

San Bernardino Mayor & City Council Terminate City Manager Montoya

By Mark Gutglueck

The San Bernardino City Council voted on Wednesday evening to terminate City Manager Charles Montoya, more than six months after his October 2023 hiring. The vote to do so was made unanimously, citing no cause for the action. Pursuant to Section 11.7 of his employment contract, his termination without cause entitles Montoya to collect a specified severance



Charles Montoya

equivalent to 12 months of his base salary, or \$325,000.

Montoya's sacking comes less than four months after he unilaterally signed a letter of intent with the San Francisco-based bond underwriting firm Stifel Financial Services in preparation of the issuance of some \$120 million in municipal bonds to be utilized for various improvement and infrastructure projects in the city, including the seismic retrofitting of City Hall, which has been

shuttered since 2017.

Previously employed as the city manager of Watsonville in California and the town manager of Florence, Arizona, as the city manager of Avondale, Arizona, the finance director and treasurer with the Town of Castle Rock in Colorado, and the chief financial officer for both Centennial, Colorado and for Jefferson County, Colorado, Montoya was hired in October after

a city manager recruitment effort in the spring and summer of 2023 that attracted 57 applicants. That headhunting effort was marred by multiple glitches, including some shifting attitudes with regard to ending the recruitment altogether and settling on hiring the interim city manager who had managed the city previously, Charles McNeely. McNeely's early sentiment against taking the permanent

See P 2

Clemmer In As Victorville's Fire Chief

City leaders are hopeful that Bobby Clemmer, who was just selected as the Victorville Fire Department's eighth fire chief since 2017 and seventh since its 2019 resurrection as a municipal entity, will give the department some permanency in terms of its leadership.

Officials believe Clemmer, who grew up in the High Desert and is an Apple Valley High School graduate, will prove a good manager of fire safety and emergency medical response operations in Victorville.

Some are saying that the department, once considered the premier fire prevention agency in the Victor Valley, was cursed by the move more than a decade-and-a-half ago to dissolve it, despite the department's revival five years ago.

Victorville, which in 1962 was the third of San Bernardino County desert cities to incorporate following the 1913 creation of Needles and the 1947 founding of Barstow as municipal entities, at that time was indirectly dependent upon the county fire department, which provided supervision of the team of volunteer on-call firefighters that composed the newly-formed city's fire department, which had existed pre-incorporation in one form or another since 1926. In 1976, the city recruited Rudy Cabriales, a one-time border patrol agent with the Immigration and Naturalization Service who had transitioned to a career as a firefighter in his hometown of Calexico before rising to become the fire chief of Coachella in Riverside County, to relocate to Victorville

See P 2

Citing First Amendment Grounds

Lawyer Questions Constitutionality Of Fontana's Political Sign Ordinance

The City of Fontana has passed an ordinance imposing a monetary burden on political candidates of dubious constitutionality which will have the practical effect of benefiting the city's well-fixed incumbent officeholders and disadvantaging those seeking to unseat them, some of the city's residents and a civil rights/free speech

lawyer have opined.

Going forward, those running for elective office, either in Fontana or for local, county, statewide or national office, will need to lay out a potentially refundable \$1,000 deposit if they plan to display campaign signs within Fontana's current 42.4-square mile city limits.

According to the reso-

lution the city council approved on May 14 in putting the ordinance in place, the city is merely "implementing a campaign sign deposit," which "has been identified as a measure to ensure accountability among candidates and reimburses the city for costs associated with removing non-compliant campaign signs."

In the run-up toward the passage of the ordinance, according to the city, all legal requirements for previewing and the regulation and enforcement of the policy was met when "the city council called a public hearing for March 26, 2024, for informational purposes and to receive public comments on the proposed fees. Notice of

the public hearing was given by publication in a newspaper of general circulation within the city."

According to the resolution, the fee is being imposed "for a specific government service provided directly to the payor, or for reasonable regulatory costs of the city for issuing licenses

See P 3

Why We Petitioned Fish & Wildlife To Protect Strawberry Creek

By Steve Loe

In September 2013 alarmed retired Forest Service employees (Gary Earney and myself), who had worked for the San Bernardino National Forest for over 50 years combined, raised a concern about the taking of so much water from Strawberry Creek, at an elevation above 5,000 feet in the

San Bernardino Mountains, during the most severe drought in over 300 years. Nestlé was diverting all of the natural spring flow from the most productive springs in the watershed under a long-expired special use permit with few protective measures.

Nestlé was using that water for its Arrowhead Spring Water

See P 3

18-Year-Old Garcia Arraigned In Murder Of 29 Palms Marine Gunnery Sergeant McDonald, 35

18-year-old Rudy Garcia, Jr. has entered not guilty pleas to murder, attempted carjacking, attempted robbery, two attempted murder and two assault with a semi-automatic firearm charges stemming from the violent rampage he engaged in on Monday night, May 20 in Twentynine Palms, which left Robert McDonald, a

Marine, dead.

McDonald was shot in the culmination of a flurry of acts that took place just after sunset that evening.

According to the sheriff's department, Garcia was one of a group of four or five young men who were consuming alcohol and creating a disturbance in the vicinity of Alpine Road and

Old Dale Road. Around 7:49 p.m., they belligerently confronted a resident, at which point the man testily responded, provoking Garcia, who produced a gun and fired several shots at the man but missed.

After the gunfire, the group scattered, with most of the others heading north and west and Garcia running

See P 8

Intimidating Father A Way Out Of Prosecutorial Dead End In Villaseñor Case?

After cataloging through a multitude of alternative approaches, including a few that skirt ethical boundaries that are as problematic as promising, San Bernardino County prosecutors have at last, it appears, constructed a face-saving solution to the prospect that their case against Sebastian Bailey Villaseñor would

evaporate into oblivion.

Villaseñor, 18 of Eastvale, was a senior at Ontario Christian High School when he was arrested on February 10 on suspicion of having violated PC 422(A) – engaging in threats of violence.

The arrest came after Villaseñor's sister, Isabella Villaseñor, who also attended Ontario

Christian, on February 8 spoke with one of the school's counselors, Mitch Stutz, about an exchange she had that morning with her brother in the school parking lot. When the subject of another student who attended the school came up, Isabella said, Sebastian expressed irritation, characterizing the coed as being haughty

and dismissive of his advances, clenching his fist as he did so, and then told his sister not to talk about the other girl.

When Isabella told Stutz about what had happened, she expressed concern over what her brother might do. She added that she knew her brother had access to their father's firearms and that over the

Christmas break she had seen Sebastian posing with some of their father's rifles in selfies he was taking. When Isabella further stated that her brother obsessively watched videos relating to school shootings available on the internet, Stutz consulted with Ontario Christian High School Principal Benjamin Dykhous.

See P 4

Upon Becoming City Manager, Montoya Sought To Impress The Council With His Can-Do Attitude And By Aggressive, Unilateral Action *from front page*

position, followed by his change of heart to wanting to step out of retirement to again take on the top administrative role in the city he left in 2012, along with the commitment the council had made to not hire the interim city manager into the full-time post thwarted his belated candidacy.

An effort by Mayor Helen Tran to have the council accede to hiring her one-time boss when she had been the human resources director in West Covina, former West Covina City Manager David Carmany, for a time interrupted the city manager hiring process. The council as early as July seemed to have reached a consensus to hire Stockton City Manager Harry Black, but a lack of security with regard to the information entrusted to the firm the

city hired to carry out the recruitment, Berkeley-based Koff & Associates, led to Black being identified as an applicant for the San Bernardino post, prompting him to withdraw from consideration.

In August 2023, the recruitment effort at last seemed to have evolved into a consensus that the best the city could do was to hire Salinas City Manager Steve Carrigan, with the mayor and four of the council strongly favoring him and one councilman willing to go along, while two council members believed the city should redouble its efforts to find a more satisfactory candidate. The council was scheduled to finalize the decision to hire Carrigan, but once again, Koff & Associates was unable to maintain confidentiality around the identity of the leading candidate. For reasons that are yet unclear, the city postponed the official hiring of Carrigan, who remained twisting in the wind between the end of August and his scheduled official hiring on October 4. In that temporal gap, his application for the San

Bernardino job became known to his political masters on the city council in Salinas, at which point Carrigan lost his nerve and withdrew as a candidate in San Bernardino.

Thus, Montoya was chosen not as the first or even second or third choice but rather as someone elevated up the list when others did not take the assignment they had applied for. It is unclear how many other candidates who had applied for the job were offered the post prior to the city council finally consenting to Montoya's hiring in October.

When he arrived in November, Montoya set about impressing the city council with his can-do attitude and energetic approach, seeking to address longstanding issues that he said had been festering because of bureaucratic and political malaise and procrastination. He set about having staff analyze problems and challenges the city faced, often initiating preliminary action or laying groundwork for decisive moves to be taken in an effort to demonstrate his abil-

ity to engage in the four principles of management: planning, organizing, directing and controlling. This approach was appreciated by some members of the council, who felt decisive action with regard to certain problems was called for. It was further appreciated that Montoya was not adhering to the direction of one dominant member of the city's decisionmakers, such as had been the case with former City Manager Bob Field and former Mayor John Valdivia. There was also some confidence that with his financial expertise, Montoya was providing sound guidance while overseeing a city that had declared bankruptcy in 2012 and had not exited from that status until 2017.

Nevertheless, in much of his approach, Montoya was presuming upon the acceptance of his action being done in good faith and that the mayor and both the individual council members and the council as a whole would view his taking action without their explicit consent, based upon his own independent judgment, as

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

not only justifiable but not being disrespectful of their authority. Very early on, this approach created a schism on the council, with Councilwoman Kimberly Calvin and Councilman Ben Reynoso in particular believing that Montoya was overstepping his authority.

