

Friday, March 29, 2024 A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service 10808 Foothill Blvd. Suite 160-446 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 (951) 567-1936

Council Votes 4-To-1 To Initiate 1,094-Acre Wine County Specific Plan In North Yucaipa

By Mark Gutglueck

Amidst reports federal authorities are scrutinizing them and their city manager and senior land use officials with regard to their ties to the development industry, the Yucaipa City Council Wednesday night gave approval to the Yucaipa Valley Wine Country Specific Plan, which is to suspend building restrictions on nearly 1,100 acres that were incorporated into the

54,524-population city's 2016 general plan.

Some saw in the action confirmation of the widespread and penetrating suspicions that reportedly invited federal investigators to take up an examination of the somewhat irregular relationship the city's decision-makers forged with the city manager they hired in a highly controversial move more than a year ago. Others, however, saw the action as a

compromise with a development industry that is salivating at the prospect of converting large swaths of open space on the city's north end, which was once grazing land or long dormant or more recently forsaken agricultural property, into massive subdivisions to include both residential neighborhoods and commercial centers.

The Wine Country Specific Plan is a proposed phased develop-

ment to subdivide 1,094 acres in what is referred to as the city's North Bench into lots for both homes and nonresidential areas for vineyards, wineries, trails, and open space. The plan calls for the primarily undeveloped land to be split into what are very close to halves, with residential uses on 547.4 acres and nonresidential uses on 546.2 acres. The proposed nonresidential land use designations

including 465.5 acres for agriculture purposes, 73.6 acres for riparian use and 7.1 acres for utility application by the Yucaipa Valley Water District, the last of which has already been put in place by the water district.

One of the areas of controversy in the plan consists of the transition in density it provides with regard to the construction of the residential component. See P 2

Twentynine Palms Brings In Cathedral City Economic Development Director To Serve As City Manager

Herbert Stone James, currently the economic development director with Cathedral City, has been chosen to serve as city manager in Twentynine Palms.

James will supplant Larry Bowden at City Hall. Bowden has served as interim city manager since October, when former City Manager Frank Luckino departed to become city manager in Desert Hot Springs.

James, 49, has been economic development director in Cathedral City since 2017.

James' professional experience in government is limited to this tenure in Cathedral City, although he has other experience in governmental appointed posts. In addition, he has experience in real estate and development liaison capacities.

At present, he is a board member of a private school, Palm Valley School Pre K-12th Grade Independent School.

James holds a bachelor's degree in business administration and accounting from Gonzaga University, a master's degree in real estate development from the University of Southern California and a doctorate in policy, planning and economic development from USC.

From 2003 until 2005, he was the land acquisitions manager for Richmond American Homes in Las Vegas, from 2005 until 2007 he was employed in land acquisitions for See P 3

Actual Culprit's Emergence Throws State Suits Against Redlands & SB County Into Question

As homeless assistance projects go, the Step Up homeless facility, which had been converted from the former Good Nite Inn in Redlands was an overwhelming success. Insofar as other efforts to formulate a solution to moving people off the streets into a dignified living setting, Redlands city officials had achieved what scores, indeed hundreds

and thousands, in actuality, almost all of other elected officials in California had been unable to attain: the application of money into a program where the money wasn't squandered or eaten up by short-term solutions or consultants and service providers who used the money for salaries or expenses and misdirected the money from those it was intended to help.

the destitute.

What Redlands had done was brilliant in its simplicity and workability. The city had taken the Good Nite Inn, a struggling and failing hotel, acquired it using state and federal money, converted it into primitive but yet dignified apartments, each with modest living room, bedroom, bathroom and kitchenette, and then

filled it with the denizens of the streets, those who would otherwise be living in alleyways or parks or under freeway on-or-offramps or railroad trestles. Moreover, the city had done it in a relatively short period of time, from conception to occupancy.

One might find some other examples of a charitable effort involving churches or a pri-

vate institution here or there that had done as well, but those were far in between. Virtually nowhere else among the State of California's governmental entities – the state government itself, the 58 counties or the 481 cities other than Redlands – had such a [solution] been conceived, articulated, formulated and planned out and then been See P 2

Second Solar Field Proposed For 29 Palms West Of Its Cemetery

Palm Desert-based E-Group PS is seeking permission from the City of Twentynine Palms to undertake a dual industrial/residential project on 477-acre site proximate to the Twentynine Palms Cemetery.

Represented by Terra Nova Planning, which has taken up the cause of preparing for the project presentation and

environmental certification effort for at least one other solar project in the 27,000-population 59.1-square mile city, E-Group is asking Twentynine Palm's planning and building division to consider its proposal to establish a 50-megawatt solar field featuring 160,000 solar panels on the northern 241 acres of the project site See P 3

4 Sheriff's Department Use Of Force Incidents In One Month In Hesperia, Apple Valley & RC Net 3 Deaths

A rash of use of force incidents, including three that resulted in the deaths of civilians, bedeviled the sheriff's department this month.

The violent nature of the encounters has provoked loud and repeated charges that sheriff's deputies are using an excessive and unnecessary degree of force and has tested unto breaking

Sheriff Shannon Dicus's stated commitment to release the relevant footage of the bodyworn video cameras all of his deputies have recently been outfitted.

The most recent such contretemps to come to public attention was the March 26 arrest of a Hesperia-based entrepreneur the sheriff's department maintains was

involved in an armed robbery two days previously. That arrest involved deputies from the Hesperia Station and took place roughly ten blocks from the man's place of business, a tattoo parlor located at 16138 Main Street next to Ararat Market Avenue on the north side of Main between Third Avenue and Fifth Av- See P 6

\$4 Minimum Wage Boost For Fast-Food Workers On April 1 Triggers Massive Layoffs

In anticipation of the 25 percent escalation of the minimum wage for their workers in California to take place next Monday, fast-food outlets throughout the county have already begun laying off workers en masse. It is anticipated that thousands more of those in that sector within San Bernardino County will be out of

work by May.

The trend in the loss of jobs is an unwelcome manifestation of the move to increase pay for workers traditionally considered to be at the bottom of the pay scale in the Golden State.

On April 1, workers in that part of the restaurant industry providing what is defined as fast-food, will see their pay jump

by \$4 – a substantial 25 percent – from \$16 to \$20. For franchises and the companies themselves – McDonald's Jack in the Box, Burger King, In-N-Out, Taco Bell, Del Taco, Baker's, Wendy's, Kentucky Fried Chicken, Church's Chicken, El Pollo Loco, Juan Pollo, Chick-Fil-A, Popeyes, Arby's, Panda Express, Subway and

others of that nature – the expense of rising minimum wages is one they are already staggering under.

Under the law, fast-food operations were considered to be part of the remainder of the economy, subject to the same conditions, vicissitudes, regulations and wage rules as all other businesses. Over the

years, the minimum wage has escalated in California. On March 1, 1997, the minimum was \$5.00. As of September 1, 1997 it grew to \$5.15. As of March 1, 1998 it rose to \$5.75. As of January 1, 2001 it became \$6.25. On January 1, 2002 it reached \$6.75. Upon January 1, 2007 it climbed to \$7.50. On January 1, 2008, See P 3

Wine County Project Would Intensify Density And Add Agricultural & Commercial Uses To Land Zoned For Low Intensity Residential Development

from front page

Under the 2016 general plan, any residential development to take place in the area was to entail no more than one unit per one-acre lot, such that homes to be built there would be what are referred to as “estates.” Under the Wine Country Specific Plan, the residential use acreage would be divided into two groups. One of those would be the “Villas,” which would consist of 629 lots on just under 146.28 acres with a maximum build-out density of 4.3 dwelling units per acre whereby the minimum net lot size is 10,000 square feet. In addition, the plan would allow 462 “estates” to

be built on lots half the size of what is permitted under the 2016 general plan – that is, half-acre lots – which would entail a maximum build-out density of two dwelling units per acre.

Of no little concern to some city residents is that under current state law, property owners will be able to construct on any property containing a dwelling unit a secondary dwelling unit known as an auxiliary dwelling unit, referred to colloquially as a “granny flat.” In this way, the 1,091 units to be permitted under the Wine Country Specific Plan could be doubled to 2,182. Moreover, the possibility exists that in the future, if the agricultural or agricultural-related commercial uses fail or do not materialize, the potential for the land to be repurposed exists. In such a case, either the current or a future council would be at liberty to convert the zoning on the 565.5 ag-

ricultural acres and the 73.6 riparian-use acres to either or both residential and commercial use. In this way, the property which was zoned for agricultural or very sparse residential use with a maximum of 1,094 estate homes could be transitioned into hosting upwards of 4,000 dwelling units and perhaps as many as 8,000 units if a future city council sees fit to allow apartments to be constructed there.

While there were elements within the community who supported making the shift, including residents, the majority of those endorsing the project had some order of a financial stake in the process. Those included the current landowners who stood to reap a profit by selling their property to the developers, the developers themselves, those involved in the type of businesses the specific plan area is to feature, to wit, vintners, would-be vintners, winery operators, restaurateurs, hote-

liers and entrepreneurs such as those looking to open wine tasting rooms or bed and breakfasts.

The Wine Country Specific Plan evolved over a number of years, having first been proposed under the watch of former City Manager Ray Casey. The concept was more aggressively pursued in the time since three members of the council – Mayor Justin Beaver and councilmen Bobby Duncan and Matt Garner – ousted Casey as city manager in a surprise move more than 13 months ago, on January 9, 2023.

As proposed, the project will, on the agricultural and commercial side, will allow for vineyards, up to 12 micro wineries, 10 artisan wineries, and 4 boutique wineries, restaurants, shops, hotels and bed and breakfasts.

