA 92399 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ELIZABETH CAZARES 12424 14TH ST YUCAIPA, CA 92399

FBN 20220011681
The following person is doing business as: BIRRIERIA LOS CONSIENTIDOS, 350 S WILLOW AVE SPC #112 RIALTO, CA 92376 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SUSANA BELTRAN NAVARRO 350 S WILLOW AVE SPC #112 RIALTO, CA 92376

FBN 20220011649
The following person is doing business as: ELYT ACTIVE, 908 E HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ELYSIA M BARAJAS 908 E HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

Public Notices

that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ELYSIA M BARAJAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 22, 2022

FBN 20220011651
The following person is doing business as: VASQUEZ FORKLIFT SERVICE, 5436 N E STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DANIEL A VASQUEZ 5436 N E STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407

FBN 20220011748
The following person is doing business as: ROAD RUNNERS, 700 IDYLLWILD DR. #21 SAN JACINTO, CA 92583 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS RIVERSIDE JAMES R BAKER 700 IDYLLWILD DR. #21 SAN JACINTO, CA 92583

FBN 20220011620
The following person is doing business as: MCM AIR SOLUTIONS, 15050 MONTE VISTA AVE APC 56 CHINO, CA 91709; MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARCOS COVARRUBIAS 15050 MONTE VISTA AVE APC 56 CHINO, CA 91709

Public Notices

ment on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk.

FBN 20220011572
The following person is doing business as: VARNADO REALTY TRUST, 12183 HIGHGATE CT RANCH CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MONTE L PEYTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

FBN 20220011533
The following person is doing business as: VALLEY PAINTING 7 DECORATING, 2525 SEPULVEDA AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404; MAILING ADDRESS 201 E STATE ST REDLANDS, CA 92373; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RICHARD H HARDEMAN 2525 SEPULVEDA AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

FBN 20220011617
The following person is doing business as: PARATAX; PARATAX INCOME TAX SERVICES; PARATAX LA; PARATAX FINANCIAL SERVICES, 18074 LAUREL DR FONTANA, CA 92336 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LEE O AMARO 18074 LAUREL DR FONTANA, CA 92336

Public Notices

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

FBN 20220011782
The following person is doing business as: DHM GENERAL STORE, 245 N WATERMAN AVE #K&L SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MAHER FAYAD 245 N WATERMAN AVE #K&L SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

FBN 20220011778
The following person is doing business as: AMERICAS TOROS MECHANICAL WELDING, 1260 N FITZGERALD AVE #204 RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS 16040 MILLER AVE FONTANA, CA 92336; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JUAN F LOPEZ 16040 MILLER AVE FONTANA, CA 92336

FBN 20220011319
The following person is doing business as: SOLPIX, 3139 N ASHFORD AVE RIALTO, CA 92377 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LOUIS C RODRIGUEZ 3139 N ASHFORD AVE RIALTO, CA 92377

Public Notices

FBN 20220011425
The following person is doing business as: U.S.A. AUTO BODY SHOP, 8265 FREMONTIA AVE FONTANA, CA 92335 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARCO DUARTE 8265 FREMONTIA AVE FONTANA, CA 92335

FBN 20220011442
The following person is doing business as: DIVINE HOME INSPECTIONS, 3713 OAKCREEK DRIVE #F ONTARIO, CA 91761 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NORMAN CRAIG CHISOLM 3713 OAKCREEK DRIVE #F ONTARIO, CA 91761

FBN 20220011431
The following person is doing business as: DIVINE ALIGNMENT CHRISTIAN COUNSELING AND SUPPORT, 9431 HAVEN AVE SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO THE SNOWDEN COMPANIES LLC 9431 HAVEN AVE SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

FBN 20220011290
The following person is doing business as: ARCHIBALD LIQUOR & WINE, 8880 ARCHIBALD AVE STE A RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; MAILING ADDRESS 4718 GRAPHITE CREEK RD

Public Notices

JURUPA VALLEY, CA 91752; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO PRAMUKHTRITH INC 4718 GRAPHITE CREEK RD JURUPA VALLEY, CA 91752; 8880 ARCHIBALD AVE STE A RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 917305

FBN 20220011505
The following person is doing business as: SAGE PATHWAYS, 5405 DELANEY WAY FONTANA, CA 9336 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LISA M ROSS 5405 DELANEY WAY FONTANA, CA 9336

FBN 20220011522
The following person is doing business as: DAMIENSONLINESHOP, 1215 BIRCH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; MAILING ADDRESS PO BOX 1352 HIGHLAND, CA 92346; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARLON D RAMIREZ 1215 BIRCH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410

FBN 20220011719
The following person is doing business as: ZINUM SOLUTIONS, 4181 MOUNTAIN DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO YUSIMY J MUNIZ 4181 MOUNTAIN DRIVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407

The Panicked Atmosphere That Accompanied Yang and Harris-Dawson's February Arrests Had Recontexted Itself By The Time Of Their August Preliminary Hearing *from page 6*

Johanna making an issue of what had occurred was leading to the 17-year-old being threatened and harassed by other students, who were characterizing him as a sexual pervert, according to the suit.

