

Back To Scratch For Mistretta Family Trust On Live Oak Canyon Project

Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC's controversial plans for what ultimately was intended to be a 24-unit single family residential subdivision in Live Oak Canyon first approved to a differing density standard nearly 18 years ago and which have been repeatedly delayed and kept viable by a series of procedurally suspect extensions of what was originally a three-year tentative map will need to go through

the approval process anew if the project is to proceed, according to Redlands officials.

While opponents of the intended development of 181.82 acres in the rustic canyon at the southeastern extreme of Redlands hailed the decision to withdraw the project from consideration, the proponents have not revealed their ultimate intention with regard to the property. If the project is yet to be

pursued, either by Mistretta Canyon Partners or some entity to whom the property is sold, land use standards now in place that have been imposed by the State of California to induce local jurisdictions to promote residential development to redress a perceived housing shortage and homelessness dilemma could redound to allowing a more intensive use of the property that could involve,

potentially, a density that would conceivably involve twice or thrice as many homes. 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 the aforementioned 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 (R-R).

Two groups – Citizens of Red- See P 2

Landver & Greenberg Appeal County Commission's Ruling On Wonder Inn Project Denial

Jason Landver and Alan Greenberg on April 3 filed an appeal with the board of supervisors of the San Bernardino County Planning Commission's March 23 rejection of their proposal to establish a resort hotel in the desert community of Wonder Valley.

The planning commission devoted four hours 37 minutes and 45-seconds to considering the San Bernardino County Land Use Services staff's recommendation and the presentation of the project made by Landver and a team of development consultants along with the input of 47 residents of the area or their advocates who inveighed against the project.

Landver and Greenberg expressed their intent to construct a 106-room hotel, to include an all-night restaurant, spa/wellness center, conference hall and event center, a 6,000-square foot swimming pool, hot tubs, outdoor showers, a 180,000-gallon water tank and a 205-space parking lot on 24.4 acres situated on 223 acres they have acquired centered on a point identified as located at 78201 Amboy Road, not too distant from the southwest corner of Amboy Road and Gammel Road. The county's land use services division's personnel assigned to the project, consisting of Senior Planner Azhar Khan and Supervising Planner Chris Warrick, were favorably disposed toward the proposal, and they recommended that the planning commission recommend ap- See P 7

Mexican Standoff Between Ontario Council Factions Ends Effort To Censure Valencia

By Mark Gutglueck

A Mexican standoff has ensued in the aftermath of a move by Ontario Mayor Paul Leon and two members of the city council to censure their colleague, Ruben Valencia, on the basis of Valencia's continuing association with foreign politicians and the municipal/governmental entities the City of Ontario earlier this year ended its

affiliation with.

Valencia and his attorney, Cory Briggs, have sharply contested multiple characterizations of Leon and Councilman Alan Wapner and Councilwoman Debbie Dorst-Porada have made about his activity in Sinaloa early last month, and Briggs maintains he has now obtained evidence that shows Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada

violated the Brown Act, California's open public meeting law, in militating to discredit Valencia, an effort which the lawyer said had been facilitated by Ontario City Manager Scott Ochoa.

Complicating factors, which include what Briggs and Valencia say is the very real possibility that the council would be subjected to a criminal prosecution, have

convinced the council and key elements of the city administration that whatever political advantage the ruling faction on the council's might obtain through the censure of Valencia would be more than offset by the negative publicity and damage to its own reputation the city council might sustain if the full extent of three of its members' actions

were to be publicly revealed. On January 17, the Ontario City Council dissolved its sister city relationship with – at the very least – the City of Guamuchil in the Mexican state of Sinaloa. Up until that time, Ontario had sister city status with six international cities – Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico; Mocorito, Sinaloa, Mexico; Guamuchil, Sinaloa, See P 2

Obernolte Sides With Federal Employees' Union Over Veterans Administration Management

Congressmen Jay Obernolte this week took a fair cross section of his Republican constituents aback by joining with another Republican in siding with the American Federation of Government Employees in an apparent dispute between Veterans Affairs management and the union.

Obernolte's support-

ers leapt to his defense, insisting the intricacies and subtleties of the issue he had taken up made it prone to misinterpretation, asserting he was remaining faithful to his conservative ideals.

With only a handful of exceptions, Obernolte has sought to identify himself as strongly to the right politically. He has succeeded as an

elected official by virtue of his location at the epicenter of one of the last remaining bastions of Republicanism in California. There is debate as to whether the stance he took this week remains solidly in keeping with the reputation he has cultivated or if he is, chameleon-like, preparing to make a lurch leftward as the Congress- See P 3

Reyes & Ramos Author Competing Warehouse Regulation Bills

That two competing bills aimed at regulating the proliferation of warehouses have originated from Democratic Assembly members representing adjoining Inland Empire districts perhaps should be but is not really surprising, given the seriousness with which an ever-larger segment of the community views the logistics industry.

As a consequence of San Bernardino County's location adjacent to Los Angeles County, home to the massive port facilities in San Pedro and Long Beach, where between 400 million tons and 700 million tons of cargo brought in by ship from Asia have been offloaded annually over each of the last five years, an See P 3

Women's Club Luncheon Tickets For Sheriff Dicus's Address At Redlands Country Club

Those who rush can yet secure a reservation to hear Sheriff Shannon Dicus address the Redlands Republican Women's Club during its luncheon at the Redlands Country Club on April 21.

For \$25 and either an email to reservations@RedlandsRWF.org or a phone call to Laurie Tremain at 909-792-2501, a

ticket to the event, which is to last from 11:30 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. and will include the serving of lunch, can be had.

Those who cannot get a ticket to the event, to be held at 1749 Garden Street, can hear the sheriff's address, but will not be seated for lunch.

Dicus was appointed to the the San Bernardino County sheriff's post

by the board of supervisors in 2021 upon the recommendation of his predecessor, John McMahon. He is the latest holder of the sheriff's reins as the head of the historic Frank Bland Political Machine, which came into existence in 1954 when Frank Bland defeated then-incumbent Sheriff Gene Mueller. Control of the machine

passed from Bland to Floyd Tidwell in 1982, from Tidwell to Dick Williams in 1990, from Williams to Gary Penrod in 1994, from Penrod to Rod Hoops in 2009 and from Hoops to McMahon in 2012.

Dicus graduated from Twentynine Palms High School and served in the U.S. Army for three years as a military policeman assigned to the

101st Airborne Division, in which capacity he was deployed to the Middle East and South America. After his discharge from the Army, Dicus returned to San Bernardino County where he worked for the Office of Veterans Affairs as a police officer at the Jerry L. Pettis Veterans Hospital in Loma Linda.

Dicus holds a bachelor's degree See P 3

Mistretta Family Retained Right To Develop Live Oak Canyon Property Despite Legal Challenge & Referendum, But Let Deadline Elapse *from front page*

lands 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 gather-

ing enough valid signatures of city voters in an abbreviated timeframe in order to qualify a referendum on the project for the November 2005 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

grassroots effort involving further 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 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 judg-

ment 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 was conveyed to the City of Redlands for just under \$1.6

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

million. The conveyance 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 Red-

lands Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 18845, Conditional Use Permit No. 1036, and Variance No. 773 for the project.

On October 21, 2015, an amended stipulated judgment was filed with the Superior Court, which indicated that the City of Redlands had

Continued on Page 4

Valencia Established An Enmity With His Council Colleagues By Running Against Them & Raising Some Ugly Issues *from front page*

Mexico; Winterthur, Switzerland; Jieyang, China; and Brockville, Ontario, Canada. Based on the documentation prepared for the January 17 council meeting, the council was to dissolve its connection with Guamuchil that evening, but according to Mayor Leon and others, the action extended to Los Mochis and Mocolito, as well.

On an official level, the City of Ontario has indicated that over the 40-year span of its sister city relationship with Guamuchil, it has donated various items of used city equipment and vehicles worth hundreds of thousands of dollars that Guamuchil had utilized for municipal purposes, while Ontario has reaped little or nothing in return. Ontario officials have said they are looking toward a more reciprocal relationship, and hope to forge a sister city relationship with some other international municipality. On an unofficial level, city

officials have hinted that Sinaloa's reputation as "the drug cartel capital of Mexico" was the actual motivation behind the divergence, along with the what they said were credible reports, originating with investigative journalist Anabel Hernández and others, that Sinaloa Governor Rubén Rocha Moya was assisted by the leadership of one of the region's most powerful drug cartels in capturing the governorship in 2021. The vote to disengage from the sister city relationship with Guamuchil passed by a 4-to-1 vote, with Valencia dissenting.

In February, Valencia sojourned to Sinaloa on a vacation with members of his family. While there, he and La Puente Mayor Charlie Klinakis met with Sinaloa Governor Rubén Rocha Moya and both Veronica Rochin and Feliciano Castro Meléndrez, members of the Sinaloa legislature, known as the House of Deputies.

In short order, there were a number of social media postings in which Valencia's meetings with Moya, Rochin and other dignitaries with the cities of Los Mochis, Mocolito and Guamuchil were referenced. Some of those

came to the attention of Ontario city officials. While the nature of the discussions that went on between Kinakis, Valencia and the local and state Sinaloa officials was not clear, Ontario officials assumed the worst.

In one of her posts, Rochin made reference to "strengthening our ties with the sister cities of La Puente and Ontario, California." Though by conflicting accounts Ontario remains a sister city with two Sinaloa cities – Los Mochis and Mocolito – and Ontario's website yet listed Guamuchil as a sister city despite the city council's January 17 action, city officials, at least initially, interpreted Valencia's discussions with Sinaloa officials as an effort to perpetuate the sister city relationship with Guamuchil and that Valencia was representing that he was acting as an official emissary of Ontario in doing so.

Some time previous to that, the council majority – including Leon, Wapner, Dorst-Porada and Councilman Jim Bowman – had developed a political rivalry with Valencia.

In 2012, Valencia had vied unsuccessfully for the council, challenging

Dorst-Porada in that contest. In 2014, in his second unsuccessful attempt at winning a council seat, Valencia ran against both Wapner and Bowman. In doing so that year, Valencia targeted Wapner, and his support network piled on, posting to YouTube footage taken by a security video camera mounted at a private residence in the area of East Hazeltine and South Pleasant Avenue in which it appeared Wapner was in public physically assaulting his then-15-year-old daughter.

After failing to capture a position on the council in either 2012 or 2014, Valencia in 2016 was at last elected to the council, the same year that Dorst-Porada was reelected for the second time.

Valencia was reelected in 2020 and last year challenged Leon for the mayoralty. Also running in the mayoral election was Christian Garcia. Leon cruised to victory by a comfortable margin with 15,583 of 29,173 total votes cast or 53.42 percent to Valencia's 10,129 votes or 34.72 percent, with Garcia's 3,461 votes or 11.86 percent making up the difference. In challenging

Leon, Valencia deepened the enmity toward him the mayor harbors.