The council on Wednesday, March 27, at last took up what was to be the final consideration of the specific

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

plan, which calls for a deviation from the general plan – a blueprint for city growth – approved in 2016, which called for modifying Yucaipa's general plan land use map, creating a land use modification overlay district and imposing the Wine Country Specific Plan within the 1,094-acre project area.

Some 300 residents were present at the Yucaipa Performing Arts

Center, where the special council meeting to consider the project was held. Fifty-seven members of the public, more than 50 of whom are Yucaipa residents, addressed the council with regard to the specific plan.

David Morgan, a member of the Yucaipa Valley Wine Alliance, said he led the outreach effort to get support

Continued on Page 4

Without Researching Who, Precisely, Was Responsible For The Misdirection Of Homeless Services Grant Funds, The State Lashed Out With Lawsuits Against Other Victims of The Diversions, Including Redlands & San Bernardino County

from front page

executed upon. No fewer than 96 individuals who had been without a roof over their heads, now were sheltered from the elements, sleeping on beds, eating meals they had cooked themselves, showering or bathing in some cases daily, using toilets that flushed and living with some modicum of dignity.

To be sure, Redlands had not gone it alone, and it had been dependent on funding it accessed from the state and elsewhere to carry off what it had accomplished, but it had overcome the lethargy of inaction and the inertia of resistance and avoided the pitfalls of waste and misdirection, opening up a facility with speed and aplomb that many others marveled at.

Then, the State of California – the California Attorney General's Office and the California Department of Housing

and Community Development – sued the City of Redlands.

According to the state attorney general and the department of housing, virtually all of the entities, governmental or otherwise, involved in seven state-and-federally-funded projects in five cities, had acted negligently, irresponsibly, greedily or with malice in their efforts to house the homeless. Among those governmental entities were, the state maintains, the County of San Bernardino and the City of Redlands. The difficulties that surfaced with regard to the financing and administration of the projects in question were primarily the result of what the state alleges was fraud, defaults and failure to perform on the part of the Los Angeles-based contractor employed by the City of King, the City

of Redlands, the City of Salinas, the County of San Bernardino and the City of Thousand Oaks to make conversions of existing hotels or motels into permanent residential quarters. In addition, according to the state, the governmental entities that took the lead in undertaking the projects together with the Santa Monica-based nonprofit those cities brought into serve as both the service provider to the homeless living within the facilities and property manager of the conversions as well as 18 other entities that became involved in the properties including lenders, law firms, foreclosure companies and title companies also deserved to be sued. California Attorney General Rob Bonta acted as the legal representative of the California Department of Housing and Community Development in the suit. At first blush, several of representatives of the entities caught up in the legal action asserted that they and at least some of the other parties named as defendants in the suit engaged in no actual

wrongdoing, willfully or unwilfully, and that being subjected to the bother and expense of the lawsuit based upon the negligence or willful wrongdoing of one or perhaps more of their co-defendants would result in some of those entities and perhaps other governmental entities deciding to refrain from undertaking homeless assistance projects from here on out because they do not want to run the risk of having to expend city or county resources on a worthwhile undertaking only to be faced with state-mandated punishment if one of the participants in the effort does not live up to its part of the bargain. While the state officially scoffed at that claim, privately, the Sentinel has learned, state officials acknowledged that some of the named defendants, including the City of Redlands, were no less victims than was the state in the matter.

In February, the company at the heart of the legal maelstrom, filed suit against the individual many believe is the party responsible for

the diversion of money which has so concerned the California Department of Housing and Community Development. If the allegations contained in that civil complaint are accurate – as they appear to be – the larger question becomes how it is that the California Attorney General's Office has failed to use is criminal prosecutorial authority in going after the actual perpetrator of wrongdoing – one who is driving a Bentley and a Ferrari while living in not one but two mansions in Beverly Hills – and why it used its civil prosecutorial authority to malign the names of Redlands city officials as well as others whose action and comportment in this circumstance have been little short of exemplary.

The Good Nite Inn, located at 1675 Industrial Park Avenue in Redlands, opened in January 2023, with 98 rooms available to those who needed them. Two months later, the converted All Star Lodge in San Bernardino opened, with 76 units available for the chronically

homeless.

In homage to the Santa Monica-based nonprofit managing the facilities, the Good Nite Inn was renamed Step Up in Redlands. The former All Star Inn in San Bernardino was renamed Step Up in San Bernardino.

As it turned out, those were the only two of the seven undertakings entrusted to Shangri-La Industries by the combination of San Bernardino County, Redlands, Thousand Oaks King and Salinas that reached completion.

Shangri-La's performance across the board had been somewhat spotty, it turned out, as lenders were not seeing any return or debt service on their loans and both general contractors and subcontractors were not paid past their first dozen paychecks. Those contractors began recording mechanics liens totaling into the millions of dollars against the Shangri-La at the four county recorder offices where the Homekey projects were being pursued. That included

Continued on Page 5

Lake Arrowhead Community Services District Wants Federal Help Eluding PFAS Liability

The Lake Arrowhead Community Services District is seeking federal assistance in dealing with its perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances contamination problem.

Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, known as PFAS, and perfluorooctanoic acid, known as PFOA, compose a family of more than 5,000 man-made and mostly unregulated chemicals that have been produced since the 1950s. They are commonly referred to as “forever chemicals” because they are resistant to degradation in the

environment and when degradation occurs, it results in the formation of additional PFAS compounds or constituents.

The precise source of the contamination has yet to be established. In October 2023, the California Environmental Protection Agency published a finding that Lake Arrowhead had a total PFAS concentration levels of 26. It has been theorized that Lake Arrowhead’s PFAS contamination is a byproduct of its Grass Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant which processes the sewer effluent from Lake Arrowhead and re-

cycles water to irrigate the golf course at the Lake Arrowhead Country Club. The theory is that the inadequate filtration of the water has resulted in eliminating other contaminants while compounding the concentration of PFAS.

On March 7, Lake Arrowhead Community Services District General Manager Catherine Cerri sent a letter to Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, Chair of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Tom Carper, and Ranking Member Shelley Moore

Capito seeking liability protections for water and wastewater agencies under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Despite the original intent that CERCLA would require those companies responsible for contamination to pay for mitigating those situations, federal legislators are now angling toward requiring water agencies to cover such clean-up costs involving polyfluoroalkyl substances when the actual or original source of the contamination cannot be deter-

mined.

Cerri’s letter asserts it is unfair that public agencies bear the cost of removing PFAS rather than the companies that manufactured them. She called upon the legislators to protect “passive receivers” such as the Lake Arrowhead Community Services from the economic devastation that would ensue from being required to redress PFAS contamination.

Cerri asked that the federal legislature avoid shifting the blame from the manufacturers of PFAS to public agencies, which she maintains do

not have the means to get to the root of the contamination. In her letter, she called for further legislative action to safeguard public water systems and reinforce CERCLA’s objective of holding polluters financially responsible for contamination remediation. She called upon Schumer, McConnell, Carper and Moore Capito to consider an approach similar to that contained in Senator Cynthia Lummis’ Senate Bill 1430, the Water Systems PFAS Liability Protection Act, which would provide exemptions from PFAS liability for public agencies.

James Assuming Post As 29 Palms City Manager *from front page*

Toll Brothers in Palm Springs, from 2007 until 2008 he was a land broker for O’Donnell/Atkins, from 2008 to 2017 the vice president of

Land Advisors Organization, at which point he went to work as the economic development director in Cathedral City.

He was a member of the Indio Planning Commission from 2010 until 2017, including a stint as chairman. He was a subcommittee member of

the general plan update committee in the City of Palm Desert concentrating on land use, housing and open space from 2015 to 2016. He was a member of the general plan advisory committee with the city of Indio from 2016 to 2019.

More recently, he has

served as a guest lecturer with the University of California at San Bernardino.

In moving into the Twentynine Palms city manager’s position, James will be taking a step up professionally while simultaneously taking, what is for the

time being, a substantial pay cut. At present, he is earning, as Cathedral City’s economic development director, an annual salary of 202,371.36, perquisites and add-ons of \$32,765 and benefits of \$54,380.63 for a total annual compensation of \$289,516.99.

In coming to Twentynine Palms as city manager, he will be paid to start \$176,425.60 in salary, along with an anticipated \$17,743 in perquisites and pay add-ons and another \$60,275.26 in benefits, for a total annual compensation of \$254,443.26.

Company Preparing EIR For 29 Palms Solar Farm *from front page*

North of Two Mile Road and west of Noel Knolls Road and construct 236 homes on the southern 236 acres of the project site.

According to E-Group PS principal Robert Smith, his company had hoped to work directly with the City of Twentynine Palms in refining the project and tailoring its plans to meet local development standards and mitigate the project in accordance with the needs of local residents and businesses.

With regard to the solar energy-production portion of the project, the company has the option under California law of bypassing local land use authority, in this case the City of Twentynine Palms, and seeking an entitlement to proceed with the project from the State of California, which renders inapplicable any local ban and supersedes any local regulations relating

to industrial solar power projects. Twentynine Palms has such an ordinance.

On February 27, Terra Nova on behalf of E-Group PS filed with the State of California under the California Environmental Quality Act a notice that it was preparing a draft environmental impact report to address a multitude of issues including aesthetics, agriculture resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, drainage/absorption, energy, flood plain/flooding, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards & hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services and recreation, as well as the impact on local schools/universities, the operation of nearby septic system, local sewer capacity, the generation of trash and solid waste, transportation, utilities/service systems and vegetation.