Montoya appeared to be safe in the niche he had created for himself, since there was a growing and intensifying estrangement between Calvin and the rest of the council. As Montoya, too, was on the outs with Calvin, he and the council majority, pri-

marily Councilman Ted Sanchez, Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra, Councilman Juan Figueroa and Councilman Fred Shorette, along with Mayor Tran, generally hewed to one side, while Calvin increasingly found herself isolated or with the support, on-again and off-again, of Councilman Reynoso and Councilman Damon Alexander. It thus appeared that Montoya had carved out for himself a safe haven within the administrative quarters of City Hall, which had relocated from the actual City Hall to offices within the

Continued on Page 5

Clemmer Victorville's Seventh Fire Chief In Five Years *from front page*

and become fire chief of an operation morphing from being a county-supervised team of volunteers to a professional department. Cabriales built that organization into what some considered to be a model fire protection agency. He retired after 21 years as fire chief in 1997.

In 2000, Cabriales was elected to the city council.

In 2004, the Hesperia City Council in a highly controversial move closed out its municipal fire department and contracted with the county fire department for fire safety service. Some four years later, in May 2008, despite Cabriales' resistance, the Victorville City Council by a 3-to-2 vote, mimicked

Hesperia and dissolved the Victorville Fire Department in favor of contracting with the county fire protection division as of July 1, 2008.

A decade later, with the ten-year contract with the county for fire service about to expire, its city council sought to reassert Victorville, which at that point stood as the county's fifth most populous municipality and its largest geographically, as a full-service city. Though the arrangement with the county was extended for eight months, in March 2019 the Victorville Fire Department was reestablished.

Initially, the city continued to employ Greg Benson, who had been hired to serve as Victorville's fire chief in April 2018, while the department was yet a division of the county. He was replaced in August 2020 by an interim chief, John Becker, who

had been the fire chief at the time the city voted to dissolve the department in 2008 in favor of the contract with the county. Becker stayed in place just six months, from August 2020 until February 2021. He was replaced in March 2021 by Jeff Armstrong, who was offered and accepted the assignment as fire chief. Armstrong remained in place for 14 months, departing in May 2022. He was replaced by Battalion Chief Brian Fallon, who had formerly been with the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Department for 16 years, and had been hired by the Victorville Fire Department in September 2021. The ambitious and upwardly mobile Fallon did not stay long, however. When he was offered the position of chief of the Lompoc City Fire Department, Fallon moved onto that position in January 2023. In December 2022, Wil-

liam "Willie" Racowschi, began serving as interim chief, remaining until April 2023, shortly after the city had arranged in March 2023 to hire David Foster, the onetime fire chief in with the Dekalb County Fire Department in Georgia and the Village Fire Department in the greater Houston, Texas metropolitan area, to serve as fire chief. Foster, however, bailed on the job as the department's acting chief after just two months. Deputy Chief Clemmer for a week took command of the agency, which then double-clutched to reestablish Racowschi as fire chief.

With Racowschi's departure, Clemmer is now leading the department.

Clemmer began as a paid call firefighter in Barstow in 2002. He simultaneously worked toward obtaining a degree in a discipline re-

lated to firefighting, which ultimately culminated in his bachelor's degree in fire science from Columbia Southern University.

After four years as a paid-call firefighter, he was hired as a full-time firefighter/paramedic in Barstow in 2006, promoting to engineer and then fire captain.

In 2017, Clemmer left Barstow to take a position as captain with the Apple Valley Fire Protection District. He remained in that position until February 2023, at which point Victorville offered him and he accepted the post of training battalion chief, then immediately moved into the role of interim deputy chief of operations, with the temporary one-week uprating of assignment to interim chief in June. In November 2023, with nearly eight months' experience as interim deputy chief of operations, Clemmer

was promoted to the actual position of deputy chief of operations. It appears that Racowschi, who was looking toward retirement, had settled on Clemmer as his successor as fire chief.

Clemmer attended the National Fire Academy in 2020 and 2021, studying under its managing officer program. He is certified as a paramedic, worked as a 9-1-1 dispatcher with Desert Comm, is a registered state fire training instructor and has served as an adjunct instructor with Victor Valley College.

"Bobby had the chance to mentor under an amazing leader in Chief Racowschi, and he's learned the organizational culture," said Victorville City Manager Keith C. Metzler. "He is going to be a great fit for the Victorville Fire Department."

-Mark Gutglueck

Letter To The Editor

It's been a pleasure to serve my community in San Bernardino as an independent pharmacist for nearly a decade. I grew up in this area and made the decision to work for an independent pharmacy over a larger chain because of the strong ties I felt with this community and because it allows me to relate more personally to our patients.

Since starting at ArrowCare Pharmacy nine years ago, I've seen firsthand the increasingly negative impact that pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) have on patients. Pharmacy benefit managers' business practices reduce patients' access while

forcing costs and out-of-pocket expenses even higher. Congress needs to address these harmful PBM policies before things get any worse.

Pharmacy benefit managers will often secure significant discounts or rebates on prescriptions directly from drug manufacturers. These savings could and should be passed down to patients at the pharmacy to help reduce their out-of-pocket expenses and make their prescriptions more accessible. However, it's far more likely that pharmacy benefit managers will simply absorb these savings. Pharmacy benefit manager practices are truly a shame – as

they pull out all the stops to exploit the good parts of our healthcare system, whether it's rebates or the 340B program.

The 340B Drug Pricing Program is a U.S. federal government program that requires drug manufacturers to provide outpatient drugs to eligible health care organizations and covered entities at significantly reduced prices. The intent of the program is to allow covered entities to stretch scarce federal resources as far as possible, reaching more eligible patients and providing more comprehensive services.

To curb predatory pharmacy benefit manager practices, Congress

must pass pharmacy benefit manager reform legislation like the Delinking Revenue from Unfair Gouging (DRUG) Act, which would increase transparency and accountability among pharmacy benefit managers. California's leaders in Washington, D.C. should help push for passage of the Delinking Revenue from Unfair Gouging Act in this Congress. Many patients cannot afford another year of waiting for their lawmakers to act.

Denise Diaz
San Bernardino, CA
92494

As The Dominant Officeholders In Fontana, Mayor Warren & Her Allies, Roberts, Cothran and Garcia See Charging Their Challengers To Post Campaign Signs As A Refinement Of the City's Political Process *from front page*

and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and administrative enforcement of the city's municipal code or other rules or ordinances" and the fee is "no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity for which the fee is imposed" and the "manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activ-

ity for which the fee is imposed."

According to the resolution, the ordinance became effective as of the vote to pass it on May 14, 2024. "All candidates running for local office in the city shall be required to submit a campaign sign deposit... set at \$1,000.00, payable to the City of Fontana for deposit into the general fund of the city or into such special funds as may be otherwise required by law," it states. The text of the resolu-

tion provides that the fee "must be submitted no later than the close of the nomination period in accordance with Elections Code section 10220."

Generally speaking, the nomination period – the roughly two-week period for submitting papers to run for city council or other offices such as mayor, treasurer or city clerk up for election in November – runs from early- to mid-July.

According to the resolution "the city council is committed to promoting fair, transparent, and orderly local elections."

That is not how many of Fontana's residents and other political observers see it.

Fontana Mayor Aquanetta Warren has held office in Fontana

for 22 years, since she was appointed to the city council in 2002. She was elected to the council in her own right, as an incumbent, in 2004 and again in 2008. In 2010, she ran successfully for mayor. She was reelected in 2014, 2018 and 2022. A Republican, indeed as San Bernardino County's premier African American Republican, she has been able to establish an overpowering political machine in Fontana. Early on in her political tenure, she established an alliance with Fontana City Councilman John Roberts, another Republican first elected to the council in 1992, a decade before Warren joined it. He was reelected in 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2010,

2014, 2018 and 2022. Warren and Roberts are now, and were previously, joined on the five-member council by two other Republicans. Currently, those two Republicans are Councilman Phil Cothran, Jr. and Pete Garcia. The single Democrat on the council is Councilman Jesse Sandoval. With her ruling coalition possessing a 4-to-1 lock on council, Warren has bestridden Fontana like a political colossus for nearly a decade-and-a-half.

The Republicans Warren, Roberts, Cothran and Garcia have maintained their upper hand on the council in Fontana despite the consideration that Democrats outnumber Republicans by a significant

margin in the city. At present, of the 114,104 voters in Fontana, 55,020 or 48.22 percent are registered as Democrats, while 25,155 or 22.05 percent are registered as Republicans. Those Fontana voters with no party preference are virtually equal or slightly less than the number of Republicans – 25,099 or 22 percent. The remaining 7.73 percent of the voters in Fontana are members of the American Independent, Green, Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or other more obscure political parties. That the four Republicans on the council are able to hold their positions despite being at this lopsided partisan disadvantage is a testament to the offsetting

Nestlé's H₂O Diversion For Its Arrowhead Spring Water Bottling Operation Was Severely Impacting The Ecology Of Strawberry Canyon *from front page*

bottling operation.

The public was being forced to ration water during this drought, while Nestlé was tak-

ing every drop from the springs that shared some of the same groundwater as the mountain communities of Crestline, Lake Gregory and Lake Arrowhead. Flows downstream to the San Bernardino Valley and Bunker Hill Basin for domestic use were being reduced by Nestlé while the Valley residents were rationing water.

Many threatened, endangered and sensitive Forest Service species

are currently and were previously located in the Strawberry Creek drainage and are dependent on year-round water. The habitat for these species, including the southern rubber boa, the least Bell's vireo, the southwestern willow flycatcher, the mountain yellow-legged frog, and the California spotted owl has been significantly degraded by Nestlé, its corporate predecessors and its corporate

successor, BlueTriton, for over 90 years. Imperiled native fish species have been wiped out in large part due to removal of such large amounts of water in the summer months. Strawberry Creek was home to the Santa Ana speckled dace and likely the Santa Ana Sucker and the Arroyo Chub. Speckled dace were eliminated from the stream in 2003 in large part from spring water removal and lack

of summer flows, after being there for thousands of years. Other more common species such as deer, bear, songbirds, rare plants and insects have been adversely affected by the spring and stream diversion.