Valencia has thus been persona non grata on the council as it is currently composed for some time. Consequently, his colleagues had previously stripped him of his adjunct council assignments, committee memberships and appointments to regional/joint powers governmental association representation posts. Thus, Valencia had no portfolio to be representing the City of Ontario in any capacity, whether the city was yet affiliated with Los Mochis, Mocolito and/or Guamuchil or not, according to his city council colleagues.

The appearance, late February 17 and early February 18, of Mexican newspaper, television and on social media reports that Valencia was in Sinaloa on a sister city mission was first picked up by, it seems, City Manager Scott Ochoa, who shared that information with Leon. A flurry of communications between the mayor, Wapner and Dorst-Porada followed. Somewhat predictably, within the echo chamber amongst the three, outrage festered

and raged as each sought to outdo the other in expressing how affronted he or she was over Valencia's audaciousness. Valencia was engaged in activity which he was not authorized to undertake, the three agreed, resolving to do something about it. The mayor's interpretation of those reports was that Valencia was cavorting with a group of international politicians and that he was representing Ontario with regard to issues and discussing the sister cities programs. There were photos of him at parties or festivities with the Sinaloa governor and a congresswoman. In at least one case he was referred to as the mayor of Ontario. Ontario City Manager Scott Ochoa was brought in on the serial discussion amongst Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada. Valencia was, the officials concluded, "out of control."

At that point, the agenda for the February 21 Ontario City Council meeting had already been set, and had been posted on Thursday, February 16. In that agenda, there was no mention of a censure. It was not until the non-business days of

Continued on Page 7

San Bernardino County Up To Its Ears In Warehouses *from front page*

endless parade of merchandise travels through San Bernardino County, making it America's major logistics hub.

Often before those goods make their way to their secondary, tertiary, quaternary or ultimate destinations, they are repositioned into warehouses where a determination of where they are to be transported is made.

In this atmosphere, warehouse developers, the owners of property to be converted to warehousing, land speculators and anyone involved in the construction of warehouses can make a lot of money. There is at least 930 million square feet of warehousing in San Bernardino and Riverside counties at present, with more being built.

There are 3,031

warehouses in San Bernardino County. In Ontario alone, there are 289 warehouses larger than 100,000 square feet. Reportedly, there are 142 warehouses in Fontana larger than 100,000 square feet.

In Chino there are 118 warehouses larger than 100,000 square feet, 109 larger than 100,000 square feet in Rancho Cucamonga and 75 larger than 100,000 square feet in San Bernardino. Since 2015, 26 warehouse projects applications have been processed and approved by the City of San Bernardino, entailing acreage under roof of 9,598,255 square feet, or more than one-third of a square mile, translating into 220.34 acres.

After Ontario, Fontana, Chino, Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino, the city in San Bernardino County with the next largest number of warehouses of more than 100,000 square feet

is Redlands, with 56, followed by Rialto with 47.

Fontana has been so aggressive in building warehouses over the last dozen years that the city's mayor, Acquanetta Warren, is known by those who both oppose and favor warehouse development as "Warehouse Warren." In 2021, California Attorney General Rob Bonta sued Fontana over its affinity for warehouses, forcing the city into a settlement that calls for far greater regulation of the construction of logistics facilities in the city of 208,393.

Increasingly, some elected officials, local residents and futurists are questioning whether warehouses constitute the highest and best use of the property available for development in the region. The glut of logistics facilities in the Inland Empire has some thinking their numbers are out of balance. In re-

futing the assertions of the proponents of warehouses that they constitute positive economic development, their detractors cite the relatively poor pay and benefits provided to those who work in distribution facilities, the large diesel-powered semi-trucks that are part of those operations with their unhealthy exhaust emissions, together with the bane of traffic gridlock they create.

In 2021 and 2022, the cities of Colton, Chino and Redlands imposed a temporary moratorium on the further construction of warehouses in their jurisdictions and the San Bernardino City Council by a five-sevenths majority very nearly did the same in June 2021. That effort to declare a moratorium on further warehouse construction, within the county's largest city fell through because to impose a moratorium

on any specific type of building, California law requires that such a ban be passed by a four-fifths vote of a governmental entity's legislative body. In San Bernardino, where the mayor is not empowered to vote, that means that six of the seven members of the council had to sign off on the moratorium.

Last year, Assemblywoman Eloise Gómez Reyes (Democrat-San Bernardino) authored and introduced legislation, Assembly Bill 2840, which was intended to insulate homeowners and their families from the harmful effects of the encroachment of warehouses into residential neighborhoods.

Assembly Bill 2840 ran into a buzz saw of opposition, however.

The California Chamber of Commerce and the Fontana Chamber of Commerce opposed the bill.

AB 2840 "exacerbates

California's existing supply chain problems," Adam Regele, CalChamber senior policy advocate, said publicly.

The bill ignored "California's robust environmental laws and regulations which already redress and fully mitigate all significant impacts from warehouse development," Regele said. California and Southern California in particular, Regele insisted, "need more warehouses to spur the economy and alleviate critical supply chain issues. Supply and distribution chains across California are a matter of vital statewide importance."

Fontana Chamber of Commerce President Phil Cothran said any legislation aimed at warehouses and Assembly Bill 2840 in particular would harm the prospect for generating more jobs locally in terms of construction, supply

Continued on Page 5

Obernolte Has Cut A Swathe Through Politics As A Conservative Republican *from front page*

sional district he represents is shifting closer to an alignment with the Democratic Party which dominates the Golden State.

The owner, president, and technical director of FarSight Studios, a video game development company, Obernolte first entered the political fray at the age of 35 in 2005, when he was elected to the Big Bear City Airport Board, overseeing the Big Bear City Airport in the unincorporated San Bernardino Mountain community district. In 2010, Obernolte was elected to Big Bear Lake City Council, where he eventually acceded to the position of mayor. In 2014, he was elected to the California Assembly, representing the heavily Republican 33rd District, which spanned the San Bernardino Mountain Communities and a good portion of San Bernardino County's Mojave Desert. He succeeded Tim Donnelly, widely

celebrated as one of the state's and nation's most conservative politicians, who left the Assembly that year in an ultimately unsuccessful effort to obtain the Republican nomination for California governor. Obernolte sought and generally succeeded in living up to the mold of a conservative politician not unlike Donnelly, managing to please his predominantly Republican constituents by resigning himself to a somewhat ineffectual role as a Republican legislator in Democrat-dominated Sacramento by sponsoring and supporting some show legislation that adhered to Republican ideals but failed to gain passage while simultaneously authoring/sponsoring less partisan-oriented general purpose legislation that garnered across-the-board support of both parties.

In 2020, when 8th Congressional District Congressman Paul Cook announced his intention of leaving Congress to run instead for San Bernardino County supervisor, the ambitious Obernolte immediately declared his candidacy to succeed Cook, garnering key Re-

publican backing along the way. He ultimately succeeded in getting elected to the 8th District Congressional post and in 2022 ran for reelection to Congress in the 23rd Congressional District, the lines for which had been redrawn in the reapportionment that followed the 2020 Census and which subsumed much of the previous 8th District and remained predominantly Republican.

In roughly 79 percent of his votes, he has voted in opposition to President Joseph Biden's position on the involved issues.

On January 6, 2021, Obernolte voted against counting Arizona's and Pennsylvania's electoral votes in the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election.

He voted against the creation of the January 6 Commission and against impeaching President Donald Trump based on accusations that the former president had incited his supporters to attack the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

In February 2021, Obernolte voted against the Equality Act, a bill that would prohibit discrimination based on gender identity and sexu-

al orientation by amending the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fair Housing Act to include new protections.

In February 2021, Obernolte voted against the resolution that stripped Marjorie Taylor Greene of her committee assignments as a consequence for what Democrats in Congress called her "incendiary and violent" statements.

In March 2021, he voted against the American Rescue Plan Act.

Obernolte supported overturning *Roe v. Wade*, and has stated that because the U.S. Constitution does not mention abortion explicitly, states may outlaw it.

In 2023, Obernolte was among 47 Republicans to vote in favor of House of Congress Resolution 21, calling upon President Biden to remove U.S. troops from Syria within 180 days.

Most of Obernolte's successful legislation involves what at least appears to be nonpartisan, middle-of-the-road regulation or deregulation, often touching on technological innovation. His Fellowship and Traineeship for Early Career Ar-

tificial Intelligence Researchers Act and Next Generation Computing Research and Development Act were included in the bipartisan House Resolution 2225, the National Science Foundation For the Future Act and House Resolution 3593, the Department of Energy Science for the Future Act, respectively. His first standalone legislation, House Resolution 3533, establishing occupational series for federal positions in software development, software engineering, data science, and data management, passed the House of Representatives in September 2021.

Though he generally falls to the conservative side of the liberal conservative divide, he has had a few exceptions.

In June 2021, he voted to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

Despite his aforementioned February 2021 vote against the Equality Act, Obernolte on July 19, 2022 joined with 46 other Republican representatives in voting for the Respect for Marriage Act, which granted the right to

same-sex marriage under federal law, stating after he did so that "As an ardent advocate for limited government, I do not feel that government should be empowered to dictate the terms of a marriage."

This week, on April 10, Obernolte and House Committee on Veterans' Affairs Chairman Mike Bost (Republican-Illinois) wrote a joint letter to Department of Veterans Affairs Secretary Denis McDonough seeking information relating the disposition of a supervisory employee at the Loma Linda Veterans Administration Medical Center who has been accused by lower ranking employees at the the medical center of creating a hostile work environment, ultimately reducing accountability, impacting employee morale, and hindering the good delivery of services to veterans.

The letter thanked McDonough for responding to an earlier letter sent on January 25, 2023 requesting all Administrative Investigations Board reports regarding the yet-unidentified supervisory employee. Without being

Continued on Page 7

3 Ontario Council Members Rushed To Prepare For Valencia's Censure While He Was Out Of The Country *from front page*

the weekend had begun, two days later, on Saturday February 18, that City Clerk Sheila Mautz was contacted by Leon,

who instructed her to put an emergency walk-on item onto the agenda. Mautz herself had at one time been a member of

the city council. Based on that experience as well as her status as city clerk, she recognized that Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada were inflating the issue far beyond what it was and that if push were to come to shove she would be hard-pressed to

justify Valencia's vacationing in Mexico as an "emergency" necessitating the alteration of the already set agenda. Still, she recognized the political primacy of Leon and Wapner and for that reason complied with Leon's demand, composing an

agenda add-on that read: "A Resolution To Censure A Council Member: That the city council discuss and provide direction to staff regarding the adoption of a resolution censuring Council Member Ruben Valencia for unauthorized representa-

tion of the city's interests and/or positions."

There was no resolution accompanying the emergency announcement. What was suggested by the add-on posting was that either the resolution would be drawn up *Continued on Page 6*

Mistretta *from page 4*

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.

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 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.