The project is de-

scribed as one to take place on 477 acres currently zoned for rural living and single-family residential estates limited to one home per five acres or one home per two-and-a-half acres that will require two general plan amendments and two rezonings, a development code amendment, a conditional use permit and a development agreement to complete. The general plan amendments included amendments to the general plan text and map to add a new renewable energy land use district, and apply it to the northern 241 acres of the project site on the land use map, and a general plan map amendment to re-designate the southern 236 acres of the project site from Rural Living (RL-5) and Single-Family Residential – Estate (RS-E) to Single-Family Residential, with 1 acre minimum lots. In (RS-1). The rezoning creating the new renewable energy district will require a development code amendment to create development standards and

permitted uses, and applying it to the northern 241 acres of the project site on the zoning map. The zoning map amendment will re-designate the southern 236 acres of the project site to allow substantially greater density of housing than the land is currently zone for. The conditional use permit is to allow the solar project to be constructed on the northern portion of the site. The development agreement is to address community benefit responsibilities of the applicant.

The window for state agencies, including the California Air Resources Board, the California Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and its Inland Deserts Region 6, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Department of Transportation, the California Department of Water Resources, the California Energy Commission, the Cali-

fornia Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, the California Natural Resources Agency, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Region 7 of the Colorado River Basin, the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Native American Heritage Commission, to carry out their review ends to-

day, March 29. The California Native American Heritage Commission is the lead agency in collecting those comments.

Local residents have voiced opposition to the project as have local residents in the environs of the Indian Cove district of Twentynine Palms expressed resistance to the concept of building another solar project there.

Minimum Wage Increase Triggering Fast-Food Layoffs *from front page*

the minimum wage stood at \$8.00. On July 1, 2014, workers could be paid no less than \$9.00 per hour. That minimum was raised to \$10.00 on January 1, 2016. As of January 1, 2017, it became \$10.50. A slight bump to \$11.00 came on January 1, 2018. On January 1, 2023, the state minimum wage leapt to \$15.50. A relatively minor increase to \$16 per hour went into effect on January 1 of this year. In 2021, discussion about taking restaurant

workers to a starting pay grade beyond that of other workers first began, under the auspices of the Fast-Food Accountability and Standards Recovery Act, dubbed the FAST Act, contained in legislation, Assembly Bill 257, that was sponsored by four Democrats – Assemblyman Chris Holden, Assemblywoman Wendy Carrillo, Assemblyman Evan Low and Assemblywoman Luz Rivas. There was solid, indeed virulent, opposition raised to the FAST Act. One of the things that proponents of the higher minimum for fast food workers were missing, it

Continued on Page 6

Many See Wine District In Yucaipa As A Potential Economic Boon While Residents Of The Area Fear It Will Intrude On The Natural & Peaceful Character Of The Environs *from page 2*

for the specific plan. In carrying out a survey with regard to plan, Morgan said, “We went through the entire city. We had multiple efforts. We stood in front of the grocery stores. We did retail. We went door-to-door. We nearly went to about 10,000 doors. It was 9,980 doors. Out of that, we were able to survey 10,590 people. When we did that, we were able to collect over 1,000 support cards. What people liked most about the project – and this is not scientific, but we did talk to the community – they like the idea that it created a scenic corridor and created local jobs and recreation with new trails.”

While Morgan said about half of the community surveyed did not know anything about the proposal, of those who did, he said, 68.9 percent of those surveyed said they supported the Wine Valley Specific Plan concept. “A large part of the community does want to see this happen,” Morgan said. “We listened to what people had to say and one thing is clear: Yucaipa residents want this approved.”

Jonathan Weldy, a resident of the county’s high desert and chairman of the San Bernardino County Planning Commission who owns a considerable amount of property to fall within the Wine Country Specific Plan area, expressed the view that the city council should give greater weight and credibility to the recommendation of those who know what they are talking about and are promoting the plan than those who are ignorant and are opposing the project out of emotion and selfishness.

Weldy said he did not stand to profit from his interest in the property if it were to be covered under the Wine Country Specific Plan. “I’m in escrow to well this property for less than I

owe on it,” he said. “This concept of a windfall [to him] going into it is just false.” The activation of the plan is good for the community as a whole, Weldy insisted.

“When you receive this testimony, it needs to be filtered by what the perspective is,” he said. “There are two perspectives here. One of them is me and one of them is us. A lot of the North Bench comments are from [the] me perspective: my, home my rights, my rural environment, my expectations, not about the community, not about what’s good for the whole. This plan is a community plan. It’s about a broader perspective.”

Weldy said there were shortsighted city residents who a generation ago opposed the development of the Chapman Heights district in the city. The council should not listen to those who are now opposing the latest effort to propel the city forward. He said the city faced a similar dilemma in 1998, when there were no shoulders and sidewalks on then two-lane Yucaipa Boulevard and Oak Glen was subject to flooding and the city had no recycled water system. Just as the money generated by allowing development in the Chapman Heights district to proceed improved the city in the intervening years, the economic boon to be reaped from the Wine Country Specific Plan implementation will, Weldy said, benefit not just that area of the city but other sections of the city as well.

We ask you to hold the vision that’s been laid out before you,” Weldy said.

Philip Schneider, a District 1 resident, said, “The Wine Country Specific Plan is inconsistent with the general plan and causes the general plan to be internally inconsistent.” He called upon the city council to “fix” the inconsistencies before approving the specific

plan. He said, “The city is wrong on several of its assumptions and processes.”

Colleen Wong said that the implementation of the plan “will benefit a very few at a cost to many. You may think grapes are great but it will destroy the trails where the community needs to hike, ride, bird and just visit. It’s where kids play. You aren’t even planning to replace the trails with parks. You’ve planned houses that are seven-and-a-half to ten feet apart with narrow streets. You think grapes will make up for it but no one will be able to hike, bike, ride or bird in the grapes. All your rural areas will become private property without access. We will no longer be a community under this plan.”

DeDe Chudy, the president of the Yucaipa Valley Conservancy, emphasized “inconsistencies” between the city’s general plan and the Wine Country Specific Plan. While acknowledging that “We know the land is going to be developed,” she expressed concern that if the “vineyards would fail, someone else will buy it [i.e., the land] at which point the property will then be subject to development at an intensity far greater than the 1,094 estates that can be built there under the auspices of the 2016 General Plan.

Kathy Bryan called the Wine Valley Specific Plan a “masterful compromise.”

Kathy Dupper said she was opposed to changing the 2016 general plan and changing the lot sizes in the area to be covered by the Wine Valley Specific Plan to less than RL-1, that being one residential unit per acre.

“That’s why my husband and I moved here: for rural living. We did not move here for up to 26 wineries, tasting rooms, distilleries, bed and breakfast, villas, restaurants and wedding venues,” she said. “This is not rural living. We don’t want a Temecula squeezed into this very small area of the North Bench. The roads are

crowded enough. The roads – Ivy, Fir and Carter are residential streets and will be unable to accommodate the many thousands of visitors your EIR [environmental impact report] states will come. These quiet residential streets are now used by young children bike riding, teenagers walking their dogs, retirees like myself horseback riding. If this Wine Country Specific Plan is approved, these roadways will have a massive increase in traffic. No amount of traffic studies or new lights will make these residential neighborhoods safe again.”

She said the activation of the plan will see the neighborhood she live in “turned into a commercial area with no freeway access and up to 188,000 visitors per year. This will destroy the quiet communities of those of us who live near the project.”

Lloyd Rekstad decried that the maximum density in the specific plan area would be upped from the one dwelling unit per acre to 4.6 dwelling units per acre if the plan were given go-ahead.

“Once these lots are sold, the details of the lot placement and design of the homes and other development details will not require planning commission approval but will simply be a decision made by staff review,” Rekstad said. “This removes broad, community-based oversight from the process and puts these decisions in the hands of unelected city staff. This is not consistent with Yucaipa development protocol, and it may lead to unbridled developments.”

Citing “26 wine tasting rooms, proposed bed and breakfasts, restaurants, boutique hotels, entertainment venues and other extensive commercial development,” Rekstad said, “This is in direct opposition to the general plan. It is totally inconsistent with the existing environment of the North Bench neighborhood. It is a virtual slap in the face of all of those citizens who spent many hours creating the

award-winning general plan.”

Rekstad added, “It is entirely unreasonable that the city should be the promoter of a project.”

Hanson Wong questioned the validity, ethics and legality of the ploy by which those gathering petitions in favor of the project had offered signers 5 dollars off each bottle of wine to be sold in the plan area as well as free food from a local restaurant.

Wong countered Weldy’s suggestion that those opposing the project were being selfish by acknowledging his selfishness extended to wanting to see the land preserved for his progeny.

“I want my children and grandchildren to have open space to walk around the city on,” he said. “Private agricultural land is not open space.”

Holly Grimm said the project was dividing the community and “fracturing of our residents. This plan is pitting Yucaipa residents against each other. The division amongst the residents has been orchestrated by outsiders that plan to gain financially from these developments,” she said. “This division has been promoted by a few well-positioned residents that stand to gain from the project, whether that is an immediate gain or a gain in the future, only they can tell you.

Scott Riley questioned why the Wine Country project plan has built into it an expectation that the wineries might fail. “This plan has got verbiage ‘if they fail,’ Riley said. “What?” He said the city’s contemplation of something officials were not sure would succeed was “offensive.”

According to city staff, an environmental impact report for the adoption of the Wine Country Specific Plan led to the conclusion that some consequences of the project pose no environmental problems. Further, most of the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified

can be offset and reduced to an acceptable level. These pertain to land use, water use, noise, traffic, and biological and cultural resources.