Drying the vegetation below the communities by taking all the water from the upper watershed is increasing the fire threat to the communities.

Earney and I asked

the Forest Service and Nestlé to meet and consider releasing some water into the stream until the drought subsided, but they both refused to take any action. The Forest Service would not meet to discuss the issue. Nestlé refused to meet with Gary Earney because it said he had not been good to them when he was in charge of administering the permit. Nestlé officials met with

Continued on Page 7

After Demonizing Villaseñor As A Would-Be Murderer Intent On Slaughtering Other Ontario Christian High School Students, Police & Prosecutors Were Unable To Identify Any Physical Acts He Took To Achieve That End *from front page*

Dykhouse and Stutz contacted the Ontario Police Department, and detectives obtained a warrant to examine Sebastian Villaseñor's online and social media activity.

By February 10, the investigators assembled an arrest warrant for Sebastian on the grounds that he had "engaged in threats of violence" along with further warrants to search the Villaseñor premises in Eastvale. In serving that search warrant, detectives and officers turned up three handguns, seven rifles, a shotgun and more than 1,000 rounds of ammunition owned by Villaseñor's father, Jose Ramiro Villaseñor.

Upon gaining access to a computer at the Villaseñor residence and the teen's communication devices, detectives accumulated a more substantial array of Sebastian Villaseñor's expressions of adolescent angst, the photos Isabella had alluded to and the internet searches he had carried out and the data he had collected, which extended to how long it would take for the police to respond to the high school from the department's south Ontario station and if and what kind of bullets would pass through the Kevlar vests worn by police officers. It was clear from young Villaseñor's postings and communications that he was somewhat embittered over his inability to establish social relationships with his peers and their rejection of him. Given his access to his father's guns, investigators came to the conclusion that the high school senior was about to embark on a mission to avenge himself on those who had snubbed him. With the anniversaries of the February 14, 2018 shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida and the April 20, 1999 shooting at Columbine

High School in Colorado approaching, the Ontario Police Department in a full-blown press conference heralded the arrest as one which had narrowly prevented a horrific exposition of hate and carnage, with Ontario Police Chief Michael Lorenz asserting Villaseñor was choreographing a precisely calculated hit involving five specific individuals that could be effectuated within a strict timeframe. "Villaseñor had every intention of carrying out a school shooting at Ontario Christian High School," Lorenz said.

Neither District Attorney Jason Anderson nor the supervising deputy district attorney overseeing the matter, Joe Gaetano, sought to deviate from or attenuate the narrative that was being perpetuated, which was that officers of the Ontario Police Department gallantly swooped in at the eleventh hour to prevent a homicidal maniac from slaughtering at least five and more likely dozens or even scores of innocent high school students. At one with Lorenz's exploitation of the circumstance to win accolades for the department he led, the district attorney's office charged Villaseñor on February 14, 2024, with one count of PC664/422 – attempted criminal threats and five counts of PC664/187 – attempted murder. This was done despite the more sober assessment of at least a few of the office's more experienced deputy prosecutors that Villaseñor had taken no actual action that might be construed as homicidal and that without at least one overt act by the defendant to try to kill someone, the minimum necessary elements of the attempted murder charges did not exist and that, as such, the case against him was less than viable.

While there was no

difficulty at all in getting beyond Villaseñor's February 15 arraignment in Rancho Cucamonga Superior Court before Judge Arthur Benner II, during which Villaseñor was represented by a deputy public defender, Frank Loo, who had virtually no familiarity with the facts of the case, sledding for the district attorney's office during Villaseñor's April 11 and April 16 preliminary hearing, at which point the defendant was represented by attorney Daniel DeLimon, proved a bit less smooth.

Gaetano had set extremely high expectations at the arraignment before Judge Benner when he successfully argued that Villaseñor should be held without bail because the youth, he said, "poses a great danger to the community." At that point, Gaetano hinted Villaseñor's field of victims extended beyond the five people he intended to kill and the one other he was charged with threatening to perhaps dozens or scores of students at Ontario Christian High School.

At the preliminary hearing before Judge Shannon L. Faherty on April 11 and April 16, Deputy District Attorney Debbie Ploghaus, who had been entrusted by both Anderson and Gaetano with moving the case against Villaseñor forward after its marquee build-up through the preliminary hearing to trial and conviction, called Dykhouse, Stutz and Isabella Villaseñor as witnesses, followed by the officers and detectives with the Ontario Police Department who had examined Villaseñor's activities – Jake Arakawa, Elizabeth Fries, Edmund McCorkle, Manuel Bonilla and Albert Alvarado. Villaseñor's scribbles on a piece of yellow paper, photos or images referred to as "thumbnails" relating to the Columbine shooting, bomb-making and tactical outfits taken from Villaseñor's cellphone or the Villaseñor family computer were introduced as evidence.

During her testimony, Isabella Villaseñor revealed that she was the object of the alleged criminal threat the case concerned. That much-belabored show of hostility, which she had related to Stutz and Dykhouse, was her brother clenching his first on the morning of February 8 in the parking lot when he told her to not mention the girl who had spurned one of his advances. She acknowledged that she had also told Stutz and Dykhouse she had seen her brother self-pose for photographs with their father's firearms in December and that he was frequently engaged with viewing videos about school shootings.

Despite the disclosure of the identities of the five students the district attorney's office alleged Sebastian Villaseñor was targeting for death – four girls who had declined Villaseñor's offer to take them on a date and the boyfriend of another girl in whom Villaseñor was interested – none of the detectives was able to produce any evidence or even indication Villaseñor had confronted or issued a threat to any of them. Nor was there any specific evidence that the defendant had acted on carrying out the action prosecutors alleged it was his intent to engage in.

Testimony from the detectives working the case revealed that despite their having hours upon hours of access to the cognitively-challenged Villaseñor outside the presence of his parents or legal counsel during which they were able to structure the nature and terms of the dialogue with Villaseñor by focusing on what they insisted was his plan to go on a shooting spree, they were unable to extract a confession from him. During an interrogation designed to break him down psychologically, one filled with loaded questions which by their very nature were implicit no matter what response was ventured, such that his guilt was implied from the outset, he continuously thwart-

ed them. When the investigators pressed him to tell them how he had planned to overcome the obstacles to carrying off the mass shooting they said he was militating to carry out, how he would get the gun and the ammunition he needed onto the campus, what vantage he would take when he opened fire, where he would position his car to expedite getting onto the school grounds and then make his getaway, how he would take on or avoid responding police officers, he simply abnegated the premise of such questions by saying, "I didn't" or "I didn't think about doing that" or "I wasn't thinking of doing that" or "I didn't think that far ahead." The upshot of his interrogation was that shooting up the Ontario Christian High School campus was their invention rather than his.

DeLimon was a far cry from the overworked, overwhelmed and indistinct designee from the public defender's office who had sat idly while Villaseñor was led toward the slaughter during his arraignment in February. As a prosecutor with the Riverside County District Attorney's Office before he went into private practice, he had prosecuted 34 homicides. He was more than up to dealing with a pretend murder case. DeLimon's cross examination during the Villaseñor preliminary hearing was designed, and for the most part succeeded, in ramming home how far out in front of themselves the detectives and the prosecutors had gotten in insisting Villaseñor had murderous intent which he acted upon.

When Detective Albert Alvarado, the lead investigator on the case who had the advantage of hearing the testimony of all of the other detectives, was asked who Villaseñor's victims were, the closest he got was suggesting that Villaseñor had in some fashion threatened his sister in the parking lot when he demanded she quit talking about the girl who had shunned him. When

DeLimon pressed Alvarado on whom Villaseñor victimized, the detective said, "I'd say he threatened Ontario Christian High School."

DeLimon told Judge Faherty that the case was devoid of any overt acts. Villaseñor, DeLimon said, "had done nothing – nothing – to prepare" to carry out any murders.

Judge Faherty, however, was persuaded by Ploghaus's presentation with regard to Villaseñor's fascination with guns and past school shootings, his 4,500 internet and/or cellphone searches which touched on such topics as tactics used in shootings, firearms, body armor and what type of bullets could pierce them and police response times. Ultimately, Judge Faherty, ruled that Villaseñor's thoughts could be ascertained by his online activities and that thoughts at some point become tantamount to plans and action. Without identifying any specific acts actually perpetrated by Villaseñor, Judge Faherty said she felt "nervous" things would have spiraled into mayhem if Isabella Villaseñor had not come forward to speak with Stutz, as Villaseñor was involved in "a continuous course of conduct" leading toward "an actual plan." She bound Villaseñor over for trial on the five attempted murder charges.

The the count of making threats of serious bodily injury against a sixth victim – revealed as being Isabella Villaseñor – upon being explicated as Sebastian Villaseñor clenching of his fist when he was talking to his sister about the girl who wouldn't give him the time of day, was dismissed.

Villaseñor thus found himself bound over for trial on five counts of PC664/187 – attempted murder – and DeLimon was thereby committed to propounding his defense before a 12-member jury of Villaseñor's peers.

In California, the stat-

Continued on Page 6

Montoya For Six Months Had The Backing Of A Majority Of The Council, But Ultimately Lost Its Support When He Sacked The Finance Director For Questioning His Bond Issuing Agenda *from page 2*

immediately adjacent Vanir Tower in downtown San Bernardino.

Notably, it was the effort to reestablish City Hall, which was constructed in 1972 without adhering to the then-newly formulated seismic standards put in place in the aftermath of the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake, as the city's administrative headquarters which generated further doubt about Montoya's suitability for remaining in the role of San Bernardino city manager.