Present in Yang's office, according to the lawsuit, was a school district/Carter High security guard. The guard and Yang sought to dissuade Johanna from pressing the matter, while implying or stating she could be suspended from school or expelled if she persisted, according to Alder and Hernandez-Ortega.

With the matter yet up in the air, Harris-Dawson later brought Johanna into her office and accused Johanna of dressing provocatively and thus encouraging the assault and not being force-

ful enough in rebuffing the 17-year-old's sexual advances, according to the lawsuit.

No action was taken by either Yang, Harris-Dawson or the security guard until February, at which point Johanna, brought to tears by again being subjected to the sexual harassment, told a teacher about the 17-year old's actions when the teacher asked why she was crying, the suit states. The teacher informed Cuellar, who contacted Stephanie Olvera. On February 16, Olvera informed the Rialto Police Department about the abuse her daughter was experiencing at the hands of the 17-year-old, according to the lawsuit.

According to the Rialto Unified School District, "The safety and well-being of students is our number one priority."

The district attorney's office must adhere to a standard in criminal court of proving the charges against Yang, Harris-Dawson and Morton to a moral certainty or beyond any reasonable doubt, while Alder and Hernandez-Ortega, to prevail for their client

need to show that a preponderance of the evidence favors their case. Prosecutors need get a unanimous guilty verdict to convict. Alder and Hernandez-Ortega can win with a majority verdict.

As early as last May, members of Anderson's office were questioning whether he would be able to obtain convictions against Yang and Harris-Dawson on felony charges wherein the underlying crime was a misdemeanor committed by a separate party.

The prosecution's narrative bogged down when substantive discrepancies with regard to the first of the alleged assaults involving the 17-year-old emerged during the preliminary hearing for Yang and Harris-Dawson. Unresolved by investigators was when that assault, initially said to have happened in September 2021 but later referred to as happening in October and then in November, occurred. More difficult still was where that assault occurred, as it could not be established that at least one of the assaults had occurred

on campus.

One of the assaults perpetrated by the 17-year-old against Johanna was said to have occurred in November of 2021, consisting of the boy "grabbing her ass" and making sexually-tinged comments to her.

Timelines with regard to the complaint made by Johanna and the action taken, or as put by the prosecutors not taken, by Yang and Harris-Dawson proved problematic for the prosecution as the preliminary hearing on the matter held in August 2022 moved into its middle stages. A presumption was that both knew of the full range of the 17-year-old's behavior no later than November and Yang and Harris-Dawson had been told by one of the victims that that she had been physically assaulted by the young man. Detective Watson, however, stated that the victim informed her that she had not told any adults about what had occurred until she related it to Watson.

There emerged a difference between what Johanna told Yang and Harris-Dawson and what she had represented to

the adults in her household about what she had told the two assistant principals. The police department and, accordingly, the district attorney's office either lost interest in or was stymied in getting to the bottom of the report that a student had been raped in September.

A rumor that one of the administrators at Carter High School was a foster parent to the 17-year-old did not pan out when investigators looked into it.

Visco, Gardner and Scaffidi were also able to provide Judge Lee with credible evidence that Yang and Harris-Dawson sought to corroborate the accusations against the 17-year-old but were thwarted in that effort when other students said to be witnesses refused to make either verbal or written statements to confirm those accusations.

Prosecutors maintained that Yang and Harris-Dawson could not use their inability to prove on their own all of the details with regard to the assaults as a defense of their action/inaction, as they had been told of two and possibly more

sexual assaults perpetrated by the 17-year-old on younger females at the high school and that they did not, as required, inform either the police department or child protective services. Nor did Yang and Harris-Dawson, according to the prosecution, contact the victims' parents or the 17-year-old's parents.

Today, Judge Lee entered a finding under the rubric of Penal Code Section 995 granting a dismissal of the Penal Code § 273 (A) charges, setting them aside against both Yang and Harris-Dawson on the grounds that the information supplied in the filing to allege a felony was improperly or inadequately sustained by the evidence and other pleadings.