Nevertheless, according to Section 5 of the environmental impact report, there is one significant or potentially significant environmental impact that will or may result from the project – that relating to air quality – which has been identified and which the city has determined cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level.

City staff conceded that “the viticultural uses” anticipated from the project “would be new and additional land use types compared to the 2016 general plan. Depending on the accessory uses of a winery, operation of wineries could generate greenhouse gas emissions from sources such as passenger vehicles associated with employees and guests, vendor and delivery trucks, off-road equipment (e.g., forklift), energy usage (i.e., natural gas and electricity), water demand, and solid waste and wastewater generation. Emissions from operation of the viticultural uses accommodated under the proposed project in the Wine Country Specific Plan would be new and additional emissions compared to the 2016 General Plan. Although individual future viticulture land use projects may not potentially exceed the 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year threshold, the combined viticultural land uses accommodated under the proposed project would exceed this threshold and would increase the magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions impacts compared to the 2016 General Plan.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, a project’s environmental impacts, including ones that will have a deleterious effect on the health, lifespan and quality of life of those living within an impactful range of the project, can go unmitigated, but

Continued on Page 11

29-Year-Old Holmes Has Accumulated Wealth & Assets Beyond Belief After Having Been Entrusted Five Years Ago As Chief Financial Officer With A Company That Did Conversions Of Hotels/Motels Into Homeless Shelters *from page 2*

some \$2.12 million in liens against Shangri-La from the work at the Good Nite Inn and the All Star Lodge at the San Bernardino County Recorder's Office.

Despite those financial difficulties both Step Up in Redlands and Step Up in San Bernardino are yet operating. The auspices under which the Redlands project and the one in the City of San Bernardino pursued by the the County of San Bernardino as well as the one in Thousand Oaks, another in King and three in Salinas which are at the center of the legal contretemps is that of the Homekey Program, what Governor Gavin Newsom touts as California's nation-leading homeless housing initiative. The cities of Thousand Oaks, Salinas, King and Redlands, as well as the County of San Bernardino actively sought, and ultimately were selected by the California Department of Housing and Community Development to receive, Homekey grants, which consisted of money available through the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund, which in turn had been established by the federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. Essentially Thousand Oaks, King, Redlands and the County of San Bernardino proposed to make a single conversion and the City of Salinas was seeking to carry out three conversions of previously existing hotels or motels into residences for the homeless. In all seven cases, the cities. county contracted with Los Angeles-based Shangri-La Industries, LLC to complete the conversions and Santa Monica-based Step Up on Second, a nonprofit, to manage the facilities. In turn, Shangri-La, in return for the four cities and the county eventually passing through to it the state and federal

funds, undertook the project, securing loans from PMF CA Real Estate Investment Trust, Qualfax, BMO Harris Bank, California TD Specialists, PPRF Real Estate Investment Trust, Lone Oak Fund, Arixa Institutional Lending Partners, LLC; Fairview Loan 123 LLC; 310 Real Estate Investment Trust, Medalist Partners Asset-Based Private Credit Fund III Commercial Real Estate LLC. Medalist Partners Asset-Based Real Estate Investment Trust III and Pacific Western Bank. Further involved were the Tullius Law Group and the Law Firm of Foley & Lardner, the Fidelity National Title Corporation and Chicago Title Company.

According to the lawsuit, Shangri-La Industries received more than \$114 million in Homekey funds from the state to convert the hotels/motels into permanent supportive housing in San Bernardino, Redlands, Thousand Oaks and two Northern California communities. The developer then granted and recorded deeds of trust to secure loans from the third-party lenders. Doing so without first obtaining the California Department of Housing and Community Development's authorization violated the terms of the Homekey agreements, according to the state.

That detail might have been missed and the matter involving violation might have flown under the radar except that Shangri-La defaulted on the loans.

When Shangri-La defaulted on the loans, the lenders began the foreclosure process, stepping on the Department of Housing and Community Development's title to the relevant properties.

According to the suit, "Defendants Step Up and Shangri-La Industries breached the agreements in several material

ways, including 1) by conveying title on acquisition of the property to a separate partnership entity that was not identified as a grantee/contractor in Agreement 17166 without requesting or receiving the Department's express prior written approval; 2) by encumbering the property with one or more deed of trusts and using the property as collateral for loans without requesting or receiving the Department's express prior written approval; 3) By failing to comply with the restrictive use provisions, as applicable; 4) by failing to pay contractors hired to rehabilitate the properties resulting in mechanics liens being placed on the property. 5) By failing to pay debt on the property causing the court appointment of a receiver over the property [various properties]."

According to the state, the lender defendants "in performance of their due diligence responsibility, were on notice, as set forth in Civil Code section 1217, of encumbrances or potential encumbrances of the property in the form of the restrictive use covenants and Regulatory Agreement obligations specified and described in the Homekey Standard Agreements. Despite such notice, the Lender Defendants issued loans to the Property Titleholder Defendants purporting to be secured by first or second priority encumbrances on the properties, rather than subordinate to the use restriction/Regulatory Agreements required by the Homekey Standard Agreements. The property titleholder defendants and defendants Step Up and Shangri-La Industries were specifically aware of the restrictive use covenant/regulatory agreement requirements in the Homekey Standard Agreements and purposefully sought to conceal and did conceal the loans from the Department [of Housing and Community Development]. The deeds of trust filed by the lender defendants

relating to loans secured by the properties to which the Homekey standard agreements relate are adverse to the first-position lien priority of the Homekey use restriction /regulatory agreement, as required by the Homekey standard agreements, and they jeopardize the purpose and intent of the Homekey statutes and use of Homekey funds."

"All seven Homekey properties in which (Shangri-La Industries) was a private grantee are at risk of imminent foreclosure," the lawsuit states.

In six of the seven cases involving the converted hotels/motels, Shangri-La and the cities and county it partnered with did not make a timely recordation of the use restrictions on the converted to ensure they would be used solely for interim or permanent housing.

Comes now, however, Shangri-La Industries with an explanation – in the form of a civil suit against its former chief financial officer, which goes quite a distance in explaining what occurred.

The reason Shangri-La Industries, as the developer of those homeless facilities, quit staying current on its bills and was no longer able to pass through the federal and state funding being used to convert those hotels/motels permanent homeless shelters was that 29-year-old Cody Holmes, who had been Shangri-La CFO until he was fired in January, had spent millions of those dollars on himself, or more accurately on himself and his now former girlfriend, while diverting Homekey money into accounts he, and he alone, controlled as well as toward purchases of Beverly Hills real estate, expensive cars, and travel to exotic locations.

While there had been indications that should have been picked up upon by Shangri-La's corporate officers well over a year ago that things were amiss, a critical and comprehensive examination of the companies

books was not undertaken by independent auditors and those with the company not involved in the diversions until after the California Attorney General's Office filed suit in January. That was because Holmes occupied the one position with the company from which a perspective on the corporation's finances could be glimpsed and understood.

Holmes was still a 20-year-old student at USC in 2014 when he was given a position as an intern at Shangri-La Industries. He moved into a full-time position with the company after he obtained his bachelor's degree from USC as an intern in 2014, when he was still an undergraduate at the University of Southern California, according to the company's lawsuit. He remained with the company as a junior financial officer while he pursued a master's degree in finance at USC, acceding to the position of Shangri-La's director of finance in 2019.

Less than six months later, Shangri-La's chief executive officer departed, and Chief Executive Officer CEO Andy Meyers replaced him with Holmes. As CFO, Holmes oversaw Shangri-La's finances, was a signatory on its bank accounts and held sway over accounting for the company.

Beginning as early as 2018, Holmes began testing the limits of his autonomy within the company, and may have been directly embezzling from it as early as 2019. In 2018, he had altered an operating agreement in which he had conferred upon himself a 50 percent ownership of the company. That document apparently went unremarked by other corporate officers until recently. The company has documented that there were major diversions of funds by 2022.

According to the lawsuit filed against Holmes by Shangri-La in Los Angeles Superior Court, Holmes, despite his seeming youth, had gained Meyers' complete trust, which Holm-

es "exploited... in order to to enrich himself and his then-girlfriend."

That then-girlfriend is Madeline Witt, for whom Holmes purchase, using Shangri-La funds, a \$111,000 Birkin bag, another \$16,839 for a Hermes Orange Togo Birkin, a \$35,000 Audemars Piaget diamond watch and a \$127,073 53-carat weight diamond necklace.

Though Witt was never officially a Shangri-La employee, Holmes managed to created an email address for her with a Shangri-La corporate affiliate and added her as an authorized holder of an account for another arm of the company. In this way, according to the suit, "[Holmes] went to significant lengths" to transfer money and assets to Witt.

Holmes engaged in all sorts of extravagant spending, purchasing a 2021 Bentley Bentayaga and a Ferrari Portofino, both of which he had the pink slips to. Using a loan made to Shangri-La, he purchased in July 2022 through a company he created, Holmes Capital, a seven-bed, 11-bath 11,000-square-foot mansion at 9301 Cherokee Lane in Beverly Hills for \$13.4 million. He had paid down, using Shangri-La funds something approaching \$4.3 million of the principal on that loan, but by last September was facing a \$9.1 million foreclosure on the property, which he staved off by filing for bankruptcy. His lawyer now maintains the property is worth \$25 million, and Holmes is seeking to sell the property through Holmes Capital.

Holmes also used well over half of a million dollars in Shangri-La funds to pay for a \$48,000 per month lease on another Beverly Hills property for over a year. In addition, he laid out \$54,400 in company funds on 20 VIP passes to the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival and another \$43,475 for private jet travel.