Montoya appears to have presumed that the full council was, or a substantial majority of its members were, in support of the retrofit, the estimated cost of which had escalated from \$8 million to \$16 million to \$21 million to \$27 million to \$41 million to \$65 million to \$75 million to \$82 million to roughly \$120 million in a little over six years.

An issue that raised itself was Montoya's relationship with the bond underwriting firm of Stifel Financial Services, with which he had numerous past dealings in his various municipal capacities elsewhere. Over the past two decades, Stifel had realized in excess of \$27 million in fees based upon projects which utilized funding structured by Stifel in the various cities where Montoya worked. In January, Montoya, without doing a cost comparison or conducting an open competitive bid, signed a letter of intent to utilize Stifel as San Bernardino's bond underwriter going forward. A target amount for an initial bond issuance of \$120 million was being openly discussed in the back rooms and hallways of the Vanir Tower. It was unclear how much of that money was to be devoted to the City Hall renovation and whether another portion would be utilized for very-low-

income and low-income housing to be undertaken by the city's housing authority. Statements by Montoya as well as by two officials with Stifel, Sara Oberlies Brown, the managing director of the firm's San Francisco Office and Mark Reader, Stifel's managing director in its Phoenix office, did not specify with any definitude how the money was to be applied.

Meanwhile, there was a legitimate debate as to whether the effort to reclaim City Hall was a worthwhile undertaking. Though there was general agreement that the building from an aesthetic and presentational standpoint was a positive asset to the city, structural engineers sounded a piercing note of caution, saying despite the best efforts to shore up the building's concrete pillars, the structural integrity of the building could not be absolutely guaranteed, no matter how much money was thrown toward doing so. Some counseled the city to seriously consider razing the existing building, as difficult and painful as doing so might be, and constructing the edifice from scratch, building it on a foundation that would incorporate gargantuan springs which serve as base isolators/dampers to absorb the seismic energy of even the most severe earthquakes to prevent structural damage and avoid any possibility of collapse.

Simultaneously, questions arose over Montoya's single-minded dedication to hiring Stifel and obstinate opposition to any kind of competitive bidding by a fuller range of bond underwriters. It was noted that Stifel had hit a rough patch, in which its annual net income for 2022 had been \$625 million, a 20.83 percent decline from 2021 and that the financial doldrums for the company had per-

sisted into 2023, when its net annual income declined 22.34 percent from what it was in 2022 to \$485 million. Some had the perception that Montoya was militating more on behalf of Stifel than he was for San Bernardino. Some went so far as to suggest that he was feathering for himself a future nest by which he would be able to move into a lucrative position with the company after he was no longer city manager.

Barbara Germaine Whitehorn, who was hired as San Bernardino's director of finance in February 2021, 32 months before Montoya arrived, had as close of a vantage on what Mon-



Barbara Whitehorn

toya was proposing as anyone at the city. While much of her time over the last several months was consumed with stacking the city's projected line items above one another in its spending plan in the 2024-25 fiscal year and making necessary adjustments, additions and deletions to ensure that all of those fit within a number no greater than the city's projected revenues between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025 being compended into the city's 2024-25 budget, she was simultaneously churning the numbers that pertained to the bond issuance Montoya had unveiled in selected circles within the city's confines, the need for debt service those issuances would create, breaking that number down into the annual drain it would represent and comparing that alongside the numbers in the annual spending plan she was working on. She was driven to a conclusion that was far less sanguine than Montoya's, namely that the city would not be able to logically service that debt in

either the short or long term. At the end of April, she resolved to make her concerns known. Noting that the proposed bond issuance had escalated from roughly \$80 million to \$120 million, she believed the ultimate reality of the resultant debt was being either soft-pedalled or hidden. Exploring the matter further, it became clear that what Montoya was driving the city toward was having to pull \$12 million out of its revenue stream to service the bonded indebtedness in upcoming 2024-25 and the city would thereafter have to devote \$10 million annually toward that debt at a minimum starting Fiscal 2025-26, doing so continuously without respite for the next 29 years.

The week of May 1, before she left on vacation, Whitehorn confronted Montoya, telling him in plain terms, she said, "The city does not have that money." She then provided the same information to the city's team in charge of capital projects, including the City Hall retrofit.

Upon returning from vacation on May 15, according to Whitehorn, she met with Montoya, indicating her unwillingness to offer her support for the City Hall salvaging effort. She said that Montoya sought to pressure her into changing her position by threatening to release, she said, "information damaging to my career into the public domain." She responded by telling Montoya he would have to fire her to prevent her from opposing the bond issuances as a city employee. She quoted him as responding, "Oh, then I'll just fire you without cause."

Indeed, that is what Montoya did, arranging for Whitehorn to receive a pink slip later that day.

Whitehorn, however, did not go gently into the good night. Rather, she returned for that evening's city council meeting, where she gave the city council a blow-by-blow account of her confrontation with Montoya over the bond issuance

proposal.

The matter stewed for a while. The council called for a special meeting on May 22, at 6:30 p.m., one to be held behind closed doors and outside the view or earshot of the public, at which it was scheduled to engage in a "public employee performance evaluation... public employee performance dismissal [and] public employee appointment" relating to the "city manager."

Before adjourning into its closed session, the council heard from multiple city residents, most of whom encouraged the council to dispatch Montoya. One of those, former Councilman Rikke Van Johnson, called for the council to undo Whitehorn's firing and return her to the position of finance director. Another resident, former Assemblywoman Cheryl Brown, speaking on behalf of herself and her husband, Hardy Brown Sr., the founder and publisher of the *Black Voice News*, called upon the council to appoint Whitehorn to replace Montoya as city manager until a replacement is found.

The council adjourned into a closed session, during which it terminated Montoya without cause on a unanimous vote and then appointed Deputy City Manager Rochelle Clayton as the acting city manager by vote of 5-to-3, with Tran, Figueroa, Shorett, Reynoso and Calvin prevailing and Sanchez, Ibarra and Alexander dissenting.

By conferring the \$325,000 severance on Montoya, it is the apparent hope of the council to foreclose any legal action against the city he would have otherwise contemplated engaging in as a consequence of his firing.

Montoya's departure might have an idiosyncratic or unique situational impact on the dynamic of governance of the city. Just prior to his arrival and during his tenure, the relationship between Councilwoman Calvin and several of her

council colleagues – in particular Mayor Tran and Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa and Shorett – deteriorated. It was during Montoya's management of the city that the city commissioned two separate investigations into what were deemed, or suspected to be, leaks of confidential information.

Those investigations were carried out by Laguna Niguel-based JL Group LLC. JL Goup's work product was marred by its lack of subpoena power, such that its investigation was dependent upon the cooperation of witnesses identified by the investigators. Since many, indeed most, of the witnesses were in some fashion affiliated with the city or were city employees who were answerable to Montoya and because he had immediate access to the preliminary and final reports pertaining to that investigation, many city employees, out of fear that their jobs were on the line if they did not cooperate with JL Group's investigators, submitted to questioning. Moreover, since hostility between Montoya and Calvin was no secret and those employees were directly answerable to, and serving at the pleasure of, Montoya, they might have colored their statements to the investigators in a hue that might have been damaging to Calvin.

The executive summary of the final report along with 18 expurgated pages of the report itself were released in April. Not surprisingly, the material made public revealed the investigators' conclusions that Calvin was the likely source of at least some of the leaks of confidential information. Thereupon, Tran, Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa and Shorett utilized that conclusion to initiate a process to potentially censure Calvin. Preparations toward holding a public hearing at which the evidence against Calvin is previewed and presented and she and/or her representatives is or are given

Continued on Page 16

With Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars Available To Them Through Their Campaign War Chests, Fontana Council Members Impose \$1,000 Fee To Post Political Signs During Election Season Within City Limits

from page 3

advantage their substantial political war chests provide them, which allow them to engage in polling of the electorate, to hire political consultants and to promote their candidacies using mailers, handbills, campaign signs, billboards, as well as newspaper, radio and television advertisements together with making it possible for them to engage in negative attacks on their opponents.

Warren's control of the council's ruling coalition has ensured that she can call virtually all of the shots at Fontana City Hall, including who is to be hired, fired and promoted, along with decision-making power over which companies or individuals will be approved for providing services and goods to the city or which entities will be awarded franchises. Perhaps most significantly, her position as the city's top political dog has given her and her allies on the council and their appointees to the planning commission as well as those who are employed within the city's building and safety, development services, economic development, housing and planning departments, who serve, essentially, at the pleasure of the city council and/or their designee as city manager, control over which developers will be granted approval for their building proposals. As such, Warren has been able to commandeer the attention and loyalty of the most consistent and deep-pocketed of contributors to the electioneering funds of those vying for office in Fontana. Her primacy in this regard, going back for more than a decade, has allowed her to accumulate, election cycle after election cycle, money in her campaign war chest which dwarfs that of anyone else in Fontana

as well as nearly all of the other politicians in San Bernardino County, with only a handful of exceptions. With this kind of funding available to her, she has made loans and transfers from her campaign nest egg to others, including Roberts, Cothran and Garcia, to get them elected or reelected, as well as to key figures within the Fontana political scene, such as members of



Acquanetta Warren

both the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors and the Fontana Unified School District Board of Trustees.