Visco, Gardner and Scaffidi will now concentrate on establishing their clients were not negligent in addressing the implications in the 17-year-old's actions toward any of the three female Carter High School students, as must be established for prosecutors to prevail in proving those charges.

-Mark Gutglueck

Alternate Murderer Theory In Cooper Case Centered On Contention The Family Was Killed Over A Horse Sale *Dispute from page 5*

be justice. Others in the Canyon Corral Bar who saw the three strangers that night were Shirley Killian, the bar manager; Pam Smith, a bar patron; Lance Stark, a bar patron whom the sheriff's department tried to intimidate into not testifying in 2004; Christine Slonaker, a phlebotomist, who recognized blood on the strangers' clothing; Mary Mellon Wolfe, who was with Slonaker and who, like Slonaker, testified to seeing the blood at Cooper's evidentiary hearing in 2004; and Kathy Royals, a waitress who waited on the strangers. Defense investigators learned that another convicted murderer, Clarence Ray Allen, who was himself executed in 2006, had become embroiled in a dispute with Doug

and Peggy Ryen over a horse he had purchased from them. Among Allen's employees was Lee Furrow, another criminal whom Allen had previously hired to kill Allen's son's 17-year-old girlfriend, Mary Sue Kitts.

According to Furrow's then-girlfriend, Diana Roper, Lee Furrow came home in the early morning of June 5, 1983 wearing bloody overalls and without the tan shirt he had been wearing earlier in the day. Lee Furrow changed out of the overalls and on June 9, Diana Roper called the sheriff's department to report what had occurred and thereafter provided the overalls to the department. The sheriff's department never had its scientific investigations division test the overalls for blood, never turned them over to Negus, Cooper's defense attorney, and instead disposed of them on the day of Cooper's arraignment. Internal sheriff's department phone logs established that a deputy sheriff

made multiple attempts to give the overalls to the lead investigator. This contradicted the deputy's later claim, when the defense made an issue of the overalls, that he never considered the overalls of evidentiary value. A supervisor admitted to an investigator that he signed off on disposing of the overalls, thereby impeaching the deputy's testimony at trial that he made that decision.

It is believed by some that Furrow is one of the three men who were unfamiliar to Lelko, the bartender at the Canyon Corral Bar working the night of June 4, 1983. Killian, Smith, Stark, Slonaker, Wolfe and Royals, all of whom were present at the bar that night, would eventually provide testimony with regard to the presence of the three men at the Corral Canyon Bar on the night of June 4.

The Ryen family's station wagon was found in Long Beach, within five miles of Furrow's mother's home. There

was blood matched to the Ryen family on both the driver side and passenger side of the front seat as well as in the back seat, an indication, Cooper's defenders say, that three men attacked the Ryen family and Christopher Hughes and then, splattered with blood, made their getaway in the station wagon.

Cooper's defenders postulate that Furrow, who was part of a murderous gang that had murdered on behalf of Allen in the past, had been sent to Chino Hills to collect on a debt the Ryens owed Allen for the horse. Undercutting that theory is the consideration that by June 1983, Furrow and Allen were no longer on good terms. In 1977, Furrow had entered a guilty plea to killing Mary Sue Kitts at the bequest of Allen, who from prison sought to arrange to have another career criminal, Billy Ray Hamilton, murder Furrow and seven other witnesses to prevent them from testifying during

the appeal process of Allen's conviction in the Kitts murder.

By the early 2000s, Cooper's legal team sought to have DNA testing carried out on several of the pieces of evidence used to convict him more than a decade-and-a-half after his trial. Evincing a rather curious attitude for those so confident in Cooper's guilt, prosecutors resisted those requests. Eventually, after Cooper's 2004 execution was narrowly averted, an order for DNA testing of some of the evidence was granted. Pointedly, the DNA test showed that the tan shirt had both Douglas Ryen's and Cooper's blood on it. The presence of Cooper's blood on the shirt delivered a seemingly irrefutable blow to the assertions of Cooper's innocence. Nonetheless, Cooper's defenders doubled down, saying they believed that Cooper's blood, drawn from him after his arrest as part of the investigative process, was subsequently

planted on the shirt. Furthermore, Cooper's legal team staked the credibility of its case on a clump of blonde hair found in Jessica Ryen's hand, maintaining it was indicative that she was murdered by someone other than Cooper, an African-American.