Late last year Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, and Mistretta Family Partners, LLC, and Frank Mistretta Jr. in earnest sought to move forward with obtaining final clearances, permits and entitlements to build. Frank Mistretta, who was working with a pro-development city staff, a pro-development planning commission and a city council equally favorably disposed toward his goals to ensure success, retained 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.

Even after the November 26, 2022 extension of the tentative tract map elapsed, city officials were on the brink of facilitating the application. There was a suggestion, as well, that the project density might double. According 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 as late as three months ago maintained the project proponent had legal clearance to proceed with the project as 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 retained the right to develop 24 units, according to the city.

Those opposed to the project, however, cited what they called "a flawed timeline" and "an invalid doubling of the permitted density for the project." They maintained that the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust's, Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC's, Mistretta Family Partners' and Frank J. Mistretta Jr.'s entitlement to build had elapsed, based upon the

May 26, 2017 expiration of the tentative tract map, which was granted with the planning commission approval on May 26, 2015. Moreover, project opponents said, since the two-year time extension to 2019 claimed by the city for the project was based on AB 166, which was only effective through 2013, the effort to extend the tract map was therefore doubly invalid, given that the Mistretta Tentative Tract Map was not even approved by the Redlands Planning Commission until 2015.

Throughout December 2022 and into January 2023, the city and Frank Mistretta Jr. proceeded as though the extensions were valid. On January 24, however, upon weighing all of the arguments pro and con, the Redlands Planning Commission denied Mistretta a third one-year time extension for project entitlements approved more than seven years ago. That started the clock running on an appeal. On February 16, Frank Mistretta Jr. requested a continuance of the appeal hearing to the May 16 city council meeting, at which he hoped to "explore options for the subject property," including a revival of the earlier 24-unit proposal or some compromise, perhaps involving as few as 12 large estate homes on the property. The council granted the request.

Word now comes, however, that Meyer, upon whom Mistretta was counting to line up all of his ducks for the appeal, has suffered a stroke, completely untracking the appeal process. The *Sentinel* was not able to verify that, as it was unable to reach Meyer or anyone affiliated with him this week.

On April 13, an email from the Save Live Oak Canyon Team to its sup-

ports went out. It stated, "The owners of 120 beautiful acres in Live Oak Canyon have withdrawn their request to continue with development. The planning commission decision will stand; the tentative tract map has expired; the land cannot be built upon without a new development process; and there will not be an appeal hearing at the May 16 Redlands City Council meeting."

Efforts by the *Sentinel* this morning to verify that report at Redlands City Hall were not successful.

Over the decades, a multi-generational 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 three controlled-growth or slow-growth initiatives – Proposition R passed in 1978, Measure N in 1987 and Measure U in 1997, as well as their rejection of the agricultural erasing Measure R in 2005.

As intensive as the hopes of those to prevent open space in Redlands from being converted to wall-to-wall housing have been the efforts by some landowners, land speculators and developers to convert much of the land within Live Oak Canyon to residential estates to reap a profit.

While the withdrawal of the Mistretta application based upon all of the preceding entitlements, tract maps and extensions going back nearly 18 years was heartening for the project's opponents, the battle they are engaged in is not necessarily over. Moreover, based on the state's changing land use standards, they might en-

counter, in the face of a continuing resolve by the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust, Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, Mistretta Family Partners and Frank J. Mistretta Jr. to develop that property, an even less desirable outcome from their standpoint than if the 24-unit project had been allowed to proceed.

If the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust, Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, Mistretta Family Partners and Frank J. Mistretta Jr. were to re-apply for an entitlement to build and go through the project vetting and approval process from scratch, the imperative handed down by the California Legislature and the California Department of Housing might allow the property to be developed in accordance with what they consider to be City Hall's too-aggressive land use policy.

Specifically, Redlands residents resisting the development are 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 so the land will be set aside as perpetual open space and wildlife sanctuary. They insist that any development would be a violation of both the spirit and the letter of Proposition R, Measure N, Measure U and Measure R. Yet, ac-

Dicus To Speak In Redlands *from front page*

from California State University San Bernardino in criminal justice studies. He has a master's degree in communication from California Baptist University.

With the sheriff's department, he was assigned at one time or another to the department's corrections division at

cording to the California Department of Housing and Community Development, a host of new laws that have been put into place over the last several years, including Senate Bill 13, Assembly Bill 68, Assembly Bill 881 and Senate Bill 330 in 2019, and Senate Bill 8, Senate Bill 9 and Senate Bill 290 in 2021 trump preexisting land use policies that limited growth as long as the development will assist in overcoming California homelessness crisis by promoting accelerated residential development. In this way, if Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust, Mistretta Canyon Partners, LLC, Mistretta Family Partners and Frank J. Mistretta Jr. are willing to go through the bother and expense of again seeking approval for a residential project on the property they yet control in Live Oak Canyon, it is not inconceivable that they could obtain approval on a project with double or even triple the density of the 24 homes they have just given up on trying to build.

For that reason, the *Sentinel* is informed, preservationists are looking at their options in moving to purchase from the Frank J. Mistretta Family Trust the 121.82 acres that entity yet controls in Live Oak Canyon.

-Mark Gutglueck

the Glen Helen Rehabilitation and West Valley Detention centers. He worked patrol out of the Apple Valley, Victorville, Barstow and Victor Valley sheriff's stations. He worked in the department's specialized investigations unit as a narcotics detective. He was assigned to the special weapons and tactics team, known as SWAT.

Continued on Page 16

To The Building Industry, Ramos's Warehouse Regulation Legislation Is Far Superior; To Environmentalists, Gómez Reyes's Bill To Protect Residents From Logistics Industry Pollution & Hazards Is Preferable *from front page*

chain management, logistics, development and the transportation industries tied into distribution centers.

"Our area has worked hard for decades, if not centuries, to assure that Inland Southern California can produce jobs and grow businesses by supporting goods movement through rail, truck and trailer transport, the ports, and education programs that build a workforce," Cothran wrote in a letter he sent to Gómez Reyes last year. "AB 2840 strips all local governments across California of their zoning and land use authority, ignores California's robust environmental laws and regulations applicable to this type of development and exacerbates existing supply chain problems and rising inflation plaguing California by making it harder and more expensive to develop these types of projects."

Cothran asserted that existing laws and regulations "already require qualifying logistics-use projects and warehouses to comply with a long list of local, state and federal environmental laws" and that AB 2840 "would stop job creation and limit our local commitment to provide for a good quality of life for all." He said, "[E]xisting law already forces new projects or the expansion of an existing facility to undergo the most rigorous environmental analysis and mitigation measures in the country."

Deciding that discretion was the better part of valor, Gómez Reyes pulled the plug on Assembly Bill 2840, resolving to back up and regroup before coming at the issue in a way calculated to succeed, utilizing the same concepts in a bill in a slightly altered form. She withdrew Assembly Bill 2840 in July 2022, without it being taken up in last year's legislative session. Gómez

Reyes said she had elected to withhold it because of "concerns around maintaining the integrity of the bill after committee-proposed amendments."

Indicating she would yet pursue comprehensive regulation pertaining to warehouse development, Gómez Reyes said she believed Cothran was overstating his case. She suggested there are yet gaps in the environmental regulations applied to warehouses. That is not to say that there is no need for warehousing, she said, but, she insisted, the environmental excesses that typified warehouses in the past could no longer be tolerated. "I want to be clear that my intention has never been to stop development," she said.

This month, saying "Warehouse growth in the Inland Empire and beyond shows no signs of slowing," Gómez Reyes introduced AB 1000, which she dubbed "the Good Neighbor Policy."

She said AB "addresses the planning and construction of new logistics centers across California. The bill would permit local governments to approve construction of large warehouses and logistics centers of over 100,000 square feet when they are 1,000 feet from sensitive receptors such as schools, homes and daycares. Local governments would also be able to approve construction of these facilities as close as 750 feet from a sensitive receptor when specific mitigation measures are followed to reduce negative community impacts."

According to Gómez Reyes, "The development of industrial facilities should not come at the detriment of the health, wellness and quality of life of the community. AB 1000 proposes a fair approach that will not only protect communities, but

also offer a chance for a project to show its commitment to being a good neighbor. The status quo is not working for many of our most vulnerable residents and we must find a better way to manage these large projects in order to move California forward."

Under AB 1000, mitigation measures that would allow a project to be within 750 feet of a project include standards related to zero-emission energy, zero-emission vehicles, transportation infrastructure and operation requirements such as a commitment to reducing truck idling in adjacent neighborhoods.

In the meantime, working parallel and slightly at odds with Gómez Reyes was Assemblyman James Ramos (Democrat-Highland), who crafted Assembly Bill 1748.

As a "special statute," Assembly Bill 1748 is applicable in particular to warehouses of 400,000 square feet or greater already constructed or to be constructed in the future in Riverside and San Bernardino counties, prohibiting the county governments therein "and any of the cities within those counties from approving the development or expansion of any qualifying logistics use, as defined, that is adjacent to sensitive receptors, as defined, unless the local agency imposes a minimum setback on the qualifying logistics use of 300 feet or follows an industrial guideline framework, as specified."

The statute defines sensitive receptors as residences, private homes, apartments, condominium units, group homes, dormitory units, retirement homes, shelters, schools, preschools, prekindergartens, schools maintaining kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, licensed daycare facilities, health care facilities, hospitals, medical clinics, community clinics, medical centers, nursing homes, long-term care facilities, hospices, convalescent facilities, live-in housing, community centers,

established community places of worship, public playgrounds, public recreation fields, public or recreation centers.

The bill states, "A local agency shall not approve the development or expansion of any qualifying logistics use that is adjacent to a sensitive receptor unless the local agency does either of the following:

(1) Imposes a minimum setback on the qualifying logistics use of 300 feet from the building's loading docks measured from the property line of any sensitive receptor to the nearest dock door using a direct straight-line method.

(2) Follows an industrial guideline framework, good neighbor policy, or sustainability ordinance adopted by the local agency, which, in its discretion, adequately balances siting qualifying logistics uses next to sensitive receptors."

While building industry advocates are not in favor of either bill, they nonetheless consider Ramos's version to be a far more reasonable set of limitations on the scope of warehouses to be built.

Conversely, environmentalists and community activists consider Ramos's Assembly Bill 1748 to represent a "fall back" and inferior version of Gómez Reyes introduced AB 1000.

Late this morning and early this afternoon, picketers and others waiving signs and placards were on hand near the front approaches to Assemblyman Ramos's San Bernardino office. They said they were there to make clear their views about not only the inadequacy of the legislation he had introduced but illustrate that the bill he is sponsoring is actually a counterproductive effort to undercut what they said was a more sincere legislative agenda on Gómez Reyes's part.

Ramos's bill provides sensitive receptors with an inadequate margin of insulation from the harmful effects of warehousing, they said. They contrasted the 1,000-foot separation offered in Gómez

Reyes's Assembly Bill 1000 to the 300-foot buffer Ramos is proposing, calling the latter "meager [and] anemic."