Warren, at the end of 2023, had \$186,112.70 remaining in her political war chest. Throughout 2023, which was for her an off-political year, she had made \$131,339.31 in expenditures, a significant portion of which went to boost the fortunes of her political allies. Of that, \$2,573.07 went to Councilman Garcia to assist him with a fundraiser for his upcoming reelection campaign this year. Moreover, in 2022, when she last ran for reelection, doing so successfully, Warren started the year with \$256,788.44 in her campaign coffer and took in throughout the course of the year \$371,291.91. She expended during the same 12 months \$482,093.31, much of it on her own re-electoral effort. Nevertheless, a substantial amount of her money was provided to other politicians, including forgiving a \$3,670 loan she had made in the past to former Fontana Councilman/current San Ber-

nardino County Second District Supervisor Jesse Armendarez, \$17,505 in loans made to Jesse Armendarez's brother, Joe Armendarez, to support him in his successful election bid for the Fontana School Board; \$4,000 to Adam Perez in support of his campaign for the Fontana School Board; \$13,609.50 in loans provided to Lauren Gomez in her unsuccessful school board electoral effort; and \$16,710.86 to Rayman Martinez for his unsuccessful attempt to be elected to the Fontana School Board.

In 2022, when he last ran for reelection, Councilman John Roberts began the year with \$67,592.89 in his electioneering fund. He collected \$86,750 in contributions that year. He spent \$41,450.54 on his successful campaign, ending the year with a cash balance of \$47,427.69.

In 2022, Councilman Phil Cothran, Jr. started out with \$10,027 in his campaign account. Over the course of the year, he collected \$95,450 in contributions. He expended \$68,527.82 on



Phil Cothran Jr.

his successful reelection campaign that year. He ended the year with \$36,949.18 left over.

Councilman Pete Garcia began this year with \$33,565.12 in his reelection fund.

Thus, the incumbent members of the city council who supported the imposition of the \$1,000 campaign sign deposit are prepared to apply a ready amount of cash to cover that deposit.

In his presentation of the draft ordinance for consideration on Tuesday, Deputy City Manager Ray Ebert represented it as a well-thought through, necessary and fair refinement of the

electoral process in Fontana.

He said that on March 26, "This item was partially presented to council regarding a fee for campaign signs, a fee deposit for campaign signs that the city would like to begin collecting... at the beginning of any campaign when the application's presented to the city. There was some discussion during that meeting regarding low-income folks who may want to run a campaign in the city and the hardship that this deposit may put upon them as well as anyone who may wish to simply not put up signs in the city. So,



John Roberts

we've changed the resolution to accommodate both low-income candidates who apply and we've chosen to adopt the low-income rates that the Department of Housing and Urban Development have [sic] adopted, and that is, effectively, anyone who makes less than fifty percent of the median wage of that community. So anyone [who] falls within that income rate would be excluded from this or exempt from this fee requirement, and they would be able to put up their signs without submitting the fee. Additionally, it will allow somebody to affirm that they will not be putting up any campaign signs in the community and only in the public right of way, which is our only authority in this particular item. If they choose to affirm they won't put up campaign signs, we will not require them to submit the \$1,000 fee as a deposit."

Based on Ebert's reference to the public right of way, Councilman Jesse Sandoval asked about where the law was applicable.

Ebert's response ap-

peared to indicate that by paying the fee, a candidate would thereby be allowed to post signs in the public right of way.

"There are two items I would respond to that with," Ebert said in response to Sandoval. "First, is we have a sign ordinance in the City of Fontana that dictates size and location of signs on personal property or private property. So, the sign ordinance would take effect for those signs that are in someone's private property, that are in their front yard, for example. Additionally, it was assumed – and I can add this language if it is council's desire – it was assumed the city only has jurisdiction over the public right of way. We don't have jurisdiction over your home outside of the sign ordinance as it exists. So, if we need to, or if the council would like us to, we can add language to stipulate that this is only applicable to signs in the public right of way, because we don't have authority anywhere else."

Sandoval pressed Ebert on whether the ordi-



Pete Garcia

nance would explicitly reverse previous bans on posting political signs in the public right of way or on city property.

"Are they going to be allowed to put signs in the parkway?" Sandoval asked, referring to the strip of landscaping between the sidewalk and the street owned by the city in both commercial and residential districts.

"I'm not an expert in this area, but I can address the point that there are many areas in public property that is the responsibility of the homeowner," Ebert said, before giving an indication that posting political signs in the city's parkways will become per-

missible for those able to pay the sign fee to the city. "If they put the deposit up, they can," Ebert said.

Cothran piped up, saying: "It was already illegal to put the signs there, according to our sign limitations, to put anything in the right of way."

Ebert responded, "The sign ordinance is the overarching authority for any signs."

There was a degree of ambiguity, but just enough daylight to indicate that the ordinance change to be voted on that night was going to allow those with enough money to pay the deposit to use the public right of way to utilize signs to promote their campaigns going forward.

City Attorney Ruben Duran did not deign to weigh in on the matter, allowing the impression that paying the deposit would widen the area in which campaign signs can be posted to the city's parkways and public right of way.

Before the council voted on the matter, Mayor Warren opened the hearing to the public.

Several Fontana residents came forward to tell the council before it voted that they believed the deposit policy was a cynical manipulation of the city's authority to solidify the incumbents' hold on political power.

Bobbi Jo Chavarria, who placed second in the race for mayor in 2010, said, "It is regretful that the city staff and the city clerk's office has taken another couple of months to return with this recommendation of ordinance and still doesn't have a policy or procedure to actually handle it. What this is is a deterrent for city council candidates to run in this city. It is also a deterrent to other elected officials and other candidates to actually participate in democracy in this city. You all are pals and friends with all the folks on Sierra [Avenue] and they let you use their right of way illegally. They let you use their right of way to

Continued on Page 8

Despite Environmentalists & The Public Becoming Increasingly Alarmed Over the Desiccation Of The Ecology In Strawberry Canyon, Nestlé/BlueTriton Corporate Officers & U.S. National Forest Officials Were Blasé About The Habitat Destruction *from page 3*

me and said they would not reduce the amount of water they were taking. They said that they would take more water if they could. They said they had an absolute right to the water recognized by the State of California.

The public became very concerned about the permit and could not understand why the Forest Service didn't take action as required by law, policy, and the San Bernardino National Forest Plan.

The U.S. Forest Service had developed a very close relationship with Nestlé and the company was being treated differently than other special use permittees. Other permittees, even special use recreation cabins owned by struggling residents, were made to modify their use of water to protect the streams when their permits were renewed, yet Nestlé was being allowed to dewater a very important stream supporting threatened, endangered, and sensitive species with no mitigation required. The environmental documents and resource protection measures relating to that permit had expired over 20 years before, along with the expiration of the permit. New species had been found and listed without any change to operations.

The greatest public outcry and public lawsuit ever directed at the San Bernardino National Forest from the Save Our Forest Association, the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the Story of Stuff Organization, and many other groups and individuals on the mountaintop and throughout the country (along with the exposure of the absurdness by Desert Sun investigative reporter Ian James and an FBI investigation) got the Forest Service to finally take some action on the 20+

year-expired permit. The Forest Service finally relented and agreed to do a National Environmental Policy Act review.

With all the public outcry and the significance of the decision to the public and natural resources, the Forest Service should have required an environmental impact statement with regard to the continuation of the expired permit, which would have resulted, at the least, in some release of water into the stream. Instead, the Forest decided to do a categorical exclusion which is supposed to be used for routine permit reissuance where nothing is really changing and there are no significant impacts from continuing the use. The continued taking of the spring water had obvious and significant long-term impacts to riparian habitat, threatened and endangered species and downstream users, but the categorical exclusion allowed Nestlé to continue the use as it was.

Nestlé threatened in the local press that it would sue the Forest Service if it sought to reduce the company's water diversion through the National Environmental Policy Act process. The Forest Service and Nestlé proposed long-term studies of adjacent watersheds. Scientists most familiar with the local ecology who reviewed the proposed paired basin studies questioned its design and ability to predict for Strawberry Creek. The permit renewal resulted in no reduction in water removal in the resulting 5-year permit, only studies and monitoring to be conducted by BlueTriton, which succeeded Nestlé as the Arrowhead Water bottler as a consequence of One Rock Capital Partners, LLC/Metropoulos & Co.'s purchase of Nestlé's North American bottling

operations with the exception of Perrier.

The various environmental groups and citizens concerned about the water depletion in Strawberry Creek filed petitions and letters of concern to the California State Water Resources Control Board. Based on that public concern, the Board evaluated and studied the history and background, largely provided by local Redlands citizen Amanda Frye. The Board issued a cease-and-desist order due to Nestlé's/BlueTriton's lack of legal water rights and the fact that the water source in Strawberry Canyon consisted of natural springs. Nestlé/Blue Triton appealed that order and the Board had hearings. Save Our Forest Association President Hugh Bialecki, Amanda Frye and myself were involved in and provided testimony over many months. The Save Our Forest Association, the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity were active participants in the hearing.

The Board hearing and all of the data and historical documents



confirmed what the public had contended all along: Nestlé/Blue Triton did not have a valid state surface water right. The springs that are now tapped before they reach the surface were all natural springs with lush riparian vegetation and year-round surface water miles downstream. The cataloging of the water flow in Strawberry Canyon from on-the-ground monitoring in a drought period (1928-1930) carried out by W. P. "Penn" Rowe, a civil engineer who had made extensive

field notes of the springs in Strawberry Canyon in the 1920s and 1930s, have now established that the stream had been severely altered by the illegal diversion.

Based on months of hearings and documentation of the real history of the springs, the Board issued a final cease-and-desist order. As expected, BlueTriton filed a lawsuit to stop the Board from enforcing the cease-and-desist order. The citizens and environmental groups knew that a lawsuit would be filed as Nestlé/BlueTriton always used delay tactics to stop enforcement of actions that would reduce the taking of water.

The public and groups were not worried about this lawsuit because they knew the Forest Service had the authority to restrict the diversion of water and protect the National Forest and downstream users, regardless of the lawsuit. Based on the new historical data on stream flows and the State water rights experts' determination of no water rights, we assumed the Forest Service would take some action

to get water back into the stream as it is backed by the law, policy and the land management plan.