The lawsuit references sixteen separate known "embezzling
Continued on Page 12

Despite Maintaining, Generally, That Recent Uses Of Force Resulting In Death Have Been Justifiable, Sheriff's Department Is In No Hurry To Release Video Footage Of Most Of The Confrontations

from front page

enue. Much of the department's takedown of Alonso was captured on video by a passerby and mounted onto a social media platform, thereafter going viral.

In the video, at first three deputies can be seen grappling with the man, identified as Christian Cardenas Alonso, a 36-year-old resident of Adelanto, at the side of the roadway behind Alonso's maroon- or burgundy-colored 1964 Chevrolet Impala, bearing the license plate number 72IX939. Alonso is face down on the pavement, with the deputies kneeling at various angles over him. At several points, Alonso's head is being scraped or raked with force against the pavement on the shoulder of the road. A fourth deputy then comes into the video's frame of focus to assist in making the arrest. Throughout the ordeal, Alonso sustains repeated blows to his head.

The location of the action is near the corner of Main Street and E Avenue.

In the video obtained by the Sentinel, abstracted from an Instagram posting by an individual who uses the handle *jesseloc_*, what looks to be one uniformed deputy, another wearing an identifying jacket and a third deputy in what appear to be plain clothes, have Alonso on the ground. The uniformed deputy and the deputy with the identifying jacket are somewhat obscured by the plain clothed deputy, who is closer to the video camera. The plain-clothed deputy, who is kneeling and positioned with his backside toward the Impala, knees the struggling and face-down Alonso three times with a moderate degree of force, whereupon a fourth deputy is seen approaching the melee. The plain-clothed deputy then punches Alonso four times as

his colleagues are bent over the arrestee with their arms extended, as if they are straining to hold him to the ground. The plain-clothed deputy then repositions himself so he is on the other side of Alonso and facing the car, at which point he knees Alonso five times with a greater degree of force to the head, then punches him straight down to the head with Alonso's head against the pavement four times and then knees him to the head again. The videographer, *jesseloc_*, can then be heard calling out, "Hey, you fucked him up already, dog."

In the video from that point on, whatever resistance Alonso might have been manifesting ceased and the deputies appear to be effectuating a handcuffing.

Initially, after the video had gathered attention by making the rounds locally but before it had accumulated hundreds of thousands of viewers statewide, nationally and internationally, the department at 10:17 p.m. on March 27 put out a press release that minimized what occurred.

Bearing the heading "A Use of Force Occurs When Deputies Investigating a Robbery Attempt to Arrest a Suspect in Hesperia," the advisory noted the time of the incident as being 4:51 p.m. on March 26. It specified the matter in question as an incidence of "robbery," which took place in the 16000 block of Main Street. It identified Alonso as the suspect, while maintaining the victim was "confidential."

According to the narrative, "On Sunday, March 24, 2024, deputies from the Hesperia Station responded to an armed robbery at the 16000 block of Main Street in Hesperia. Through investigation, investigators identified Christian Cardenas Alonso as the suspect.

Alonso is a convicted felon and an active criminal street gang member."

Furthermore, according to the department, "On Tuesday, March 26, 2024, investigators from the Hesperia Station located Alonso near the intersection of Main Street and E Avenue in Hesperia. The investigators initiated a traffic stop and contacted Alonso who refused to exit his vehicle. Alonso resisted arrest and a use of force occurred."

The department added that "During a search of Alonso's vehicle, the victim's property was located in the trunk. A search warrant was subsequently served at Alonso's place of business, Califa Tattoo, located at the 16000 block of Main Street in Hesperia. Upon service of the search warrant, investigators contacted several known criminal street gang members inside the business who attempted to flee out the back door of the business. Investigators recovered a firearm, ammunition, and gang indicia from inside Alonso's business."

According to the department, "The investigation is being forwarded to the district attorney's office for review."

The advisory concluded with a statement from Sheriff Shannon Dicus.

"I have been made aware of the use of force that occurred during the arrest of a suspected armed robbery suspect. The use of force is currently under investigation, which includes the review of all body worn cameras. The deputy has been placed on administrative leave pending the outcome of the investigation," Dicus was quoted.

The Sentinel's effort to engage with Dicus was met with a response from the department that Dicus had left the state and would not be available until after the Easter holiday. The department refused to release footage from any of the four available bodyworn video cameras that is in the custody of the department.

Less than three weeks

ago, in the aftermath of a fatal shooting of a suspect by at least one of the department's officers on March 9, Dicus told the Sentinel and numerous other media outlets that the department was anxious to make bodyworn camera video footage available to the media and public to dispel notions that the department has been engaged in unwarranted uses of force.

Despite his ordeal, Alonso survived. That has not been the case with three other suspects who crossed paths with department personnel in recent weeks.

On March 9, Ryan Gainer, a 15-year-old resident of Apple Valley was shot in the torso what is believed to be three times by a deputy as he wielded a bladed garden hoe and galloped toward another deputy who had arrived at the Gainer Family home at 13494 Iroquois Road in response to calls for assistance by a member of the Gainer family. Young Gainer was experiencing what has been represented as "an autistic episode," during which he was assaulting one of his sisters and had broken a window and was threatening others with a glass shard after having been disciplined by his parents.

Gainer was pronounced dead upon be-

ing transported to a local hospital. The department in short order released the video footage of that shooting, taken from the perspective of two of the deputies.

A Rancho Cucamonga man who was slammed to the pavement in a confrontation with San Bernardino County sheriff's deputies died after the encounter.

The sheriff's department provides contract law enforcement services to Rancho Cucamonga, functioning as that city's police department.

Some 22 minutes after midnight on March 19, deputies in Rancho Cucamonga engaged in a violent encounter with Mohd Hijaz, 32 in the 10100 block of Foothill Boulevard, just east of the Foothill/Hermosa Avenue intersection, following a report by a nearby resident that an individual was acting erratically, seeking to open apartment and vehicle doors, and that he had pulled the building's fire alarm.

After locating Hijaz "seated in a bush" and yelling incoherently, deputies reported that Hijaz without warning advanced toward them and refused multiple commands to stop, at which point, according to the department, "a use of force occurred" and Hijaz struck one deputy

in the face. Reportedly, Hijaz was severely injured when he was lifted and brought with force to the ground by a deputy in response to Hijaz's combativeness. He lost consciousness and transported to a local hospital where he was determined to have died.

The department has not released the video footage of the ordeal involving Hijaz.

On March 23 in Hesperia, deputies shot and killed 52-year-old Keith Vinyard after deputies, in apparent response to a domestic violence warrant for Vinyard's arrest, engaged in a vehicle chase in which he attempted to escape and was driving recklessly.

After the pursuit ended within the vicinity of the 15400 block of Halinor Street, according to the sheriff's department, Vinyard refused to comply with commands made by a deputy, whom Vinyard threatened to shoot. While it is unclear whether Vinyard actually possessed a gun, the department claims he armed himself with a "large metal object" as other deputies arrived on scene, at which point, at around 9:50 p.m., he was fatally shot.

The department has refused to release the footage of Vinyard's shooting.

-Mark Gutglueck

FAST Act Was Intended To Empower Fast Food Workers Into Equality With Or Even Superior Status To Regular Workers from page 3

was said, was that many of the jobs at places like McDonalds or Burger King were entry level, not just entry level at the particular location where the worker was employed but entry level into the workforce all the way around. These were jobs that were very simple ones requiring only minimal skills and training. No college degree was required. Indeed, no high school diploma was needed. There were virtually no prerequisites beyond being able to report to work, more

or less on time, and, perhaps, speak English, and in some cases even that was not required. Traditionally, many fast-food workers were high school students working part time at what would be for most his or her first job.

With the FAST Act, a new era was initiated in which fast-food workers had a somewhat unique niche cut out of them, one in which, as of next Monday, will put them into a situation which they will have a starting position – in terms of their starting wages – one fourth greater in terms of pay, then beginning workers in other industries. Even the least experienced and skilled of workers employed with fast-food operations will make 125 percent of

what their inexperienced and newly hired counterparts with companies otherwise will be making. That is, if they still have their jobs.

To make up for the increase in pay to their workers, many or most fast food outlets have incorporated a series of alterations to how they conduct business to minimize their need for workers. This has included having fewer workers per shift, which has force the workers remaining with the companies to increasingly multi-task, by waiting on customers and then prepare the meals ordered, run cash registers, deliver or hand over the food to the customers on the premises and then bus tables and carry out

Continued on Page 12

Public Notices

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVS B 2 3 1 3 0 2 9 NOTICE TO VICTOR BELTRAN; MONICA MARIA BELTRAN; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY 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 DÍAS 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 telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

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

Public Notices

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

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es): Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, Branch Name: San Bernardino Justice Center The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

JENUS K. NOURAFCHAN, Esquire
LEVY & NOURAFCHAN
9454 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 500
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212
Phone: (310) 274-9993
Fax: (310) 888-3255
DATE (Fecha): June 8, 2023

Clerk (Secretario), by Kylie Meneses
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) 23STCV18665 NOTICE TO OTIS WHITE, an individual; DAVID WHITE, an individual; ROBERT FIELDER, an individual; DANNY RAY WHITE, an individual; BONITA BARNES, an individual; TEVIS BARNES, an individual; VERONICA WHITE JENKINS, as successor trustee of the Doris White Trust; KIMBERLY WHITE, as successor trustee of the Vertis White Trust; CHERAYA JOHNSON, an individual; TRENICA MUNERLYN, an individual; JOE WHITE, an individual; JASMINE WHITE, an individual; LAUREN BARNES, an individual; FREDDIE BARNES III, an individual; KAHLIL BARNES, an individual; JEREMIAH BARNES, an individual; BRIANNA BARNES, an individual; DEJUAN BARNES, an individual; AND ALL PERSONS UNKNOWN CLAIMING ANY EQUITABLE OR LEGAL RIGHT TO THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS COMPLAINT, WHICH IS ADVERSE TO THE PLAINTIFFS' TITLE OR ANY CLOUD UPON PLAINTIFF'S TITLE THERE TO YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you re-

spond 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 DÍAS 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 telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Public Notices

spond 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 DÍAS 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 telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

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

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

Public Notices

men de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechar el caso. This case affects the real property commonly known as 2936 Emerson Way, Altadena, California 91001 and more particularly described as "the North 40 feet of Lot 10, said distance being measured parallel with and along the West-erly line of said Lot, of Tract No. 7074, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 86 Page 9 of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County."