Ramos's Assembly Bill 1748 would be applicable only to warehouses that are 400,000 square feet or more in size, and would extend only to those in Riverside and San Bernardino counties. It leaves open the possibility that a differing set of regulations could be applied to smaller warehouses or warehouses outside of San Bernardino and Riverside counties. Nevertheless, by setting the regulation bar low on warehouses of that size, the likelihood that more exacting standards could be imposed on smaller warehouses is diminished.

Some environmentalists suggested that what Ramos was doing was creating a scenario in which less stringent regulations would attain with warehouses in San Bernardino and Riverside counties, making the region more of a magnet for such uses than it already is.

While neither Ramos nor Gómez Reyes was willing to make any direct comment about the other's bill or the relative merits of the legislation they are proposing, there is an unmistakable tension between the two, who in a very real sense are in competition with one another for, if not control over, a major leadership role in the Democratic Party in California.

Both can lay claim to being the primary San Bernardino County or Inland Empire Democrat in Sacramento at present.

Gómez Reyes is the the Assembly majority leader. With the change in California's term limit law that went into place with the state's legislators elected in 2012 onward, politicians are no longer limited to six years or three terms in the Assembly and eight years or two terms in the California Senate. Instead, legislators are limited to 12 years as a lawmaker in California,

meaning a member of the Assembly can remain 12 years or six terms in the lower house if he or she so chooses and the voters are indulgent of that person's continuing tenure in office. Similarly, a state senator can remain in that capacity for three four-year terms.

Gómez Reyes was first elected to the Assembly in 2016 and is thus eligible to remain in the legislature, consecutively based upon her ability to be reelected, through 2028. As majority leader, she is line behind Assistant Speaker Pro Tem Stephanie Nguyen, Speaker Pro Tem Christopher Ward and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon as the fourth highest ranking Democrat in the Assembly. While she is likely to be handily reelected in 2024 and 2026 if she were to seek to remain in the Assembly and would have an outside chance of acceding to the position of Assembly speaker before she retires, she is forgoing that opportunity and will instead run for the State Senate in 2024. She has a better than fair prospect of succeeding in that ambition, which would make her the senior state legislator in the region during her final four years in office, perhaps even giving her the opportunity to become the president pro tem of the California Senate, the de facto leader of that body, which is otherwise headed by the lieutenant governor who serves as the ex officio president of the State Senate. Despite being a lame duck at that point, she would nevertheless stand as an undisputed heavyweight within not only the party but state government in general.

Meanwhile, Ramos, who was first elected in 2018 and can serve through 2030, is the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, a powerful legislative post. He is likely to move into a Democrat leadership position in the Assembly, potentially replacing Gómez Reyes, perhaps as early as next year and more likely by 2024,

Continued on Page 16

Do You Have Information Of Public Interest? Call the *Sentinel* at (951) 567 1936 The *Sentinel* is always looking for information to inform our readership and keep our readers abreast of newsworthy developments. The *Sentinel* devotes itself to what is happening in and around San Bernardino County. Social events, political news, issues pertaining to education, medicine, industry, commerce, development, real estate, history, culture and entertainment are of interest to us.



San Bernardino County **Sentinel**

News of Note
from Around the
Largest County
in the Lower
48 States

Let us help you make our readers aware of what is happening in your corner of the world. Do you have a news tip? Don't hesitate to pick up the phone or drop us a line at sbcsentinel@yahoo.com to alert us to that fascinating tidbit.

With Valencia In Sinaloa & Mexican Media Lionizing Him And Erroneously Attributing His Visit As Related To A Sister City Relationship With Ontario, His Council Rivals Seized Upon The Circumstance As Justifying His Censure *from page 4*

over the weekend or on Monday and Tuesday and would be presented to the public and the council at the Tuesday night meeting or that the council would draft the resolution during the course of the meeting.

Word spread that Valencia was out of town and that the city council was rushing to hold a censure hearing against him in absentia so he could be officially rebuked.

Tuesday night, February 21, a stirred-up public demanded that a cogent case be presented against Valencia together with evidence and that Valencia be afforded the opportunity to defend himself.

Absent from the meeting was Councilman Bowman. Present in the council chambers as Valencia's legal representative was Briggs, the grandson of Homer F. Briggs, a former Ontario councilman.

Addressing the council, Briggs informed its members he intended to put the city and the council through their paces by insisting that Valencia be provided with due process and that he was looking to not only delve into the council's motive and rationale for going after Valencia but would inquire as to whether the council had sought

to load the dice against his client by arriving at a decision to censure Valencia and discussing doing so in advance of that evening's meeting.

In rushing into a censure hearing in the guise of emergency action without any drafted resolution beforehand, Briggs said, the council appeared to be in violation of the State of California's open meeting law, the Ralph M. Brown Act.

The Brown Act prohibits a quorum of an elected body from coming to a decision on action or reaching a consensus on action outside of an agendized meeting that is open to the public. It requires that all such action to be clearly disclosed and outlined in the agenda for such meetings, which is to be publicly posted at least 72 hours in advance of such public meetings commencing and that the discussion and deliberations with regard to that action and the votes pertaining to it take place in public, with starkly defined exceptions – those being contemplated or ongoing litigation, contract negotiations, employee termination or discipline and negotiations for the sale or purchase of real estate – carved out in the act to allow those discussions and deliberations to

take place in closed sessions outside the scrutiny of the public. The Brown Act prohibits more than two members of a five-member decision-making elected body such as the Ontario City Council from discussing or arriving at a consensus on any issue to be decided by a vote, and makes it illegal for "serial" discussions among any such panel members from taking place, meaning that while two members of a five-member board, commission or council can in private discuss a matter to be voted upon, neither of those two can then contact a third or fourth or fifth member of the body in question and discuss that issue privately. Verbally at the February 21 meeting, Briggs made a public records request on the spot.

"I would like all the private and public account email, text messages, voice mails, everything exchanged by any member of the city council to anybody, including other members of the city council about this item," Briggs said.

Briggs said the council was initiating action that was not properly defined.

"Your agenda doesn't tell anybody what this is about," he said.

Straitjacketing Valencia into a censure, Briggs said, was a likely violation of the city's code of ethics and its rules of procedure, as well.

He threatened a lawsuit if the city proceeded that night without making specific the charges

against Valencia and giving him an opportunity to respond.

"I don't think you want to litigate," Briggs said.

Valencia abstained from directly participating in the discussion, allowing Briggs to speak on his behalf.

Celina Lopez, who was a city council candidate in 2020 and 2022 and previously had differences with Valencia, nonetheless said the council's move to censure Valencia without clarifying why it was doing so or supporting documentation demonstrated a lack of transparency.

Maria Galvan questioned why the council had felt it necessary to submit a change to the agenda over the weekend and denounced it for not including the resolution of censure in the agenda packet.

Following an exchange between Leon and Briggs in which Briggs assured the mayor that he would insist upon a due process proceeding for his client in which Leon would be a sworn witness subject to cross examination and Leon implied that the evidence against Valencia was rock solid and that he was willing to go through whatever was necessary to marshal it, the council deferred action on the censure to an indefinite future date.

This week, having obtained communications that had taken place between Leon, Wapner, Dorst-Porada and City Manager Scott Ochoa

on Friday, February 17; Saturday, February 18; and Sunday, February 19 through the public records request process, Briggs publicly revealed it. Though what was released was in some fashion incomplete, in essence it indicated that Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada had engaged in some order of a Brown Act violation, and it raised questions about Ochoa's role in facilitating that violation and enabling a select faction on the council in carrying out a politically-angled act of retribution against an elected official.

On Friday, February 17 at 1:39 p.m. Ochoa sent Leon 13 photos apparently gleaned from Valencia's Facebook page depicting meetings Valencia had with various personages in Mexico, including Governor Rubén Rocha Moya and legislators Veronica Rochin and Feliciano Castro Meléndrez.

Within two hours, it appears, either Leon or someone else had passed that information along to Dorst-Porada because at 3:38 p.m. on February 17, Dorst-Porada sent an email to Ochoa that was electronically carbon copied to City Attorney Ruben Duran and Ontario Communications and Community Relations Director Dan Bell in which she included a link to Valencia's Facebook page, information Ochoa already had seen, as was demonstrated in his earlier text message to the mayor.

"This is Valencia Facebook," Dorst-Porada wrote. "What can we throw at him?"

This prompted a somewhat sarcastic reply from Ochoa.

"If he's out on bail then I think we got him for leaving the country," the city manager responded.

More than 24 hours later, between 4 o'clock and around 5 o'clock in the afternoon on Saturday, February 18, Ochoa sent at least seven more texts to Leon, ones that included forwardings of and links to social media postings relating to Valencia's Mexico trip, ones which apparently included Valencia's Facebook postings and postings made by the Sinaloa politicians to their social media accounts. Among those were Rochin's reference to a meeting in which Valencia and Klinakis and Governor Rocha Moya took part, which she said had the effect of "strengthening our ties with the sister cities of La Puente and Ontario, California."

Referencing this, Ochoa texted Leon, "Doh. That could well be a problem."

"Smoking gun," Leon responds.

"It would seem so," says Ochoa. Nevertheless, Ochoa adds, "I'll still wager, though, that he has a video of himself talking to them, and explaining that he is not here in an official capacity, but rather there in support of his friend from La
Continued on Page 8

Unwillingness To Release Report Heightens Mystery Over Republican Obernolte's Atypical Support Of Government Employees'

from page 3

specific as to the reports' contents, the letter states that the Administrative Investigations Board report, dated February 8, 2021, found the supervisory employee was creating a hostile work environment. The letter noted that the Administrative Investigations Board included roughly 4,000 pages of exhibits in its report and investigators conducted 57 hours of transcribed interviews with 36 witnesses over the course of the investigation. That investigation and two others conducted between July 2020 to May 2022, the letter stated, substantiated that the supervisory employee was creating a hostile work environment. Both the Administrative Investigations Board and one of the other investigations recommended the supervisory employee be removed from employment with the Veterans Administration, according to the letter.

Obernolte's and Bost's letter states, "Unfortunately, despite the investigations' consistent evidence and recommendations, and the massive amount of time, money, and energy spent investigating the supervisory employee over nearly three years, the supervisor remains employed at the VA Loma Linda Healthcare System."

Obernolte's and Bost's letter refers to the continued employment of the supervising employee as an "untenable situation," with which Obernolte and Bost are frustrated. "Despite medical center leadership doing everything possible within its legal constraints, the supervisory employee is still employed and is repeatedly creating an environment that you claim the Veterans Administration does not tolerate," their letter states. "Consequently, employees are forced to either work in

a hostile environment or leave the Veterans Administration."

According to the letter, "Our veterans, the dedicated VA workforce, and taxpayers deserve to know why bad employees are still employed by VA and accountability is being swept under the rug."