This was not the case. Forest Service officials told us they were worried that the State lawsuit made it more of a problem for the Forest Service to take action, and that it would be sued by BlueTriton if the Forest Service took that action. The officials said the Forest Service had been threatened by Nestlé before if they proposed reducing the taking of water.

Many others and I have been telling the Forest Service that it is clear now that the State of California and Forest Service have the right to curtail the taking of water for bottling by BlueTriton and there is no excuse for not moving ahead to restore the stream and the watershed. The National Forest Service says it is moving ahead to do something but needs to be very careful and deliberate.

However, here we are 10 years later and there is still no requirement for BlueTriton to release any water to the stream.

Due to the frustration with the Forest Service for refusing to take any action in 10 years, the concerned public has reached out to the Department of Fish and Wildlife to enforce the need for a streambed alteration agreement as required in California and made a term of the BlueTriton permit.

By law, BlueTriton has to have a streambed alteration agreement in order to continue their diversion of the spring water and the diversion of the stream in upper Strawberry Creek. State law and Forest Service permit requirements are that BlueTriton must obtain a streambed alteration agreement. The stream has been completely dried up by BlueTriton and BlueTriton needs to put some water back in the stream to meet state and federal requirements. We now have historical information that shows the flows in the springs and the streams even during drought years. Restoring water back to Strawberry Creek will make a huge difference in the watershed for all of the plant and animal species. In addition, having Strawberry Creek restored as a wet ecosystem instead of a dry ecosystem will have an effect on the ability to control wildfires threatening the community in the front country. A well-watered watershed with water and Strawberry Creek flowing would provide water for firefighting

and a much better place for firefighters to defend than in its current dry state. The Santa Ana speckled dace, a Forest Service sensitive species, and one of the most imperial species in Southern California, was eliminated from Strawberry Creek in the last 100 years with diversion of all the summer flows in the headwaters by Nestlé/BlueTriton. Restoring dace along with other native species that were probably there such as the arroyo chub and the Santa Ana sucker will be a high priority for the state and federal government when water is restored.

Blue Triton has refused to get an agreement from Fish and Wildlife, saying that there was no impact to the springs or the stream because it takes the water before it gets to the surface. That is the problem. There is no surface water where there should be a flowing, thriving stream. The summer months from June through September are the hardest on the watershed and its plant and animal life. That is the time of year when species are nesting, frogs are breeding, etc. If BlueTriton was willing to work with the Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife, water could be released into Strawberry Creek this summer and the summer drought and severe impacts downstream could be avoided. However, BlueTriton has refused to put one drop of water into the stream to benefit the stream. The Forest Service and Fish and Game have the authority to require releases.

Strawberry Creek is public water. The National Forest and the public have a right to push for the stream's protection. We are hoping that the agencies will stand up to the wealthy bullies – BlueTriton – and put water back into our stream.

Steve Loe is a former National Forest Service biologist who spent much of his career assigned to the San Bernardino National Forest.

Fontana Council Heard And Rejected Citizen Objections To Charging Candidates To Post Campaign Signs *from front page*

display the signs all over the place.”

Chavarria noted that in the past, the signs of those challenging council incumbents have been “confiscated even before the election is over.” She referenced “signs being removed arbitrarily from their approved posting.”

Chavarria said the sign deposit ordinance is “just another tool in the city’s arsenal to really oppress any public voice. The \$1,000 we know is no big sweat for a mayor who can illegally and over the limit fund her other candidates that she supports. But a thousand dollars even for someone who makes above the poverty wage is still a huge request and burden on a grassroots candidate to have their money tied up for an election cycle. With no policy or procedure in place, no accounting, you all can charge whatever you want per sign. I don’t think this should be approved at this point until we see the procedures.”

Oscar Zambrano,

speaking in Spanish, said, “This clearly violates the freedom of expression of people, especially the ones who are poor. We need to eliminate political resolutions and laws that prevent access to democracy, especially those restricting poor people. It is not enough to have access for people with low income, because it is very easy for four or five council members to have a thousand dollars because they have their friends in the chamber of commerce or in San Bernardino County. They have PACS [political action committees] that support them.”

Zambrano said, “As a resident, I oppose this initiative. A lot of people will now be limited in their access and ability to run for public office.” He said the council was dominated by the mayor and her allies. “That is why today we want to have democracy and freedom of expression,” he said. He called upon the council to eliminate the obstacles to those in the community, particularly those who are not privileged, getting involved politically. He said that he was requesting that the council not pass the sign fee deposit ordinance, even though he knew the council majority was going to vote

for it. He emphasized that there were many people in the community who had different attitudes and opinions than the members of the city council. He said the sign fee deposit ordinance was intended more for the convenience and perpetuation of the power of the council than it was for the principle of democracy or for the community.

Stacy Ramos said, “This policy is definitely a barrier to entry for candidates that don’t have the couple hundred thousand dollars that Cothran, Acquanetta, Roberts get. We need to make sure that the democratic process and running for office is accessible to all. A thousand dollars to pay up front for one to sign up can be a detrimental effect for folks who like me who don’t get the money that you guys get to run for office. I really don’t see the need for this ordinance.”

Ramos continued, “My other concern about this is there is no process or procedures on how we are going to actually roll this out. I know that my boss would never let me roll out a new process or a new ordinance or anything unless I had all my ducks in a row.

“My last concern,” Ramos added, “is that

we have something called community. But what does community mean? How are we defining community? Are we defining it at a park? Are we defining it on a corner? Are we defining it at somebody’s house? Somebody’s yard? I know this city. I know how you weaponize these ordinances to punish people who are fighting for their democratic rights.”

Elizabeth Sena said, “I am pretty sure this ordinance came about because of a particular campaign for a specific position is coming up in 2026, maybe the one of the mayor. I have taken a look at some of your guys’ [Form] 460s, which show your political campaign contributions. I always find it alarming how much money you receive from developers that later on down the road you guys end up approving projects for. If all of these efforts are for the 2026 elections, it is very telling that you guys want to put fees [on political candidacies] because you guys can afford it. Your political campaigns can afford it because you guys sponsored other people who are on the council today.”

Without saying so directly, Warren sought to suggest that the ordinance was not intended to provide incumbents or well-financed candidates with an advantage over their challengers or opponents. As one of the most heavily backed politicians in the county monetarily, she left any direct assertions to that effect to Ebert. In addressing whether paying the ordinance would indeed have the effect of allowing those well-endowed enough financially to post signs in the public right of way, she spoke in circles, making a statement that could not be interpreted to any logical or cogent conclusion.

“The right of way is the right of way called public right of way,” she said.

Fontana is doing nothing any different than other cities, she asserted.

“Several cities around this region have this current ordinance because of what they call sign graffiti,” she said, a curious projection, given that in the election seasons in which she has been on the ballot, her signs overwhelm those of all others in Fontana.

She justified the ordinance by insisting, “No one is benefiting from this financially up here,” without directly addressing whether the incumbents on the council would realize an electoral boost or political benefit from the ordinance. “It won’t be outlandish and it won’t be unobtainable,” she said.

The ordinance was approved on a motion by Roberts and a second by Cothran, followed by a 3-to-1 vote with Garcia absent and Sandoval dissenting.

Today, May 24, David Loy, an attorney with the First Amendment Coalition, told the *Sentinel*, “I see a serious constitutional problem with the imposition of this fee in that it appears to be an effort to regulate political speech. The Supreme Court has ruled that a governmental entity cannot regulate signs based on their content. It would be one thing if it were to regulate any and all types of signs, but this is specific to political campaign signs. That is a limitation of speech based on content, so I think what we have is a serious question as to whether this violates the First Amendment.”

Loy said the city was not without authority to regulate signage, but that if it is to do so, it must involve a consistency of application and purpose.

“It may be that the city might not allow anyone to place signs in the public right of way, but it cannot create an exception that is based on the content,” he said. “This is a resolution that is based on the content of speech.”

Loy said the city allows certain entities to post signs in the public right of way. That being the case, it must allow other entities, extending to candidates for

political office, to do so as well. Any limitations put on the political candidates must, under the California and U.S. constitutions, be imposed on others, he said.

For some in the community, there was concern about the way in which Ebert and the council handled the discussion on Tuesday, with a degree of ambiguity relating to whether paying the fee would allow a candidate to post signs in the public right of way borne of Ebert suggesting that to be the case, Cothran noting that it had been the case in the past that such postings were prohibited and a lack of specificity offered by the city attorney on that point. If a controversy breaks out over what the ordinance allows or doesn’t allow, an analysis of the intent expressed by the city’s legislative body during the discussion of the ordinance prior to its approval could point to the conclusion that giving those who pay the fee clearance to post their campaign signs in the public right of way or the city’s parkways was consistent with what Ebert presented and the council’s intent.

Loy said the wording of the resolution itself was not clear on that point.

“That is not what the resolution says as I look at it,” he said.

Whether or not the council was engaging in a rhetorical end run during the discussion of the ordinance, at which he was not present, Loy said, the actual content of the resolution does not look to pass constitutional muster.

“Be that as it may, this appears to in fact have content as its criteria,” Loy said. “The resolution specifically identifies campaign signs. It applies only to campaign signs, which is one type of signs. It does not address or apply to commercial signs, or for music concerts or arcades or parades or church meetings or what have you. The Supreme Court says government cannot

Continued on Page 16

Marine Gunnery Sergeant Shot In The Head And Killed By Teen *from front page*

southeast toward nearby Knott Sky Park. McDonald was parked in his vehicle with his dog near the dog park at the south end of Knott Sky Park near El Sol Avenue and Foothill Drive. Garcia came up on McDonald and, according to the sheriff’s department, “without provocation” and in an apparent effort to steal his car, shot the 35-year-old gunnery sergeant in the head. The gravely wounded McDonald sought to drive off, but lost control of his car and rammed into a parked vehicle, which

had several occupants, reportedly a young family.