On Christmas Eve 2018, just prior to his leaving office, Governor Brown issued an executive order relating to the Cooper case calling for new testing, using up-to-date scientific standards to be applied on four pieces of evidence: the tan T-shirt found in a ditch off the side of the road near the Corral Canyon Bar, an orange towel found near the scene and the handle of the hatchet used in the murders and the hatchet sheath.

"I take no position as to Mr. Cooper's guilt or innocence at this time, but colorable factual questions have been raised about whether advances in DNA technology warrant lim-

Continued on Page 12

Residents Say City Is Letting Developer Use Expired Entitlement To Proceed With Live Oak Canyon Project *from page 2*

ing to the city, the January 2014 purchase and sale agreement allows each residential lot/unit to include a second residential unit as allowed under Government Code sections 65852.1 and 65852.2 and the City of Redlands Municipal Code. According to the city, the tentative tract map and conditional use permit applications would be amended as per the general plan alternative.

The city maintains the project proponent has le-

gal clearance to proceed with the project as now proposed – extending to 24 units – since the general plan alternative locked in with the December 2006 stipulated judgment specified that the residential development was not to exceed 36 residential lots/units. Because the October 21, 2015 amended stipulated judgment conveyed the development rights to 12 lots/units to the city, Mistretta retains the right to develop 24 units, according to the city.

Those questioning the city's action in considering approval of the project maintain that the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust's, Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC's and Mistretta Family Partners entitlement to build

has elapsed, based upon the May 26, 2017 expiration of the tentative tract map.

In a letter dated January 10 to the Redlands City Council, Steve Rogers, a Redlands resident and licensed civil engineer, requested that the council intervene to prevent the planning commission from proceeding with the processing of the Mistretta project application.

"This project was approved solely by the planning commission in 2015 and was never taken to the Redlands City Council for approval in 2015 and that is why all the time extensions are being granted by the planning commission without being recommended to the city council for approv-

al," Rogers stated. "I can remember questioning this process as not being consistent with the California Subdivision Map Act. Former City Attorney Dan McHugh sent me over a section of the municipal code that indicates this is possible if no one on the city council 'calls the map up' to be considered. I believe that this section along with the section of the Redland Municipal Code indicating that the city can give three one-year time extensions for an approved tentative map rather than the maximum of a two-year extension makes the Redlands Municipal Code out of compliance with the California Subdivision Map Act state law."

According to Rogers,

"Additionally, the final map for this tentative tract must be signed by the city engineer after the city council approval." Consequently, Rogers asserted, "For the city council to not have taken any action to approve the environmental impact report/tentative tract/conditional use permit entitlements in the first place or approve any of the time extensions, all of which were instead approved by the planning commission, is improper and in violation of state law."

The Sentinel has been provided with communication between Redlands residents in which options being discussed with regard to the Mistretta proposal includes retaining an attorney for legal action if the plan-

ning commission approves the project and the city uses it as the final determination as to the entitlement to build.

Putting as diplomatically as he could, Redlands land owner Ron Simmons in an email dated January 15 intended for all Redlands officials to Brian Foote, the city's planning director, wrote, "I strongly urge the Redlands City Council to collaborate with the Mistretta family, environmental and conservation groups, and Morongo (Cahuilla) Tribal leaders to refrain from housing development in Live Oak Canyon and set this land aside as perpetual open space and wildlife, as well as human, sanctuary."

-Mark Gutglueck

State Panel Calls Evidence Against Cooper "Conclusive" While His Champions Decry It As Having Been Doctored *from page 11*

ited retesting of certain physical evidence in this case," Brown wrote in his executive order. Brown said that if the tests failed to turn up new DNA or some that did not lead to any identifiable individual, "this matter should be closed."

Over the years, the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office, district attorneys Kottmeier, Stout, Ramos and deputy district attorneys Grover Merritt and James Secord have insisted that Cooper was the killer, he was given a fair and adequate trial while represented by a competent attorney and that previous DNA tests and other scientific analyses point unerringly to his guilt.

In appeals to Governor Brown in 2017 and 2018 that led to Brown's Christmas Eve 2018 order, Cooper's defense team, led by attorney Norman Hile, insisted that Cooper had never worn the tan shirt and the person who was wearing it was the person who had murdered the Ryens and Hughes. Hile said modern DNA analysis is more sophisticated and exacting than what was previously available, extending beyond

blood to sweat and skin particles absorbed into or adhering to cloth, allowing a determination to be made that it was not Cooper who was wearing the shirt. The testing would also bear out Cooper's defense team's suggestion that the case against Cooper has been tainted all along by law enforcement misconduct and efforts to load the dice against his client, most notably Hile said, by saturating the tan T-shirt with blood drawn from Cooper as part of the investigative process after his capture.