Some San Bernardino County Republicans, including four who voted for Obernolte, this week questioned why Obernolte either assumed or moved to the conclusion that the unidentified Veterans Administration supervisor had acted inappropriately. They noted that the report was still being kept under wraps, that the supervisor had not been identified, that the supervisor was not being given an opportunity to defend his action and that the complaints against the supervisor had been lodged through the American Federation of Government Employees, a union representing Veterans Administration employees.

As Republicans, Obernolte's constituents said they considered unions – and government employee unions in particular – to represent a dark force in American society, one that is, basically and ultimately they said, decreasing the efficiency of government and intensifying the lack of useful productivity of government employees in general and undercutting the quality of governmental services while escalating the cost of government and increasing the burden on taxpayers. They believe, as Republicans, that management should be given the benefit of the doubt when it comes to disputes with labor. They observed that in addition to not identifying the supervisor they complained of in their joint April 10 letter to McDonough, neither Congressman Obernolte nor Congressman Bost marshaled the evidence against him. This, they assert, does not provide the public or the media with the ability to verify or in any way confirm the case against the supervisor. While acknowledging that a

case against the supervisor and perhaps even an overwhelming one might be contained within the 4,000 pages of exhibits and 57 hours of transcribed interviews with witnesses interviewed by investigators, the Administrative Investigations Board report had not been released, leaving the validity of the conclusion Obernolte and Bost had reached in question if not in doubt, they said.

The *Sentinel* wrote to Obernolte's office, asking if it would arrange for the report to be released.

The *Sentinel* asked, if releasing the report is not possible, whether Obernolte's office could identify the supervisor at the Loma Linda Veterans Administration Hospital who is the subject of that report so the *Sentinel* could offer him an opportunity to respond to the aspersions that have been lodged against him.

The *Sentinel* asked, if neither releasing the report nor identifying the supervisor by name is possible, if Congressman Obernolte could put into his own words an explanation of why, in this particular case, he felt that siding with the American Federation of

Government Employees over management was justified.

Obernolte's public spokeswoman, Emily Carlin, told the *Sentinel* that the interpretation that Obernolte was siding with the American Federation of Government Employees over management was a misreading of the circumstance and that Obernolte and Bost were essentially pushing for the bipartisan Veterans Administration Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, which was signed into law in 2017, during the administration of President Donald Trump. According to Carlin, the Loma Linda Vdministration Medical Center supervisor in question qualifies to be disciplined under the act, but because the Biden administration is not making use of the act, he is avoiding being held to account.

She emphasized statements made by Obernolte and Bost that accompanied the public release of the letter.

"America's veterans have dedicated their lives to our country and protecting the freedoms we hold dear," according to Obernolte. "In return, our

nation has promised to deliver the best possible care to them when they leave our armed forces. A Department of Veterans Affairs that is unable to maintain a productive work environment for its employees is a VA that is unable to deliver on that promise. The VA's failure to terminate an employee with a long and troubled record of creating a hostile work environment for subordinates has led to the loss of numerous good employees. Furthermore, this culture is hindering the department's ability to provide the quality services America's veterans deserve at VA Loma Linda. It is critical that the bureaucratic red tape that kept this supervisor in place is removed and that the Department of Veterans Affairs take immediate action to revise their procedures to ensure the immediate removal of problematic employees in the future."

"The purpose of the bipartisan Accountability Act is to give the VA secretary the tools to ensure that the VA workforce is the best, and that employee misconduct and poor performance are a thing of the past," said Bost. "Yet, the House Commit-

tee on Veterans' Affairs continues to hear reports that this is not the case, most recently at the Loma Linda VA Medical Center where a toxic supervisor continues to be employed following multiple investigations over three years into his misconduct and recommendations that he be removed. As chairman, that is unacceptable to me, which is why I'm proud to lead this letter demanding answers from the Biden administration with my friend from California, Representative Obernolte."

Local Republicans nonetheless, while acknowledging that Obernolte and Bost are taking action against a supervisor employed by the Veterans Administration now overseen by the Democratic Biden Administration, noted that the employee in question once was part of an operation then overseen by the Republican Trump Administration. They said regardless of which party the occupant of the White House is affiliated with, Obernolte and Bost carrying a brief for the American Federation of Government Employees is unseemly.

After Clumsy Concealment Of Tortoise Data Dooms Wonder Inn Project, Proponents Making Appeal

from page 3

proval of the undertaking to the board of supervisors. The board of supervisors must sign off on the project because, of the 24.4 acres that are to be developed, only 3.18 acres are currently zoned for service commercial use, which is consistent with a resort. The remaining 21.22 acres are zoned for residential development, with a requirement that each dwelling unit be located on a five-acre lot. Only the board of supervisors has the authority to grant the required zone change, conditional use permit and policy land use amendment Landver and Greenberg are seeking.

By the tenor of some of the comments of the planning commissioners present at the meeting – Kareem Gongora, Michael Stoffel, Matthew Slowik and Jonathan Weldy – they seemed favorably disposed toward the resort concept.

Things went amiss, however, when Landver made a presumptive assertion suggesting that he and Greenberg had an absolute "right" to develop the project as they proposed it and that the commission, board of supervisors and county had no discretion with regard to the project approval or terms of approval. Things worsened for the proponents when it was revealed that the team of development specialists Landver and Greenberg hired to usher the project past the planning staff and planning commission, which included the politically well-connected David Mlynarski and his

assistant, Julie Gilbert, made misrepresentations about the presence of endangered desert tortoises on the subject property and those development consultants then made a personal attack on the biologist who found evidence of those tortoises' presence, questioning his ethics, apparently because they felt that by withholding payment to him for that study, they could prevent him from publishing his findings.

The assertion by Mlynarski and Gilbert that the biologist had acted unethically by refusing to keep his survey results under wraps and providing a copy of the study he completed to entities that had not paid for it, coupled with a threat by Gilbert to blackball the biologist, Ed LaRue, with the development industry appeared to have sorely offended the commission members, who took the effort to bury

the evidence of the endangered tortoises being present on the property as an affront and an attack on the integrity of the county's land use approval process.

Exposed was an apparent code of obfuscation and deception at play within the San Bernardino County development industry that officials felt could not be countenanced if it were publicly revealed, as had been the case with the Wonder Inn project presentation.

Ultimately, Weldy, Slowik Stoffel and Gongora declined to make any recommendation to the board of supervisors, which was tantamount to a project denial.

Landver and Greenberg appealed the passive denial to the board of supervisors.

"It seems that a lot of people are against progress and growth at all costs," Landver said.

-Mark Gutglueck

Text Message Exchanges Between Mayor, Council Members & City Manager Show What Valencia's Lawyers Says Are Brown Act Violations *from page 6*

Puente. Still, it doesn't look good on him. He is just hell-bent on wasting everybody's time."

"Regardless," responds Leon. "He gets called out."

On Sunday, at 5:07 p.m., Dorst-Porada is texting with Leon, an exchange that includes images relating to Valencia's trip to Sinaloa, among which are photos of his interaction with Mexican politicians and one of him, his wife and daughter in a helicopter taken from Valencia's Facebook page.

Leon texted to Dorst-Porada in reference to the helicopter trip "Hope he didn't pay for the flight."

At 10:46 p.m. on Sunday night, February 20, Dorst-Porada was involved in a text message discussion with Wapner. Having texted links/images to him of Valencia's social media postings about his trip to Mexico, Dorst-Porada asks Wapner, "Does this hold any weight?"

Wapner replies, "Yep, why not?"

"He's not dumb. Why would he give us this kind of ammunition?" Dorst-Porada inquires.

"Then why are we doing a new code of ethics?" Wapner responded. "Why complain about him? How about him embarrassing the city? Seems like you're defending him."

"I just can't believe how brazen he is, it just shocks the shit out of me," Dorst-Porada responds.

A 7:51 a.m. on February 21, Leon in an effort to emphasize the grounds for censuring Valencia, texted Ochoa an image of a Spanish language social media posting that featured Sinaloa Congressman Feliciano Castro Meléndrez and Sinaloa Congresswoman Rochin, and then remarked, "Strengthening our ties with Sister Cities? Not a

vacation trip!"

Leon then asked, "So how is this public news?"

Ochoa responded with an excerpt from a local social media outlet, *Ontario Political News*, which stated, "These corrupt asshole (sic) a (sic) busy trying to 'censure' Council Member Ruben Valencia on probably zero evidence of political wrong doing (sic). While our city is the laughing stock of the United States. The Mayor Paul 'Humps a Lot' Leon has allowed under his watch, Ontario to become... America's 14th Dirtiest City."

According to Briggs, the emails and text messages demonstrate both how Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada are violating the Brown Act by ushering each other toward a conclusion that Valencia should be censured for his actions in Mexico and how trumped up and flimsy the case against Valencia is.

Briggs points out that the alleged offense Valencia engaged in was representing the City of Ontario vis-à-vis the international sister city program. Yet, in none of Valencia's posts did he make that claim, Briggs said. Rather, references to the sister city program came from social media postings made by others, which contained misinterpretations of the purpose for his client's presence in Mexico.

"They [i.e., Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada] have no evidence other than Facebook posts," Briggs said. "They couldn't have weaker evidence."

Worse still, Briggs said, Ochoa seemed to recognize that Valencia had not gone to Sinaloa in the assumed capacity of representing Ontario or seeking to perpetuate Ontario's sister city relationship with the three cities in Sinaloa. It was a fact that Ontario once had sister city relationships with Los Mochis, Mocorito and Guamuchil and that La Puente yet has a sister relationship with a city in that region, Briggs said, and that Klinakis represents La Puente. That such is the case and that some

Sinaloan politicians or media outlets blurred the distinction between Ontario and La Puente or otherwise conflated the two Southern California cities with one another was not something Valencia had perpetrated or was responsible for and it certainly does not form the basis of any rational rationale for censuring him, Briggs said.

"If you look at what Scott Ochoa wrote – 'I'll wager he has a video of himself talking to them, and explaining that he is not here in an official capacity' – he thinks or knows it is very possible that their [Leon's, Wapner's and Dorst-Porada's] theory is way off and that Councilman Valencia was not acting in any sort of official capacity when he was down there," Briggs said. "But he [Ochoa] still gives the mayor a thumbs up when he says, 'Regardless. He gets called out.' Scott Ochoa is at least enabling the council in taking action he knows is based on invalid evidence and reasoning. He is getting politically involved, which is highly improper."

Briggs noted that City Attorney Ruben Duran was in the informational loop with regard to what the council majority and Ochoa were plotting, but that there was no definite indication that Duran had become actively involved or was furthering the effort.

"I have not seen any evidence that he was implicated in this, but that is not to say he isn't involved," Briggs said.

Valencia told the *Sentinel* said that the council's ruling coalition has "been looking to censure me for a long time."

He insisted that what took place in February was "a family vacation. I took my wife and daughter on the flight on my own dime."