Deputies responded to the scene shortly thereafter and attempted to render McDonald lifesaving assistance. Nevertheless, he died before he received any further medical attention.

Garcia, yet on foot, had by that time headed west. Deputies looking for him spotted him several minutes later near the intersection of Sullivan Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue. He was taken into custody there. Deputies recovered a gun he was carrying believed to have been used in McDonald’s killing.

In addition to the murder, attempted car-

jacking, attempted robbery, attempted murder and assault with a firearm charges, the district attorney also filed three count enhancements of discharging a firearm and causing great bodily injury, two enhancements of discharging a firearm and two enhancements pertaining to use of a firearm in the commission of a crime against Garcia.

His arraignment was conducted telephonically this morning before Judge Rasheed S. Alexander between the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, where he is being held, and the Department M2 at the Joshua Tree Courthouse. The People of California were

Continued on Page 16

Having Previously Taken More Than 30 Homicide Cases To Trial As A Prosecutor, The Hardnosed DeLimon As Villaseñor's Defense Attorney Was Not Going To Allow His Client To Be Railroaded On Attempted Murder Charges When He Had Not Tried To Kill Anyone *from page 4*

ute that covers a criminal attempt is Penal Code § 664 PC. According to the law, an attempted crime occurs when an individual, a would-be perpetrator, tries to achieve some specifically outlawed end or goal but does not achieve that clearly defined objective. Actuating an attempted criminal act, even though the attempt is not moved through to completion, meets the requirements of criminality under Penal Code § 664.

Genuine criminal attempts generally are met with a punishment or penalty that is equal to one-half the sentence as that for the crime that was attempted but not actually perpetrated.

Under California law, attempted murder consists of a failed attempt at killing someone, involving physical action taken in which the explicit intent was to kill but which failed, such as a perpetrator shooting, stabbing or unleashing what could be deadly force upon someone, irrespective of whether the intended victim or victim is actually shot or stabbed or hit or not, where the target yet survives. Planning a murder does not suffice as attempted murder until such a plan is actuated, according to legal authorities.

To obtain a conviction under Penal Code § 664, a prosecutor must prove two things to convict the defendant, those being 1) the defendant intended to violate a specific section of the penal code and 2) the defendant performed a "direct act" relating to committing that crime. Such a direct act must entail an actual step – some physical action – toward committing the crime. Thinking about a crime or planning a criminal action or preparing to commit a crime does not constitute a direct act. An actual step must indicate a

definite intent to commit the criminal offense and involve an immediate action which initiates the offense.

Even if a plan to violate the law has been made, no offense under PC § 664 occurs if no act in furtherance of the planned crime takes place or if the plan is abandoned without any action taking place.

Under the most reasonable and logical of application of the law, a criminal attempt entails the criminal party initiating action relating to the crime in question but discontinuing before completion of the act either because circumstance or the intended victim or others thwart the attempt or the perpetrator himself desists on his own without fulfilling the criminal objective.

Sometime earlier this month, the *Sentinel* is told, District Attorney Anderson refocused on the case and was given enough of a briefing for him to understand that Ploghaus is now set to go to trial without being able to establish any overt acts on Villaseñor's part and that the only other charge – making criminal threats – had been dismissed. The prospect that the entire case against Villaseñor would be dismissed upon DeLimon making a pretrial motion or that Villaseñor would walk after a trial was held was overwhelming, Anderson had come to realize. Yet, many believed that despite his lack of technical guilt on the charges that had been lodged against him, Villaseñor continued to represent a danger to others. At that point, some in the district attorney's office, including Anderson, had reached the conclusion others had months previously: Villaseñor needed psychological counseling and mental

health treatment and that repositing him into a jail cell in which he was surrounded by older, hardened and experienced criminals was in no way likely to benefit him, lessen whatever hostility he had toward others or attenuate the danger he posed. An effort was quietly initiated to see if a plea settlement short of trial could be obtained. As is often the case, such negotiations start with an unrealistic offer from which a more pragmatic middle-ground deal can be arrived at. What the district attorney's office was offering, however, was a ham-fisted continuation of the arrogant position it had taken all along, one in which Villaseñor would simply plead to a single count of attempted murder, his sentence would be set at the time he had already served in jail and he would be given an open-ended probation which would entail him participating in mental health treatment until such time as prosecutors were satisfied that he no longer represented a threat to the community.

To DeLimon, whose position all along had been that Villaseñor was not guilty of any crime, let alone what he had been charged with, and who intimately knew the weakness inherent in the case prosecutors had saddled themselves with, was not willing to accept anything even remotely resembling what was being offered.

Indeed, the only remaining leverage the district attorney's office possessed consisted of the terms under which Villaseñor was being incarcerated – in the general population without bail. Yet, even that was working against Anderson, as he and his office had proven impervious to requests that the young man's vulnerable state be taken into consideration when Gaetano had insisted that he should continue to be held on a no bail hold. The inconsistency of maintaining, on one hand, that Villaseñor constituted so great a threat that allowing him to leave jail would be un-

conscionable and, on the other, that he could now be unleashed upon society without being incarcerated, was ludicrously apparent. The only positive inducement the district attorney's office had to offer is that Villaseñor will be released from the inappropriate holding conditions that the district attorney's office insisted upon imposing on the youth.

The district attorney's office tried again, this time offering to vacate all of the attempted murder charges and recommend that Villaseñor endure no further jail time if he would enter a single guilty plea to felony assault with a firearm. That deal was conditional upon Villaseñor, through DeLimon, further accepting an unapplied use-of-a-firearm-during-the-commission-of-a-criminal-offense sentencing enhancement, one which would be held in abeyance as long as Villaseñor cooperated in participating in and completed receiving mental-health treatment as part of his probation. At issue for DeLimon, however, was that the district attorney's office was again constructing a guilty plea on a crime his client had not, in fact, committed. Moreover, the conditions of the plea would require that Villaseñor complete to prosecutors' satisfaction, whatever mental-health care regime they specified, such that if Villaseñor did not, he would be subject to a revocation of his probation, which would trigger the application of the 19-year prison sentence for the assault-with-a-firearm offense.

DeLimon rejected that deal.

At that point, collective panic, from the top to the line-prosecutorial level, gripped the district attorney's office. In large measure because of its own doing, the district attorney's office had created for itself an intractable problem. Instead of soberly analyzing what it had with the Villaseñor matter and quietly without fanfare utilizing non-prosecutorial tools

such as counselors and mental-health professionals in dealing with a troubled young man and taking steps to ensure that Villaseñor would not have access to firearms at his home or elsewhere, the office had gone along with publicizing the Villaseñor case in parallel with the Ontario Police Department's self-aggrandizement.

A decade before Anderson was elected district attorney in 2018, he had been an Ontario City Councilman. As the Villaseñor matter was undergoing its initial round of publicity, Anderson was overheard by mid-range prosecutors in his office remarking that the Ontario Police Department should be given full backing with regard to the case. This put Gaetano and then Ploghaus in the position of having to double down on rather than moderating the police department's exaggerations relating to Villaseñor. This had led to the present circumstance in which prosecutors were in the position of having to endure losing at trial in their effort to protect society from a defendant they had participated into inflating into a publicly-perceived monster intent on and capable of killing scores of innocents.

At that point, any sense of honorable compartment or ethical resolution was out the window. The prosecutors scanned the horizon for any leverage or vectoring of force that remained. One factor of only a very few factors in the prosecutor's office's favor was that Villaseñor remained in custody among a multitude of felons and under conditions that those who cared about him, his family in particular, and those mental health and developmental professionals who knew about what he was enduring, wanted to see ended at once.

The primary factor militating against the district attorney's office was DeLimon. As Villaseñor's attorney he was offering the prosecution no quarter and he understood, to the degree that

it could be understood, the fatal limitations in the case it was pursuing. The one conceivable strategy the district attorney's office could come up with was to in some way attenuate DeLimon's effectiveness, break his single-minded concentration, compromise his devotion to his client. What was called for was the equivalent of a crafty major league pitcher throwing a 98-miles-per-hour fastball at the head of a dug-in power hitter who is on a hot streak.

Any victory the district attorney's office was to snatch from the jaws of defeat in the Villaseñor case was to involve interrupting the support network around the defendant. That support network consisted, primarily, of DeLimon and Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, who had retained him to defend his son.

The weak link that the district attorney's office had spotted was Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, the registered owner of the seven rifles, three handguns and shotgun to which Sebastian Villaseñor had access found at the 3,201-square foot home located at 7940 Tallow Tree Circle in Eastvale where Jose Ramiro Villaseñor resided together with Sebastian Villaseñor and Isabella Villaseñor.

Isabella testified that she had seen her brother posing for selfies with her father's rifles in December 2023. On January 21, 2024 Sebastian Villaseñor turned 18. At one point, DeLimon, in expressing his belief that the district attorney's office was wrongheadedly pressing for a plea conviction against Sebastian Villaseñor on use of a firearm in the commission of a crime statute, publicly acknowledged that his client was still 17 years old when he had posed with his father's rifles. That was a crucial fact, one which opens the potential for a prosecution of Jose Ramiro Villaseñor on a Penal Code § 25100 charge. Penal Code § 25100 prohibits storing a firearm in an unsecured

Continued on Page 10

Public Notices

PERSONS: Petitioner: Isabela Gil on Behalf of Eva Plascencia, A Minor, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: EVA PLASCENCIA to EVA ISABELA GIL RODRIGUEZ, THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the hearing and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: 06/20/2024, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S24
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SBSCS Upland in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 05/06/2024
Judge of the Superior Court: GILBERT G OCHOA
Published in the SBSCS Upland on 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 06/01/2024, 06/07/2024

FBN 20240003571
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

FLAWLYSS CURLS 8977 FOOTHILL BLVD STE B RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; ALYSSA TAMASOALII
Business Mailing Address: 3275 GARDEN DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

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

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

/s/ ALYSSA TAMASOALII
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: April 12, 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 I8090

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 May 17 & 25 and June 1 & 8, 2024.