Brown's order did not extend to DNA testing on the clump of hairs found clutched in Jessica Ryen's palm. In the spring of 2019, however, Hile and Cooper's advocates convinced Brown's successor, Governor Newsom, to augment the testing on the shirt, the orange towel and the hatchet handle and hatchet sheath with DNA testing on the hairs in Jessica Ryen's hand, other preserved blood evidence, fingernail scrapings from the victims and a green button found at the Lease/Lang house.

Bode Technology, a respected forensic laboratory, carried out that analysis. The results be-

yond what was already known, that the shirt bore Cooper's blood and that of Douglas Ryen, were inconclusive. The hairs in Jessica Ryen's hand were her own and non-human animal hair.

Both camps – those representing Cooper and the district attorney's office – maintain the Bode Laboratories examination results support their positions with regard to Cooper's innocence or guilt. The Bode results do nothing to add to the prosecution's case that Cooper is the murderer, Hile and his team maintain. The Bode results confirm that Cooper's blood was on the shirt along with Douglas Ryen's, the district attorney's office has countered, and there was nothing in the testing to suggest that anyone other than Cooper murdered the Ryens and Hughes.

To resolve the dispute, Newsom's order called for the team of Morrison & Foerster lawyers, serving as special counsel, to carry out an independent investigation of the evidence marshaled so far in the aftermath of Cooper's conviction. Newsom said he was confident that the Morrison & Foerster lawyers could serve as an independent trier of fact, with no interest in sustaining Cooper's conviction nor in making a determination of Cooper's innocence.

Under normal circumstances, an appeal of a conviction extends only to issues raised at trial. Newsom's order gave Morrison & Foerster license to explore any issues relating to Cooper's guilt or innocence, whether previously considered in the official record of the trial and the appeal process or not. The review extend to the 1984-to-1985 trial, the sheriff's department's investigative file, evidence and testimony presented pre-trial and during appeals, and any material or evidence that did not make it into the trial or appellate record, along with all DNA testing results.

Morrison & Foerster, in its capacity as special counsel retained technical and research experts to go over the arguments made on Cooper's behalf and the evidence marshaled to support those assertions, and looking at the alternate murder suspect(s) theory centering around Furrow first propounded by Negus and later emphasized by his appellate attorneys.

According to Morrison & Foerster, those experts were unable to substantiate that theory.

"Cooper has not established that others committed the Ryen/Hughes crimes," according to the special counsel report.

What conclusive DNA evidence does exist is "highly incriminating"

and points solely toward Cooper as the perpetrator of the grisly murders of the three Ryens and Hughes, according to the special counsel report. "The contention that someone else committed the crimes is refuted by the overwhelming evidence of Cooper's guilt, and by the absence of any DNA evidence or any other persuasive evidence that points to any other person as the culprit."

Perhaps the most damning evidence against Cooper, which is not subject to accusations of planting or alteration such as the cigarette butts that were found in the Ryen station wagon after they were missed in the first go-round by sheriff's investigators is Cooper's blood that was found on a wall in the Ryens' home at the immediate murder scene.

This, together with Cooper's blood and Doug Ryen's on the T-shirt discovered by the road near the Ryens' home not far from the Lease/Lang house, cinches the case against Cooper in the minds of many.

The special counsel report cites Cooper's DNA on belatedly discovered cigarette butts recovered from the Ryens' station wagon as a further indicator of Cooper's guilt.

"We are extremely disappointed by the spe-

cial counsel's report to the Board of Parole Hearings and disagree strongly with its findings," the law firm of Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe, which is leading Cooper's appeals team, said in reaction to the Morrison & Foerster panel's conclusions. "Most fundamentally, we are shocked that the governor seemingly failed to conduct a thorough review of the report that contains many misstatements and omissions, and also ignores the purpose of a legitimate innocence investigation, which is to independently determine whether Mr. Cooper's conviction was a product of prosecutorial misconduct. The report failed to address that critical issue. "Kevin Cooper has suffered imprisonment as a death row inmate for more than 38 years for a gruesome crime he did not commit."

That is not accurate, according to Morrison & Foerster, which held in the final report, "Special counsel carefully considered specific requests on behalf of Cooper for further inquiry and have concluded that there is no reasonable possibility that more investigation beyond what has already been conducted in this matter could affect the conclusion that evidence of Cooper's guilt is conclusive."