Valencia said he was well aware before he departed that "The mayor and council chose to terminate the sister city relationship with Guamuchil before my vacation. They said there was no economic value to keep the relationship with Guamuchil."

Valencia said he voted

against the change, but respected the action once it was officially taken. To the best of his understanding, Valencia said, the January 17 vote to do that applied only to Guamuchil.

In fact, Valencia said, "We were in Mocorito and another city, Culiacán, and other parts of Sinaloa, which is more like a state, and not an actual city. Long story short, I have a relationship with one of the congresswoman down there, Veronica Rochin. We went down there and she greeted us at the airport when we arrived on that Thursday [February 16]. One of our first stops was near the capital, where we saw the governor, Rubén Rocha, and other congresspeople. All of us were there talking and having a good time, posting pictures during this time."

Valencia continued. "From what I understand, the mayor [Leon] got all excited and wanted to finally censure me, pointing at me being down in Mexico," Valencia said. "Basically, he wants to put me in a corner. That is what this group [Leon, Wapner, Bowman, Dorst-Porada and those previously affiliated with them politically] has done to people before. They did it to [former Councilman] Paul Vincent Avila, to [former Councilwoman] Debbie Acker, to [former Councilman] Rudy Favilla or anybody that couldn't get along with them. They try to put whoever it is into a corner. They got together and tried to pull this thing off while I was on vacation. I didn't find out I [i.e., his scheduled censure] was actually on the agenda until Sunday. I was still on vacation when someone sent me a message saying, 'You are on Facebook and they are going to use that to censure you.' That call prompted me to call the city manager, who didn't return my call. Finally, I talked with the city attorney. That's when he broke it down for me. I said he needed to send me the resolution and he said he had to be careful in sending me the resolution because there could

only be communication between two of the members of the council over any pending action and if the resolution was sent between me and the mayor and then it went to another person on the council it would be a Brown Act violation. Knowing the mayor is only a puppet to that other individual [Wapner] and that he needs coaching and has to be told what to do by the others, he [Duran] wasn't able to send me the resolution."

In fact, no resolution had been drafted, as the intent had been to draft something akin to a resolution among the council members on the dais on February 21 and vote on it on the spot. The thought was that Valencia would be absent that evening, giving the council carte blanche to proceed without his resistance, city officials have told the *Sentinel*.

"On Monday, he [Duran] sent me a draft copy of what they were going to do," Valencia told the *Sentinel* on April 13, referring simply to the language that had been put together by Mautz calling for the city council to discuss and provide direction toward adopting a resolution censuring Valencia for unauthorized representation of the city's interests and/or positions. "When I landed early Tuesday, I went and got my attorney," Valencia said. "I found out they were ready to go with the draft resolution. This was being pushed by the mayor. All he had to do was fill in the blanks of this planned resolution. I did not share with anybody that I actually had an attorney, so when the time came for the discussion of that item at the meeting that night, I recused myself and let my attorney get up and do his thing. He requested the emails and texts the other members of the council had made. I knew there was communication prior to the meeting. I heard some of it myself. My wife and I were walking by Councilwoman Dorst-Porada's office when I came into City Hall prior to the meeting. Her door was open and she was talking rather

loud about my Mexico trip. I could tell she was talking to Paul Leon. Before the meeting, I knew there were discussions. They were all conspiring to put me in the corner. So, Cory [Briggs] pretty much read them the riot act that night. He said, 'I know you don't like my client and you are doing this to be vindictive. He said he wanted all of the documents and communications that were relevant to the effort to pass the censure resolution before a vote is taken, so I would have a chance to respond. They had ten days with an extension of 14 days. The city delayed and it was only after the deadline that the city finally started to turn over what Cory asked for. They are giving it to us in bits and pieces, and we are learning more every day. As recently as today, Cory has been receiving screen shots from Debby [Dorst-Porada] and Alan [Wapner] and Paul [Leon]. They were all in on the conversation prior to the council meeting, trying to figure out how they could lock me up in a box. They were supposed to have released those things weeks ago, but they are just getting around to it now. We don't know what they are withholding. What we have already shows they were violating the Brown Act. Even the city manager [Ochoa] was in on it."

Valencia had a slightly different take on Ochoa's involvement than did Briggs.

On one level, Valencia said, Ochoa's heart isn't in with what the council majority is demanding that he do.

"In that one exchange, where Debbie is asking what they can throw at me, he says that if I'm out on bail they can get me for leaving the country, he's being facetious. It's like he's making fun of Debbie, right to her face."

Valencia said of Ochoa, "I think he's frustrated and he's frustrated because for the last five years this has been a constant battle. The four of them – well, not so much Jim [Bowman] but the three of

Continued on Page 16

Public Notices

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 04/28/2023 09:00 AM Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 18 FIAT ZFBFCXDB-4JP651918 8KJH650 CA To be sold by AGUIARS TOWING, INC 10785 SANTA FE AVE E HESPERIA CA 92345

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 April 14, 2023

SUMMONS - (FAMILY LAW)

NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): PAULINE PHUONG BUTCHER-TRUONG

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

PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): JAMES STEPHEN BUTCHER

CASE NUMBER FLHE2206214

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

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

Public Notices

web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogados de su condado.

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

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

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

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

Filed: OCTOBER 12, 2022

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

880 N. STATE STREET HEMET, CA 92543

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

ANDREW L. WESTOVER, CFS (STATE BAR #253398)

WESTOVER LAW GROUP, APC.

24640 JEFFERSON AVENUE, SUITE 204

MURRIETA, CA 92562

(951) 894-8440

Case electronically filed: OCTOBER 12, 2022

by Maria Martinez, Deputy (Asistente) for Clerk of the Court (Secretario)

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

FBN 20230002484

The following entity is doing business as BEAUTY EMPIRE 8790 19TH ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: BEAUTY EMPIRE LLC 8790 19TH ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

Mailing Address: POST

Public Notices

OFFICE BOX 2820 FONTANA, CA 92334

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202251611878.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JULY 18, 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/ SOPHEA CARRISIMI, CEO

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

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 19576

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 March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

FBN 20230002707

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as INGAGE HD CREATIONS 9745 LIBERTY COURT ALTA LOMA, CA 91737 KATRINA B JOHNSON 9745 LIBERTY COURT ALTA LOMA, CA 91737

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/ KATRINA B JOHNSON, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/17/2023

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 J5480

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 March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

FBN 20230002800

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as MOR MAINTENANCE 14570 ROSEMARY DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92335: BRYAN MARTIN MORATAYA 14570 ROSEMARY DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

Public Notices

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/ BRYAN MARTIN MORATAYA, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/20/2023

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 19576

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 March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

FBN 20230001829

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as HARMONIOUS CHILDBIRTH 11175 AZUSA CT STE 110 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 DEBORAH H GARCIA 2821 OAK CREEK DR UNIT E ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 24, 2021.

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

s/ DEBORAH H GARCIA, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/24/2023

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 19576

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 March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 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 LLC 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 be-

Public Notices

comes 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 12/31, 2022 and 01/06, 01/13, 01/20, 2023. Corrected on February 17, 24 and March 3 & 10, 2023. Recorrected on March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

FBN 20220011500

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as MY MISSION [and] MY MISSION LLC 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 201731110010.

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. Corrected on February 17, 24 and March 3 & 10, 2023. Recorrected on March 24, 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DIANNE H. BREKHUS aka DIANNE HARGRAVE BREKHUS AKA DIANNE HARGRAVE aka DIANNE BREKHUS

CASE NO. P R O S B 2 3 0 0 3 7 2

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DIANNE H. BREKHUS aka DIANNE HARGRAVE BREKHUS AKA DIANNE HARGRAVE aka DIANNE BREKHUS has been filed by SHARYN D. BREKHUS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SHARYN D. BREKHUS be appointed as personal representative to

Public Notices

administer the estate of the decedent.

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

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

A hearing on the amended petition will be held in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on APRIL 27, 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.

Attorney for Shelby Ford: ANTONIETTE JAU-REGUI (SB 192624)

1894 S. COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350

Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

JOSEPH M WOJCIK SBN 177296

DAVIS & WOJCIK APLC 1001 E MORTON PLACE, SUITE A HEMET, CA 92543

Phone (951) 652-9000

Fax (951) 658-8308

joe@dw.law

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 31, April 7 & 14, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ELLA MAE FORD

CASE NO. PROSB2300324

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ELLA MAE FORD

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by SHELLY FORD in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

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

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the

Public Notices

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

A hearing on the amended petition will be held in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on APRIL 27, 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.

Attorney for Shelby Ford: ANTONIETTE JAU-REGUI (SB 192624)

1894 S. COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350

Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 31 and April 7 & 14, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NO. CIVSB2227699

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: THEODORE BOHL filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: THEODORE BOHL to THEODORE MARTIN BOHL 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: 05/04/2023 Time: 08:30 AM Department: S33

Public Notices

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

Dated: 11/07/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: BRIAN S. MCCARVILLE

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 4/7/2023, 4/14/2023, 4/21/2023, 4/28/2023

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE No. 2225408

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner ANDY H. CHEONG filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

ANDY H. CHEONG to ANDY HERO FU

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: MAY 3, 2023
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S23

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: August 17, 2022
Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Priscilla Saldana
Andy Cheong, In Pro Per
6226 Castleton Street
Chino, CA 91710
(626) 864-5566
aherocheong@gmail.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 31 and April 7, 14 & 21, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: RICKY BRADLEY

CASE NO. PROSB2300416

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of RICKY BRADLEY has been filed by TRENECE GAINES in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that TRENECE GAINES 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 amended petition will be held in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on APRIL 24, 2023 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Public Notices

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 May 8, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: April 3, 2023

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

Attorney for Trenece Gaines :
R. SAM PRICE
SBN 208603
PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
454 Cajon Street
REDLANDS, CA 92373
Phone (909) 328 7000
Fax (909) 475 9500
sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14 & 21, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FRANCES SYLVIA WRIGHT

CASE NO. PROSB2300360

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of FRANCES SYLVIA WRIGHT
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JASON WRIGHT in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JASON WRIGHT 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 amended petition will be held in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on APRIL 24, 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

Public Notices

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Jason Wright:
ANTONETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624)
1894 S. COMMERCENT-ER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14 & 21, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JEFFREY HANOUM

CASE NO. PROSB2300157

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JEFFREY HANOUM aka JEFFERY HANOUM has been filed by DAMEN JEFFREY HANOUM in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DAMEN JEFFREY HANOUM 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 MAY 17, 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, 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

Public Notices

court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

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

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

Attorney for Damen Jeffrey Hanoum:
Neil Hedtke, Esquire SBN 273319
820 North Mountain Avenue
Upland, CA 91786
(909) 579 2233 Fax (909) 618 1622 hedtkelg@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14 & 21, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BETTY PETERSON

CASE NO. PROSB2300445

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BETTY PETERSON aka BETTY JO PETERSON Has been filed by JOSEPH ERNEST NELLIGAN in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOSEPH ERNEST NELLIGAN 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 MAY 24, 2023 at 9:00 A.M. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

IF YOU 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.