Este caso afecta a la propiedad inmobiliaria comúnmente conocida como 2936 Emerson Way, Altadena, California 91001 y más particularmente descrita como "los 40 pies al norte del lote 10, dicha distancia se mide paralela y a lo largo de la línea oeste de dicho lote, del tramo No. 7074, en el condado de Los Ángeles, estado de California, según el mapa registrado en el Libro 86 página 9 de Maps, en la oficina del Registrador del Condado de dicho Condado."

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es): Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 N. Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Jacqueline S. McGuinness, Esquire
Ervin Cohen & Jessup
9401 WILSHIRE BLVD., 12th Floor
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212
Phone: (310) 273-6323
Fax: (310) 888-3255
DATE (Fecha): August 7, 2023

Clerk (Secretario), by G. Robinson, Deputy for David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/ Clerk of the Court
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

FBN 20240002120
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

ARRAZOLA AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR 5512 ARROW HWY STE D 2 MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; JAVIER ARRAZOLA SANCHEZ

Business Mailing Address: 970 E MONTEREY AVENUE POMONA, CA 91767

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/ JAVIER ARRAZOLA SANCHEZ
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/04/2024

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 J6733

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 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

FBN 20240002099
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernar-

Public Notices

no County as
MARIACHI REAL ZACATECAS 9223 1/2 JUNIPER AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; AMIR TOLENTINO

Business Mailing Address: 9223 1/2 JUNIPER AVE FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MARCH 1, 2024.

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/ AMIR TOLENTINO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/01/2024

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 J7527

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 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

FBN 20240000544
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

REBIRTH WINES 6605 JASPER ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701; BEYOND WORLDS 6605 JASPER ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

Business Mailing Address: 6605 JASPER ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202359210013.

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/ GEORGE SAAD
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 1/19/2024

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 J4019

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 1, 8, 15 & 22, 2024.

FBN 20240000555
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

LA SIENNE 9881 6TH ST. STE. 201 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

Business Mailing Address: 9881 6TH ST. STE. 201 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number 5919951

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 1, 2024.

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

Public Notices

also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ SUZY WON, CFO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 1/19/2024

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 J4019

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 1, 8, 15 & 22, 2024.

FBN 20240001991
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

E&J INSURANCE SERVICES 762 CHANDLER WALK UPLAND, CA 91786; EFRAIN NAVA [and] JANET R NAVA

Business Mailing Address: 9881 6TH ST. STE. 201 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE.

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

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

/s/ EFRAIN NAVA, Partner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/29/2024

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 J2286

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 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

ACCOUNTING CITATION
Accounting Number 2021-358

SURROGATE'S COURT – CUYUGA COUNTY SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

By the Grace of God Free and Independent

TO Michael A. Ritchie, if living, but if dead, his distributees, legal representatives, assigns and all persons who by purchase, inheritance or otherwise have or claim to have an interest in the Estate of Angie Buonocore a/k/a Angelina Buonocore, whose last known address was in Highland, CA and whose current address is unknown to petitioner.

A petition and an account having been duly filed by Mary Jane R Wilkinson, whose address is 7449 Beach Road, Auburn, NY 13021,

YOU ARE HEREBY CITED TO SHOW CAUSE before the Surrogate's Court, Cayuga County, at Auburn at Auburn, New York, on April 26, 2024, at 1:30 o'clock in the noon of that day, why the account of Mary Jane R Wilkinson, a summary of which has been served herewith,

as Administrator of the estate of ANGIE BUONOCORE aka ANGELINA BUONOCORE should not be judicially settled.

HONORABLE JON F. RUDELMANN, Surrogate
Dated, Attested and Sealed
HALEY A. BROWN, Chief Clerk

Name of Attorney: Midey, Mirras & Ricci, LLP by Frank R Fisher, Esq Telephone Number:

Public Notices

315 568 5861
Address of Attorney: 54 Fall Street, PO Box 299, Seneca Falls, NY 13148

[Note: This citation is served upon you as required by law. You are not required to appear; however, if you fail to appear it will be assumed you do not object to the relief requested. You have a right to have an attorney appear for you, and you or your attorney may request a copy of the full account from the petitioner or petitioner's attorney.

ESTATE OF ANGIE BUONOCORE A/K/A ANGELINA BUONOCORE

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNT BY

MARY JANE R. WILKINSON, ADMINISTRATOR

CHARGES: Principal received \$123,214.66

Total Charges: \$123,214.66 CREDITS: Funeral and administration expenses \$ 31,395.33

Total Credits: \$ 31,395.33 Balance on Hand \$ 91,819.33

Plus balance in trust account + \$4.00 \$ 91,823.33

Less unpaid administrative expenses \$ 560.00 Balance on hand: \$ 91,263.33

The foregoing balance of \$91,263.33 consists of \$91,263.33 in cash and \$0 in other property on hand as of the 5th day of June, 2023. It is subject to deduction of estimated principal commissions amounting to \$5,928.58, estimated attorney fees amounting to \$5,928.58, and to the proper charge to principal of expenses of this accounting.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2024.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Sharon Goodman Case NO. PROVA2400066.

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Sharon Goodman A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Jennifer Moore in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE 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. Jennifer Moore 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. F3 at 09:00 AM on 04/22/2024 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third

Public Notices

Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Probate Division

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.

Jennifer Moore:
1441 Morton Circle Apt C
Claremont CA 91711
Telephone No: 9092841943
Published in the SBSCS
Ontario on: 03/14/2024,
03/21/2024, 03/28/2024

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Sharon Goodman Case NO. PROVA2400066.

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Sharon Goodman A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Jennifer Moore in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE 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., Jennifer Moore 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. F3 at 09:00 AM on 04/22/2024 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West Third

Public Notices

Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Probate Division

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.

Jennifer Moore:
1441 Morton Circle Apt C
Claremont CA 91711
Telephone No: 9092841943
Published in the SBSCS
Ontario on: 03/14/2024,
03/21/2024, 03/28/2024

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Miguel Gaucin Saucedo Case NO. PROVA2400207

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Miguel Gaucin Saucedo A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Rita Marie Saucedo-Almanza in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE 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., Rita Marie Saucedo-Almanza 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. F1 at 09:00 AM on 04/17/2024 at Superior Court of California, County of

Public Notices

Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Blvd. Fontana, CA 92335, Fontana District-Probate Division

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.

Pro Per:
Rita Marie Saucedo-Almanza
8115 Tapia Via Drive,
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Telephone No: 909-957-2532

Published in the SBSCS
Rancho Cucamonga on:
03/14/2024, 03/21/2024,
03/28/2024

FBN 20240001154
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as SION CONSTRUCTION 1245 W 28th Street SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405
Business Mailing Address: 1245 W 28th Street SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number 4180274.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: May 20, 2018.
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
/s/ EVERADO FRAUSTO-GUTIERREZ, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 2/06/2024
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 J6733
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 15, 22, 29 & April 5, 2024.

FBN 20240002531
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as R12 AUTOMOTIVE 1502 WEST D STREET ONTARIO, CA 91762: NEVELLE E PIERSON
Business Mailing Address: 1502 WEST D STREET 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: N/A.
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares

Public Notices

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/ NEVELLE E PIERSON
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/14/2024
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 K1583
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 15, 22, 29 & April 5, 2024.

FBN 20240002384
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
U-ROCK-U 300 S. MOUNTAIN AVE #1081 UPLAND, CA 91786: JOSEPH C ESTRADA
Business Mailing Address: 300 S. MOUNTAIN AVE #1081 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: FEBRUARY 25, 2024.

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

/s/ JOSEPH C ESTRADA
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/11/2024
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 D9865

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 15, 22, 29 & April 5, 2024.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: RAMIRO CORONA PEDRAZA CASE NO. PROVA2400237

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of RAMIRO CORONA PEDRAZA has been filed by LORRAINE PEDRAZA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that LORRAINE PEDRAZA be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests that the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held APRIL 15, 2024 at 9:00

Public Notices

a.m. at San Bernardino County Superior Court, Fontana District

Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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 LORRAINE PEDRAZA: JAMES LEE, ESQUIRE SBN: 110838
LAW OFFICE OF MARC E. GROSSMAN 100 N. EUCLID AVE, SECOND FLOOR Upland, CA 91786
jim@wefight4you.com
Telephone: (909) 608-7426
Fax: (909) 949 3077
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 22, 29 and April 5, 2024.