SUMMONS - (CITACION JUDICIAL)
CASE NUMBER

Public Notices

for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Janis, Stephen P
10788 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga CA 91730
Telephone No: 909-980-0677
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on:
4/7/2023, 4/14/2023, 4/21/2023

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Steven Sanchez

Case NO. PROSB2300296

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

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 09:00 AM on 04/25/2023 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

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

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

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

Salina Sanchez
4872 Olive Street Montclair ca 91763
Telephone No: 909-600-9513
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on:
4/7/2023, 4/14/2023, 4/21/2023

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Cory Kaikainahaole

Case NO. PROSB2300397

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

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S37 at 09:00 AM on 05/08/2023 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

Public Notices

for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Janis, Stephen P
10788 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga CA 91730
Telephone No: 909-980-0677
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on:
4/7/2023, 4/14/2023, 4/21/2023

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Steven Sanchez

Case NO. PROSB2300296

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

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 09:00 AM on 04/25/2023 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

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

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

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

Salina Sanchez
4872 Olive Street Montclair ca 91763
Telephone No: 909-600-9513
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on:
4/7/2023, 4/14/2023, 4/21/2023

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Cory Kaikainahaole

Case NO. PROSB2300397

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

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S37 at 09:00 AM on 05/08/2023 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

SUMMONS - (CITACION JUDICIAL)
CASE NUMBER

Public Notices

(NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVSB2101620

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): ESTATE OF HARRY S. COONEN, the Testate and Intestate Successors of HARRY S. COONEN, Deceased, and ALL PERSONS CLAIMING BY, THROUGH OR UNDER SUCH DECEDENT; ESTATE OF MAX COONEN, the Testate and Intestate Successors of MAX COONEN, Deceased, and ALL PERSONS CLAIMING BY, THROUGH OR UNDER SUCH DECEDENT; ESTATE OF SIDNEY WEINBERG, the Testate and Intestate Successors of SIDNEY WEINBERG, Deceased, and ALL PERSONS CLAIMING BY, THROUGH OR UNDER SUCH DECEDENT; ESTATE OF SONDRA HERRERA, the Testate and Intestate Successors of SONDRA HERRERA, Deceased, and ALL PERSONS CLAIMING BY, THROUGH OR UNDER SUCH DECEDENT; RICARDO HERRERA, an individual; MIMI HERRERA-PEASE, an individual; DEANNA HERRERA, an individual; BENJAMIN COONEN, an individual; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): CALIBER HOME LOANS, INC.

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

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), 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 CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen 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 telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que

Public Notices

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 informacion 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 presentacion, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podra quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratis de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelp-california.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperacion a \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesion de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la direccion de la corte es):
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
 247 WEST THIRD STREET,
 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0210

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

MALCOLM CISNEROS
 2112 BUSINESS CENTER DRIVE,
 IRVINE, CA 92612
 Telephone: (949) 252-9400
 DATE (Fecha): February 1, 2021
 Clerk (Secretario), by Anai Cortez-Ramirez
 Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE No. 2225408
 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner **ANDY H. CHEONG** filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

ANDY H. CHEONG to **ANDY HERO CHEONG FU**
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: MAY 3, 2023
 Time: 8:30 AM
 Department: S23
 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino,

Public Notices

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: August 17, 2022
 Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Priscilla Saldana
 Andy H. Cheong, In Pro Per

6226 Castleton Street
 Chino, CA 91710
 (626) 864-5566
 aherocheong@gmail.com
 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE No. 3202305
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner **YADELLAH GAZANFARI** filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

YADELLAH GAZANFARI to **YADIE GAZANFARI**

[and]
EDDIE GAZANFARI to **YADIE GAZANFARI**
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: MAY 22, 2023
 Time: 8:30 AM
 Department: S24
 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: August 17, 2022
 Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: Gloria Marin
 Yadellah Gazanfari, In Pro Per

11879 Mount Royal Court
 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91737
 (626) 864-5566
 yadmimo@yahoo.com
 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

FBN 20230002985
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as FOREVERME BOUTIQUE 2279 N TEAKWOOD AVENUE RIALTO, CA 92377.
KEREN H DIAZ 2279 N TEAKWOOD AVENUE RIALTO, CA 92377
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A.
 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ **KEREN H DIAZ**, Owner
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/24/2023
 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 J5065

Public Notices

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

FBN 20230003444
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as TRANSMART 4752 W MISSION BLVD, UNIT A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; TRANSMART 4X4 USA INC 4752 W MISSION BLVD, UNIT A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763
 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as number: 4645012.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 30, 2009.
 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.

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 92411; **DAMION'S CONSTRUCTION SERVICES LLC** 6709 LA TIJERA BOULEVARD #551 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045
 Mailing Address: 6709 LA TIJERA 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.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

FBN 20230003241
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as HYPERHIVE 8966 BENSON AVE SUITE A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; HYPERHIVE 8966 BENSON AVE SUITE A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763
 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as number: 5598137.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 19, 2023.
 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/ **JUAN GARCIA**, CEO
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/30/2023
 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 M4750

FBN 20230001715
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as FRESHH DONUTS 1150 N RIVERSIDE AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; **THEARY THOEUN** 6019 MAGNOLIA RIALTO, CA 92377
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 4, 2013.
 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/ **THEARY THOEUN**, Owner
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/22/2023
 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 J9576

FBN 20230001310
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as KOTB REALTY 9483 HAVEN AVENUE, STE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; **STEVEN T THACKER** 3736 OAK CREEK DRIVE UNIT E ONTARIO, CA 91761
 Mailing Address: 3736 OAK CREEK DRIVE UNIT E ONTARIO, CA 91761
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 6, 2023.

Public Notices

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/ **STEVEN T THACKER**, Realtor/Owner
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/08/2023
 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 March 10, 17, 24 and 31, 2023. Corrected on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 10, 17, 24 and 31, 2023. Corrected on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 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 92411; **DAMION'S CONSTRUCTION SERVICES LLC** 6709 LA TIJERA BOULEVARD #551 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045
 Mailing Address: 6709 LA TIJERA 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.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.
 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 12/31, 2022 and 01/06, 01/13, 01/20, 2023. Corrected on February 17, 24 and March 3 & 10, 2023. Corrected again on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

FBN 20230001715
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as FRESHH DONUTS 1150 N RIVERSIDE AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; **THEARY THOEUN** 6019 MAGNOLIA RIALTO, CA 92377
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 4, 2013.
 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/ **THEARY THOEUN**, Owner
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/22/2023
 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 J9576

FBN 20230001310
 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as KOTB REALTY 9483 HAVEN AVENUE, STE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; **STEVEN T THACKER** 3736 OAK CREEK DRIVE UNIT E ONTARIO, CA 91761
 Mailing Address: 3736 OAK CREEK DRIVE UNIT E ONTARIO, CA 91761
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 6, 2023.

FBN 20230002725
 The following person is doing business as: BULLET DELIVERY. 1030 N. MOUNTAIN AVE #287 ONTARIO, CA 91762
CASEY C CLARK 1030 N. MOUNTAIN AVE. #287 ONTARIO, CA 91762.
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to

Public Notices

the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 3, 10, 17 & 24, 2023. Corrected on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:
GROVER EDWARD PANKEY
 C a s e
NO. PROSB2300384

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of **GROVER EDWARD PANKEY**

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by **QUINZELLA PANKEY** in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that **QUINZELLA PANKEY** be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 09:00 AM on 05/09/2023 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

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

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

IN PRO PER
 624 W 16TH ST. UPLAND CA 91784
 Telephone No: 909-921-4784

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023, 04/28/2023

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

Public Notices

TATE OF: KIM BURGETT CASE NO. PROSB 23 00 4 1 8

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

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

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held MAY 8, 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, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: April 3, 2023
 Sabrina Munoz, Deputy Court Clerk
 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Attorney for Brandy Burgett:
R. SAM PRICE
 SBN 208603
 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
 454 Cajon Street
 REDLANDS, CA 92373
 Phone (909) 328 7000
 Fax (909) 475 9500
 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on April 14, 21 & 28, 2023.

FBN 20230002725
 The following person is doing business as: BULLET DELIVERY. 1030 N. MOUNTAIN AVE #287 ONTARIO, CA 91762
CASEY C CLARK 1030 N. MOUNTAIN AVE. #287 ONTARIO, CA 91762.
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
 The registrant commenced to

transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 01, 2003
 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/ **CASEY C CLARK**, OWNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 17, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202316MT
FBN 20230002682
 The following person is doing business as: BIG J'S SOCIAL BBQ. 18640 10TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JH MISSION INVESTMENTS LLC 18640 10TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316
 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 16, 2023
 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/ **JASON J HERNANDEZ**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 16, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202315MT
FBN 20230002684
 The following person is doing business as: DESTINY ST CONSTRUCTION. 11010 ARROW RTE STE 109 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JCE REALTY CORPORATION 11010 ARROW RTE STE 109 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ **EMILIA TOVAR**, PRESIDENT
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 16, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202314MT
FBN 20230002643
 The following person is doing business as: SWAFELEN BY EVE. 7545 CINEGA DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346
 [MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EVELYN J OSKO 7545 CIENEGA DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346.
 The business is conduct-

Public Notices

transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 01, 2003
 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/ **CASEY C CLARK**, OWNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 17, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202316MT
FBN 20230002682
 The following person is doing business as: BIG J'S SOCIAL BBQ. 18640 10TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JH MISSION INVESTMENTS LLC 18640 10TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316
 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 16, 2023
 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/ **JASON J HERNANDEZ**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 16, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202315MT
FBN 20230002684
 The following person is doing business as: DESTINY ST CONSTRUCTION. 11010 ARROW RTE STE 109 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JCE REALTY CORPORATION 11010 ARROW RTE STE 109 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ **EMILIA TOVAR**, PRESIDENT
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 16, 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 03/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023 CNBBI3202314MT
FBN 20230002643
 The following person is doing business as: SWAFELEN BY EVE. 7545 CINEGA DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346
 [MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EVELYN J OSKO 7545 CIENEGA DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346.
 The business is conduct-

Public Notices

transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 01, 2003
 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/ **CASEY C CLARK**, OWNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 17, 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 03/2

Public Notices

04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202308MT

FBN 20230001557 The following person is doing business as: SHARP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES. 502 W 1ST ST. RIALTO, CA 92376... The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230001557 The following person is doing business as: SHARP EXTERMINATOR COMPANY. 502 W 1ST ST. RIALTO, CA 92376... The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230001813 STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT The following person is doing business as: ESPINOZA MARKET. 924 COLTON AVE COLTON, CA 92324... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The fictitious business name referred to above was filed on 04/03/2019.

Public Notices

mon law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202311MT

FBN 20230002223 The following person is doing business as: PHONEFIXER. 500 INLAND CENTER DR GLENDALE, CA 92408... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 07, 2023... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230002101 The following person is doing business as: WINDOW TINTING 2023 LLC. 859 N MOUNTAIN AVE APT 7E UPLAND, CA 91786... The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230002134 The following person is doing business as: FIRST TEAM CLOTHING. 6547 MANZANO ST CHINO, CA 91710... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 01, 2019... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Public Notices

name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202314MT

FBN 20230003028 The following person is doing business as: VIXEN HAIR CO. 147 E VINE ST SUITE #62 REDLANDS, CA 92373... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003014 The following person is doing business as: RAINBOW LANDSCAPE. 14974 SUMMERLAND LN FONTANA, CA 92336... 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.

FBN 20230003051 The following person is doing business as: CARLOS PORTALES & ASSOCIATES. 3186 HILLVIEW DR. S. UNIT 2 CHINO, CA 91710... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Public Notices

name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202317MT

FBN 20230003012 The following person is doing business as: MADRID SERVICES. 1440 W EDGEHILL RD APT #17 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405... The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230002887 The following person is doing business as: ONE WAY RESTAURANT BURGERS. 1403 E FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786... The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230002830 The following person is doing business as: JD CONCRETE PUMPING. 1608 BRADBURY AVE DUARTE, CA 91010... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 23, 2018... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Public Notices

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 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202320MT

FBN 2023003006 The following person is doing business as: US CHINA BUSINESS & FIRENSHIP FEDERATION. 6952 AVIGON DR CHINO, CA 91710... The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 21, 2023... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003112 The following person is doing business as: BOTANICA EL DUENDE. 8145 CYPRESS AVE SUITE J FONTANA, CA 92335... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003126 The following person is doing business as: PAIN AWAY WACU. 330 N D ST SUITE 524 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 08, 2023... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Public Notices

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 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI420232699MT

FBN 20230003113 The following person is doing business as: GARCIA'S GLASS. 16155 SIERRA LAKES PKWY #160-149 FONTANA, CA 92336... 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.

FBN 20230003219 The following person is doing business as: ELITE BARBER. 1667 N MOUNTAIN AVE SUITE 122 UPLAND, CA 91784... The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUN 01, 2015... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003176 The following person is doing business as: EAGLES DYNASTY NETWORK. 1461 E COOLEY DR 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: MAR 29, 2023... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Public Notices

expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/31/2023, 04/07/2023, 04/14/2023, 04/21/2023 CNBBI4202326MT

FBN 20230003168 The following person is doing business as: AQUAMAN POOL AND SPA. 1551 W 13TH ST UNIT 215 UPLAND, CA 91786... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003159 The following person is doing business as: FLY CAM MEDIA. 1255 W COLTON AVE STE 143 REDLANDS, CA 92374... The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 27, 2023... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20230003141 The following person is doing business as: CATRANS. 9763 MEADOWOOD DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOV 15, 2004... By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

Whatever Means Are Necessary To Rid Ontario Of Valencia Are Justified, Leon/Wapner/Dorst-Porada Supporters Maintain *from page 8*

them [Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada] – are constantly doing this kind of thing. With the last city manager [Al Boling], they were critical of him because he wouldn't help them completely isolate me. He would say things like, 'Well, he's not really breaking the law.' And they would say, 'You're always sticking up for Ruben.'"

Ochoa is now being subjected to the same pressure as Boling before him, Valencia said. Ochoa vacillates between trying to please Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada and trying to coexist with everyone, Valencia said.

"He has told them that I am not doing anything illegal by being out in the community and just because they don't like it and they are mad about, there is nothing that can really be done," Valencia said. "In this case, he tried, I think, to warn them to back off, that I was just down in Mexico having a good time. Sure enough, though, they didn't back off. He sort of

has this 'I told you so' attitude. He is tired of them always trying to cause controversy, but he has to go along some of the time. There was discussion at the last council meeting about revising the council rules of conduct. They were last revised in 2014 when they did that for Councilman Avila. They are now trying to do another revision I refer to as the 'Ruben rules.' They are making these rules so that, basically, if I walk out the door and I'm wearing a blue shirt without getting permission from the mayor to wear a blue shirt I am in violation of the rules and I can be censured for wearing a blue shirt. Getting censured isn't a crime. They have already stripped me of my committee assignments and joint powers representation appointments and any authority to travel on behalf of the city, so that the only thing I can do is attend the council meetings and vote. That's it. They try to tie you up like that. They have made it so that the people who are not on their team are not in places where they can see who the rest of the council is interacting with and meeting with. They don't want to worry about witnesses. That's why they are doing what they do and they are trying to do it now. My alleged violation was

I was representing the city without permission. They are saying that if I go anywhere and am recognized as a member of the council, I first have to call the mayor and get permission for that. A while back there was a huge illegal fireworks explosion in the city and some people were killed and some homes destroyed and a news station camera crew chased me down. They wanted a comment about the explosion. So, instead of having the city look bad and saying 'No comment,' I gave them a quote about what had occurred. They [the council] came down on me, saying, 'You are not supposed to talk to the news media. Only the mayor talks to the news, bla, bla, bla. I understand it was a public information officer kind of thing, but if you are out there in public and a news organization is there, it is really awkward to just walk away and that is likely to make the city look worse. This is how silly they are getting. This is the way our city operates. Basically, by being elected, I have lost my freedom of speech. I have told them that if they are going to trump my freedom of speech, 'I will have my attorney do my talking to you.'"

The February 21 council meeting ended with the suggestion that

the council would revisit the subject of censuring Valencia at a future meeting, present the case for doing so, endure cross examination by Briggs and take a vote on making that censure.

Immediately after the February 21 meeting, Leon jetted off to Hawaii for a vacation of his own. While there, he suffered a heart attack, undergoing two operations in which stents were inserted into his vascular system to ward off the potential of coronary blockages. He is under a doctor's orders to reduce the stress in his life. According to the supporters of the Leon/Wapner/Bowman/Dorst-Porada faction of the council, to give Leon an opportunity to recover from his coronary episode, the stress-inducing effort to censure Valencia has been abandoned.

Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada partisans insist that the three and Bowman are intelligent, committed, highly moral and dedicated public servants who selflessly have the best interest of Ontario and its 186,653 residents at heart, while Valencia is a narcissistic snake-in-the-grass looking toward self-aggrandizement while victimizing his own constituents. Valencia is deserving not only of censure but being driven from office, and the sooner the better,

they say. It is a shame and disgrace, they insist, that an opportunistic lawyer like Briggs has joined forces with Valencia in an effort to have all that is good eclipsed by evil.

The assertion that the censure effort has been dropped as part of an effort to protect Leon's health is subject to dispute. That interpretation holds that neither Leon nor Wapner nor Dorst-Porada is inclined to endure Briggs' raising of the Brown Act violation issues that will come about if the effort to censure Valencia persists and an examination of the genesis of the censure rationale and the evidence to support it is undertaken.

Under normal circumstances, an examination of any Brown Act violation implications that might result would be undertaken by the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office. The current San Bernardino County District Attorney, however, is Jason Anderson, a former member of the Ontario City Council who was a colleague of Leon, Wapner and Bowman and was replaced by Dorst-Porada in 2008. In addition, Anderson, when he was in private practice, at one point acted as Wapner's attorney. Thus, an evaluation of the Brown Act violation implication relating

to the effort to censure Valencia would likely undergo a very public conveyance of jurisdiction to the California Attorney General's Office for a determination on whether a prosecution should be pursued, subjecting Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada and the City of Ontario to unwanted negative publicity.

On one side, Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada have their guns trained on Valencia, loaded with bullets they promise will expose him as an American politician cavorting with international drug cartel-affiliated politicians south of the border. On the other, Valencia and Briggs have firepower of their own, ready to be unleashed in a fusillade to demonstrate Leon, Wapner and Dorst-Porada as being contemptuous of the rules of civil discourse, fair play and honesty when it comes to informing public opinion and the governmental decision-making process, along with being in flagrant and deliberate violation of California's open public meeting law. Thus, the four appear to be at a classic impasse, with virtually no prospect that any action will be taken one way or the other, despite the considerable controversy and adverse publicity the council has managed to subject itself to.

Gómez Reyes & Ramos Offer Differing Environmental Safeguards On Warehouses & Differing Leadership Options For Their Party *from page 5*

putting him on a trajectory to be considered a candidate for Assembly speaker before he retires, which would make him the first Native American to hold that post.

There are subtle differences between Ramos and Gómez Reyes.

While both are celebrated as advocates for the downtrodden, Gómez Reyes as an activist lawyer before she was elected to the Assembly and Ramos as the chairman of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians before he initiated his public career as a politician with his services on the San Bernardino

Community College District Board of Trustees followed by his successful 2012 campaign for the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, Ramos has ascended to a far higher rung economically than Gómez Reyes. A multimillionaire as a member of the tribe, which runs a fabulously lucrative casino in Highland, he reportedly makes \$18,000 per day in gaming revenue. This has sensitized him to the "plight" of other wealthy individuals in the State of California. Thus, he is more sympathetic to large scale businessmen, such

as developers and operators of warehouses, than are most other members of the Democratic Party in California.

Viewed from this perspective, the competition between the legislation sponsored by Ramos vs. that brought forth by Gómez Reyes is understandable on a more comprehensive basis.

According to Ramos, AB 1748 will protect residents from the untoward impacts of warehouse development while allowing investors promoting economic development to see a reasonable return on their money.

"AB 1748 is a balanced approach to warehouse siting by allowing local jurisdictions to develop policies for their communities or

follow the model set out last year after vigorous debate and hard won compromise," he said. "It addresses the need to mitigate vital health concerns important to all of us while protecting critical product supply

chains around the globe, nation and state."

Overly aggressive curbs on the logistics industry carry with them the potential of wreaking devastation on the community as a whole, he said.

"We saw what happens when ports and other transportation hubs are stalled for products such as baby formula, medicine, food products and building materials are held up."

—Mark Gutglueck

Sheriff To Address Women's Group In Redlands *from page 4*

He for a time worked in the department's intelligence division, which was attached to the department's command echelon, a position from which he and that unit's investigators gathered compromising information relating to the county's politicians, elected officials and community leaders, in particular the

council members in the cities and towns which contract with the sheriff's department to provide law enforcement services. He also had a supervisory assignment in the department's technical services, communications and records divisions, as well as its bureau of administration.

With the 2017 retirement of Assistant Sheriff David Williams, who previously appeared to be on a trajectory to suc-

ceed McMahon as sheriff, an effort to groom Dicus as the next sheriff began. Dicus moved into the undersheriff post, where he had immediate authority over the internal affairs division which is referred to in San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department parlance as the professional standards division, its civil liabilities division which goes hand-in-hand with professional standards, and the bureau of administration.