ACCOUNTING CITATION
Accounting Number 2021-358/A
S U R R O G A T E ' S COURT - CAYUGA COUNTY
SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
By the Grace of God Free and Independent
TO Michael A. Ritchie, if living, but if dead, his distributees, legal representatives, assigns and all persons who by purchase, inheritance or otherwise have or claim to have an interest in the Estate of Angie Buonocore a/k/a Angelina Buonocore, whose last known address was in Highland, CA and whose current address is unknown to petitioner.

A petition and an account having been duly filed by Mary Jane R Wilkinson, whose address is 7449 Beach Road, Auburn, NY 13021,
YOU ARE HEREBY CITED TO SHOW CAUSE before the Surrogate's Court, Cayuga County, at Auburn in Auburn, New York, on May 13th, 2024, at 9:30 o'clock in the fore of that day, why the account of Mary Jane R Wilkinson, a summary of which has been served herewith,

as Administrator of the estate of ANGIE BUONOCORE aka ANGELINA BUONOCORE should not be judicially settled.
HONORABLE JON E. BUDELMANN, Surrogate
Dated, Attested and Sealed March 18, 2024
HALEY A. BROWN, Chief Clerk
Name of Attorney: Midey, Mirras & Ricci, LLP by Frank

Public Notices

R Fisher, Esq Telephone Number: 315 568 5861

Address of Attorney: 54 Fall Street, PO Box 299, Seneca Falls, NY 13148

[Note: This citation is served upon you as required by law. You are not required to appear; however, if you fail to appear it will be assumed you do not object to the relief requested. You have a right to have an attorney appear for you, and you or your attorney may request a copy of the full account from the petitioner or petitioner's attorney.

ESTATE OF ANGIE BUONOCORE A/K/A ANGELINA BUONOCORE

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNT BY

MARY JANE R. WILKINSON, ADMINISTRATOR

CHARGES:
Principal received \$123,214.66

Total Charges: \$123,214.66
CREDITS:
Funeral and administration expenses \$ 31,395.33

Total Credits: \$ 31,395.33
Balance on Hand \$ 91,819.33

Plus balance in trust account + \$4.00
\$ 91,823.33

Less unpaid administrative expenses \$ 560.00
Balance on hand: \$ 91,263.33

The foregoing balance of \$91,263.33 consists of \$91,263.33 in cash and \$0 in other property on hand as of the 5th day of June, 2023. It is subject to deduction of estimated principal commissions amounting to \$5,928.58, estimated attorney fees amounting to \$5,928.58, and to the proper charge to principal of expenses of this accounting.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 22 & 29 and April 5 & 12, 2024.

FBN 20240002571
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

REVITALIZE BUSINESS SOLUTIONS 2603 HARBOUR TOWN TRL ONTARIO, CA 91761: LAURIE L PETRI

Business Mailing Address: 2603 HARBOUR TOWN TRL ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ LAURIE L PETRI, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/15/2024

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 J3256

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 22, 29 and April 5 & 12, 2024.

FBN 20240002572
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

BEST KEPT BOOKKEEPING SERVICES 2603 HARBOUR TOWN TRL ONTARIO, CA 91761: LAURIE L PETRI

Business Mailing Address: 2603 HARBOUR TOWN TRL ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious

Public Notices

business name or names listed above on: January 1, 2024.

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/ LAURIE L PETRI, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/15/2024

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 J3256

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 22, 29 and April 5 & 12, 2024.

FBN 20240002561
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

DEL MAR SOCIAL SERVICES RESOURCES 7380 CORRESPONDENCE PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: TRACI M MARTINEZ

Business Mailing Address: 7380 CORRESPONDENCE PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 13, 2024.

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/ TRACI M MARTINEZ, Director
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/15/2024

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 J9784

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 22, 29 and April 5 & 12, 2024.

FBN 20240002532
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

ODDBALL ARTWORKS 7512 ALTA CUESTA DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: ELIZABETH AL GALANG

Business Mailing Address: 7512 ALTA CUESTA DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ ELIZABETH AL GALANG
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/14/2024

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 D9865

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 22, 29 and April 5 & 12, 2024.

Public Notices

listed above on: JAN 01, 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/ FRANCISCO M. OROZCO, CFO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 11, 2024 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 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI120240MANUEL

FBN 20240002364 The following person is doing business as: SUNFLOWER CLEANING SERVICE. 294 LOMA VERDE COLTON, CA 92324; MAILING ADDRESS 294 LOMA VERDE COLTON, CA 92324; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GRACIELA N. DESIA N/A. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: FEB 20, 2019 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/ GRACIELA N. DESIA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 11, 2024 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 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI1202421MT

FBN 20240002316 The following person is doing business as: CORN & CANE. 6218 HELLMAN AVE ALTA LOMA, CA 91701; MAILING ADDRESS 6218 HELLMAN AVE ALTA LOMA, CA 91701; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ARTURO RAVAGO ; ERIC KORVER ; MARTHA KORVER . The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ARTURO RAVAGO, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 08, 2024 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Public Notices

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI1202422MT

FBN 20240002254 The following person is doing business as: DING TEA RIALTO. 1133 W CASMALIA ST STE 2 RIALTO, CA 92377; MAILING ADDRESS 1133 W CASMALIA ST STE 2 RIALTO, CA 92377; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO HAPPY JK LLC 1133 W CASMALIA ST 102 RIALTO, CA 92377 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202358811065 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 07, 2024 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JOHN TRANG, MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 07, 2024 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 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI1202423MT

FBN 20240002236 The following person is doing business as: LUX STUDIOS. 1822 E ELMA COURT ONTARIO, CA 91764; MAILING ADDRESS 1822 E ELMA COURT ONTARIO, CA 91764; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUX HOLDINGS, LLC 1822 E ELMA COURT ONTARIO, CA 91764 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202357610445 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: JAN 17, 2024 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/ KATLYN LAMB, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 07, 2024 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 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI1202404MT

Public Notices

mon law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/15/2024, 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024 CNBBI1202424MT

FBN 20240002078 The following person is doing business as: ATMYFRIENDSHOUSE; ANGEL WINGSUAS. 4195 CHINO HILLS PARWAY #1199 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709; MAILING ADDRESS 14947 CHELSEA AVE CHINO HILLS, CA 91709; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JEVITA R WEBSTER 4195 CHINO HILLS PARKWAY #1199 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709. 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/ JEVITA R WEBSTER, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 01, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202401MT

FBN 20240002602 The following person is doing business as: PROSPERITY LEASING SOLUTIONS. 9161 SIERRA AVE SUITE 203-B FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 9161 SIERRA AVE SUITE 203-B FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO J&F INNOVATIONS GROUP INC 9161 SIERRA AVE SUITE 203-B FONTANA, CA 92335 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 3429001 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/ FAVIOLA NIEVES, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 15, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202402MT

FBN 20240002617 The following person is doing business as: DL DENTAL CERAMICS. 164 W HOSPITALITY LN STE 14A SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DAMON D LE 164 W HOSPITALITY LN STE 14A SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: MAMI SKIN LAB 28. 14298 ST ANDREWS DR SUITE #7 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395; MAILING ADDRESS 14298 ST ANDREWS DR SUITE #7 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LILIAN A VILLEDA MURILLO 14298 ANDREWS DR SUITE #7 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395. 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/ LILIAN A VILLEDA MURILLO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 13, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202403MT

FBN 20240002462 The following person is doing business as: BOBA KORNER. 15567 SHARON CT FONTANA, CA 92336 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO BOBA KORNER LLC 15567 SHARON CT FONTANA, CA 92336 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202358517211 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DAVID SORENSEN, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 13, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202404MT

FBN 20240002617 The following person is doing business as: DL DENTAL CERAMICS. 164 W HOSPITALITY LN STE 14A SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DAMON D LE 164 W HOSPITALITY LN STE 14A SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408. 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/ DAMON D LE, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 15, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202405MT

FBN 20240002818 The following person is doing business as: GET FRESH BARBER SHOP. 264 W BASELINE RD. RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS 12329 IMPERIAL HWY NORWALK, CA 90650; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ALL STARS BARBERSHOP NORWALK 12329 IMPERIAL HWY NORWALK, CA 90650 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4600649 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/ VERONICA SANDOVAL, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 21, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202406SD

FBN 20240002553 The following person is doing business as: DINGLI YAO DBA VCA AUTO GROUP. 16004 CONDOR AVE CHINO, CA 91708; MAILING ADDRESS 16004 CONDOR AVE CHINO, CA 91708; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DINGLI YAO 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/ DINGLI YAO, OWNER

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 14, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202407MT

FBN 20240002640 The following person is doing business as: DONUT MAKER #5. 393 W HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; MAILING ADDRESS 393 W HIGHLAND AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TOSSNIPHEAP POK 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/ TOSSNIPHEAP POK, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 18, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202408MT

FBN 20240002813 The following person is doing business as: WATERMAN PRINT CO. 999 N WATERMAN AVE STE A23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; MAILING ADDRESS 999 N WATERMAN AVE STE A23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO J'S HOBBY SHOP INC 999 N WATERMAN AVE STE B18 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 5321257 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/ JAMALL A. THOMAS, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 21, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202411IR

Public Notices

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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202409MT

FBN 20240002736 The following person is doing business as: ANGI RESIDENTIAL SERVICES. 1127 WHISPERING FOREST DR BIG BEAR CITY, CA 92314; MAILING ADDRESS PO BOX 1561 BIG BEAR CITY, CA 92314; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ANGELA L CATUNA N/A. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: FEB 28, 2019 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/ ANGELA L CATUNA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 20, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202410MT

FBN 20240002650 The following person is doing business as: BLISS SHOES 1 MILLS CIRCLE SUITE 800 ONTARIO, CA 91764; MAILING ADDRESS 1 MILLS CIRCLE SUITE 800 ONTARIO, CA 91764; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SHARLYN LU The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 16, 2020 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/ SHARLYN LU, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 18, 2024 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 03/22/2024, 03/29/2024, 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024 CNBBI2202411IR

Yucaipa Wine Country Project Given Go-Ahead from page 4

only if the decision-making board for the agency overseeing the development that is to take place makes a finding of overriding consideration to allow the project to proceed.

In this way, city staff prepared a declaration of overriding consideration

for the Yucaipa City Council relating to the Wine Country Specific Plan.

According to Yucaipa city staff, "The California Environmental Quality Act requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when

determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'" Thus, if the city council believes the benefits of the project will outweigh its drawbacks, it has the option of allowing it to

proceed. With City Manager Chris Mann, City Attorney Steven Graham, Director of Development Services Fermin Preciado, Deputy Director of Community Development/City Planner Benjamin Matlock as well as one of the city's consultants, Justin Wallin along with the city's environmental consultant, JoAnn Hadfield, recommending that the city

proceed with the approval of the specific plan, a majority of the city council concluded the proposed project "would support the Yucaipa Valley Wine Alliance's American Vitacultural Association petition to designate the Yucaipa Valley as a federally recognized wine region by providing a framework for future viticulture development."

Furthermore, the council majority made a finding that the "proposed project would promote financial feasibility and promote economic development through the tax revenue and jobs generated by the winery and viticultural components, and through the residential component which would create additional housing options for existing and new residents to support lo-

Continued on Page 12

Holmes Looted Shangri La So Entirely, The Completion Of The Redlands & SB Projects Is A Tribute To The Perseverance Of Local Officials *from page 5*

transactions" that Holmes and Witt engaged in from July 2022 to October 2023 by which \$7.3 million in company funds went into accounts the then-couple separately controlled. According to Shangri-La, Holmes was able to make use of Shangri-La's company's payment processing software to steer payments into accounts he controlled. Holmes forged Meyers' signature on at least four occasions, according to the company. Holmes was able to elude detection by preventing the company's controller from having access to the bank accounts he was pilfering from. Holmes was also able to have certain information bypass Meyers through a stratagem in which he created a company email account for Meyer which

only Holmes had access to. Additionally, Holmes created more than one phone line for Meyers, which terminated with a phone in Holmes possession and control. In addition, Holmes managed to receive mail delivered by the U.S. Postal Service to the company headquarters addressed to Meyers, which he screened before removing certain items and delivering the remainder to Meyers.

According to Shangri-La's attorney, Brian A. Sun, the "mismanagement, lies and outright theft," Holmes engaged in "plunge[d] Shangri-La into financial chaos" and thereby doing the company "tremendous reputational damage."

Holmes' actions were a direct and proximate cause of the company defaulting on its loans

relating to the Homekey properties, which triggered the companies unintentional violation of its contracts with the state.

Holmes oversaw Shangri-La's loans and its grants from state and federal agencies, including the Project Homekey funding, according to the lawsuit states. Under the terms of the Homekey grants, Shangri-La was prohibited from taking out loans on the properties intended to house the homeless, the intention being that the grants would cover the purchase and renovation of the hotels/motels in question, allowing the shelter programs to function for three to four years before having to be replenished through some other form of funding.

In defiance of the regulations attending the provision of the grants, Holmes, in the guise of Shangri-La, borrowed tens of millions of dol-

lars against its Homekey properties, ultimately going into default and then foreclosure on those loans. The state is seeking to stop foreclosure auctions and obtain court orders consigning the properties to use as affordable housing.

The lawsuit maintains Holmes did not disclose to Meyers or other Shangri-La corporate officers when payments on those loans ceased. In the case of one of the properties in Salinas, according to the suit, Holmes forged Meyers' signature on documents to refinance a \$9.7 million loan thereon.

The lawsuit delineates action that Holmes was taking right up until the time that the state filed suit against all of the defendants in which he was securing loans against the properties, without the knowledge of any of the defendants. On January 2, according to the suit, Holmes phoned

up a letter to the California Department of Social Services purported to be from an employee of a lender that showed Shangri-La was yet "in good standing." In actuality, the lender referenced was a fictional company, and the letter was a forged signature of an employee with a different bank.

Sun has petitioned the court for a restraining order against both Holmes and Witt to prevent them from removing money from eight accounts controlled by Holmes and one controlled by Witt into which they over the last three to four years have diverted Shangri-La money.

Sun said that Shangri-La has "significant concerns" Holmes is "dissipating the assets he absconded with, that being the money he stole and is converting. He's liquidating those assets, turning them to cash, and then possibly mov-

ing them offshore and moving them in a way that would not be reachable to his creditors."

The suit calls for both Holmes and Witt to be assessed damages greater than \$20 million for their embezzlements and another \$20 million in damages due to the financial exposure to third parties and lost business income.

Efforts by the Sentinel to learn from the California Attorney General's Office and the California Department of Housing and Community Development whether it is now prepared to drop the lawsuit against the City of Redlands, the County of San Bernardino and the other defendants pursuant to verification of the facts asserted in the lawsuit filed by Shangri-La against Holmes and Witt, provoked no response.

Yucaipa Council Ignores Concerns Of A Compromised Land Use Process To Pass The Wine County Specific Plan 4-to-1 *from page 11*

cal businesses" and that "the proposed project's development of a wine industry would expand the city's tourism indus-

try and encourage the development of winery-related accessory uses, further promoting economic activity in the city." This extended to the council majority's belief that the "proposed project would create a regional draw for the city with the potential to host wine festivals, wine tasting events, harvest festivals, weddings, and corporate events, there-

by singling [out] Yucaipa as a premiere destination for wine lovers in the region and state."

In recent weeks, the Yucaipa City Council, has been dogged by reports that federal authorities have interested themselves in the way in which they have empowered City Manager Mann, who formerly and perhaps currently served as an advocate for the

building industry, to promote development projects calling for extensive upgradings in both density and intensity of use over what is permitted in the city's zoning codes and growth regulations. In the face of citizen concern that the city's land use processes have been compromised, a majority of the council concluded that the conditions of approval it imposed on

the Wine County Specific Plan balanced the project's benefits against its significant unavoidable impacts. The city council majority determined that the proposed project's benefits will outweigh its significant unavoidable impacts. The city council, accordingly, issued a statement of overriding consideration with regard to the specific plan. That state-

ment of overriding consideration was capped with a 4-to-1 council vote in which Mayor Justin Beaver, Councilman Bobby Duncan, Councilman Ennis Venable and Councilman Matt Garner prevailed over dissenting Councilman Jon Thorp accepted the Wine Country Specific Plan.

State Action Meant To Boost Pay Is Resulting In Fast-Food Workers Losing Their Jobs *from page 6*

custodial chores. Moreover, many companies, such as McDonalds and Taco Bell now discourage customers from ordering from manned operation counters and have instead vectored them to electronic kiosks where the orders are taken without any need for human interaction, further eliminating the need for employees. Virtually all fast-food operations have sought to automate certain jobs formerly carried out by human workers to some degree.

With fast-food opera-

tions having now been efficientized to offset the rise in the minimum wage to \$16 per hour, the prospect of now having to pay workers \$20 per hour at a minimum is threatening to undo fast-food kitchens in California entirely.

The sole remaining remedy beyond further drastic employee cuts, which may prove to be no remedy at all, is to increase menu prices. Doing that, however, is likely to result in a loss of revenues, which could threaten the continuation of the operations in question as going concerns.

Accordingly, the Sentinel has learned, McDonald's, Popeyes, Jack in the Box, Del Taco and In-N-Out locations in San Bernardino County

have initiated layoffs, with indications they will continue and extend to Burger King, Wendy's and Taco Bell by next week.

In pushing for the passage of the Fast-Food Act, many fast-food workers and their family members had held public demonstrations in which they carried placards, pickets and signs emblazoned "Stand With Fast Food Families Pass AB 257."

Symbolically, Governor Gavin Newsom had signed Assembly Bill 257 on Labor Day 2022, stating at the time that it would raise the minimum wage for franchise restaurant workers as high as \$22 by the following year. That goal was not achieved,

but the Fast Recovery Act created a council of workers, corporate representatives, franchisees and state officials with a mandate to set minimum industry standards on wages, working hours and other conditions for fast-food workers statewide. The council, which was weighted in favor of labor rather than franchise holders or corporations, was at liberty to increase wages or keep them the same. Since that commission has come into existence, the minimum wage for fast-food workers has increased from the \$11 per hour it was on December 31, 2022 by more than 45.45 percent to \$16 per hour today and will undergo another 25 percent bump to \$20 next week.

The intent on the part of Holden, Carrillo, Low and Rivas was to bolster the power of workers who had no real recourse for rampant wage theft, poor pay and poor or unsafe conditions in the workplace. Now, however, with franchises and corporations firing and laying off employees they can no longer afford, many of the former placard-carrying workers and their family members are cursing Holden, Carrillo, Low and Rivas as they find themselves or their breadwinners out of work.

Efforts by the National Franchise Association and the National Restaurant Association in the aftermath of the passage of Assembly Bill 257 to prevent the commis-

sion from getting carried away with what its labor-representing members considered to be reforms were less than successful.

At this point, both fast-food restaurant owners and many of those who remain as employees at those establishments are hoping the commission, which has the virtually unchecked authority to raise the minimum hourly wage for fast-food workers or not raise the hourly rate as it collectively sees fit, will choose to take a more moderate approach going forward.

The FAST Act is applicable to employees with fast-food restaurants featuring at least 100 locations nationally.