FBN 20240004740
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

P & C REAL ESTATE GROUP 8047 DAY CREEK BLVD SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; LYNN M. PERRY
Business Mailing Address: 8047 DAY CREEK BLVD SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that

Public Notices

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/ LYNN M. PERRY, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 5/17/2024

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 May 17 & 25 and June 1 & 8, 2024.

FBN 20240003571
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

FLAWLYSS CURLS 8977 FOOTHILL BLVD STE B RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; ALYSSA TAMASOALII
Business Mailing Address: 3275 GARDEN DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ ALYSSA TAMASOALII
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: April 12, 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 I8090

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 May 17 & 25 and June 1 & 8, 2024.

FBN 20240004686
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

BREAST BUDDIES 6323 SADDLE TREE PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; LARRY D. LOFTON

Business Mailing Address: 6323 SADDLE TREE PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ LARRY D. LOFTON, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 5/16/2024

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

Public Notices

and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 17 & 25 and June 1 & 8, 2024.

FBN 20240003679
The following person is doing business as: BENSON LIQUOR. 5685 RIVERSIDE DR #H & J CHINO, CA 91710; MAILING ADDRESS 5685 RIVERSIDE DR #H & J CHINO, CA 91710; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO IHAB E SHARABEEN 5685 RIVERSIDE DR #H&J CHINO, CA 91710; ADEL A HANNA 5685 RIVERSIDE DR #H&J CHINO, CA 91710. 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/ IHAB E SHARABEEN, PARTNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 16, 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 04/26/2024, 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024 CNBB17202401MT

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: PHILIP A. ARCARA

CASE NO. PROVA2400065

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of PHILIP A. ARCARA: a petition for probate has been filed by JOSEPH J. ARCARA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOSEPH J. ARCARA be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held July 25, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. at

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F3 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

Public Notices

Filed: JANUARY 24, 2024
Nycrole Patterson, Deputy Court Clerk.

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Robin M. Hatcher:

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 24 & 31 and June 7, 2024.

FBN 20240004431
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

AGAPE'S RES 904 NORTH 1ST UPLAND, CA 91786; RYAN P MEDINA

Business Mailing Address: 333 E ARROW HIGHWAY, PO BOX 1717 UPLAND, CA 91785

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/ RYAN P MEDINA, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 5/09/2024

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 J2523

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 May 24 & 31 and June 7 & 14, 2024.

FBN 20240002317
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

AWESOMESTONES 9881 6TH STREET STE 201 RAN-

Public Notices

CHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; WON2 INC 9881 6TH STREET STE 201 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

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

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

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 1, 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/ SUZY WON, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/08/2024

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 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 April 19, 26, May 3 & 10, 2024.

FBN 20240002343
The following person is doing business as: EMPIRE PAVING. 2717 ETIWANDA AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS 2717 ETIWANDA AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DAVID OLIVARES JR

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/ DAVID OLIVARES JR, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CNB-B18202401CV

FBN 20240004116
The following person is doing business as: THE OAKS RESTAURANT. 37676 HIGHWAY 38 ANGELUS OAKS, CA 92305; MAILING ADDRESS 37676 HIGHWAY 38 ANGELUS OAKS, CA 92305; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO M5&J LLC 34977 AVENUE #C YUCAIPA, CA 92399 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA

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: MAY 01, 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/ GURVINDER SINGH, PRESIDENT
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 26, 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202405MT

FBN 20240004116
The following person is doing business as: THE OAKS RESTAURANT. 37676 HIGHWAY 38 ANGELUS OAKS, CA 92305; MAILING ADDRESS 37676 HIGHWAY 38 ANGELUS OAKS, CA 92305; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO M5&J LLC 34977 AVENUE #C YUCAIPA, CA 92399 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA

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: MAY 01, 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/ MONICA AGUILAR, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202405MT

Public Notices

nardino on: MAY 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202403MT

FBN 20240004110
The following person is doing business as: LEGEND IMPEX. 460 WIER DR APT 6 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408; MAILING ADDRESS 460 WIER DR APT 6 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MOHAMMED A. TAYOUB

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/ MOHAMMED A. TAYOUB, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 30, 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202406MT

FBN 20240004045
The following person is doing business as: NEW EVOLUTION STEEL. 14601 APPIAN WAY FONTANA, CA 92337; MAILING ADDRESS 14601 APPIAN WAY FONTANA, CA 92337; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CESAR A JIMENEZ 14601 APPIAN WAY FONTANA, CA 92337. 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/ CESAR A JIMENEZ, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 26, 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202404MT

FBN 20240004018
The following person is doing business as: CARRILLO MARKET. 635 E. HOLT BLVD, SUITE A ONTARIO, CA 91761; MAILING ADDRESS 635 E. HOLT BLVD, SUITE A ONTARIO, CA 91761; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SINGHGUR INC. 681 E FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION C-6111081

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/ GURVINDER SINGH, PRESIDENT
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 26, 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 05/03/2024, 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024 CN-BB18202407MT

FBN 20240004038
The following person is doing business as: METZTLI HOUSE OF BEAUTY. 2795 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; MAILING ADDRESS 2795 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARIA E FLORES CARVAJAL 2795 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405. 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

The San Bernardino County Sentinel Offers The Lowest Prices For The Publishing Of Legal Notices Among All Of The Newspapers In San Bernardino County

Are you looking to publish a Fictitious Business Name Notice? An Order To Show Cause? Notice Of A Trustee Sale? Notice Of A Petition To Administer An Estate?

Publish your notice at a reasonable rate.

Call (909) 957 9998 for a quote on all of your legal noticing needs.

The Sentinel is a legally adjudicated newspaper of general circulation for both the City of Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino County.

Main Business Address & Editorial Office: 10788 Civic Center Drive, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730



San Bernardino County Sentinel

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

Public Notices

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.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202413MT

FBN 20240003674

The following person is doing business as: POMONA PRINT STOP; AMERICAN SPIRIT PRINTING 9077 ARROW ROUTE STE 120 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730;

MMF CAPITAL LLC 9077 ARROW ROUTE STE 120 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 201900810100

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 14, 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/ PHILLIP M FEDERICO, MANAGING MEMBER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 16, 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

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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202412MT

FBN 20240004273

The following person is doing business as: DELICIAS CATERING SERVICES 7516 MAPLE AVE FONTANA, CA 92336; MAILING ADDRESS 7516 MAPLE AVE FONTANA, CA 92336; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

MARIA D GUTIERREZ 7516 MAPLE AVE FONTANA, CA 92336

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. 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/ MARIA D GUTIERREZ, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 03, 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.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202411MT

FBN 20240004275

The following person is doing business as: FOREVER SMASH BURGER 11505 MAPLE AVE HESPERIA, CA 92345; MAIL-

Public Notices

ING ADDRESS 11505 MAPLE AVE HESPERIA, CA 92345; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

EPIFANIO M GUERRERO 11505 MAPLE AVE HESPERIA, CA 92345

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/ EPIFANIO M GUERRERO, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 03, 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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202410MT

FBN 20240004274

The following person is doing business as: APPLIANCES 4 LESS 17389 ARROW BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 17389 ARROW BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

JAIME D VELASQUEZ 17389 ARROW BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information

Public Notices

which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ JAIME D VELASQUEZ, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 03, 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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202409MT

FBN 20240004271

The following person is doing business as: NB CONSTRUCTION 5199 SILVER MOUNTAIN WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737; MAILING ADDRESS 5199 SILVER MOUNTAIN WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737;

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

RB COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS INC. 5199 SILVER MOUNTAIN WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737

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/ RONALDO BUSANTE, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 03, 2024

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

Public Notices

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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202408MT

FBN 20240004390

The following person is doing business as: EMPIRE BOUNCE CASTLES 7046 OAKCREST CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; MAILING ADDRESS 7046 OAKCREST CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

DC FLIPS LLC 7046 OAKCREST CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202004610218

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/ DARIO C. CARRILLO, CEO

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

tion 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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB192024071R

FBN 20240004187

The following person is doing business as: FLOORS DESIGN SERVICES 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC 109 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; MAILING ADDRESS 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC 109 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410;

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

RAFAEL LOPEZ DIAZ

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAY 02, 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/ RAFAEL LOPEZ DIAZ, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 02, 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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202406MT

FBN 20240004246

The following person is doing business as: MOJAVE EXPRESS 14670 RODEO DR VICTORVILLE, CA 92395; MAILING ADDRESS 14670 RODEO DR

Public Notices

VICTORVILLE, CA 92395; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RICARDO DURAN PENA

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 21, 2009

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

s/ RICARDO DURAN PENA, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 03, 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 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CN-BB19202405MT

FBN 20240003525

The following person is doing business as: ARTISANS 8900 BENSON AVE SUITE D MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; MAILING ADDRESS 8900 BENSON AVE SUITE D MONTCLAIR, CA 91763;

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

RICHARD A ESSLINGER

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: DEC 18, 2009

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

Public Notices

LIKEN AVE SUITE 104-220 RANCHOUCUCAMONGA,CA91730; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO HILDA GONZAGA... The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 2024000487 The following person is doing business as: PINATA FELIZ. 203 PLEASANTVIEW AVE COLTON, CA 92324; MAILING ADDRESS 203 PLEASANTVIEW AVE COLTON, CA 92324; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GENARO LOZOYA; NORMA A. LOZOYA

FBN 2024000485 The following person is doing business as: SOLAR MONKEY. 4200 MISSION BLVD MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; MAILING ADDRESS 4200 MISSION BLVD MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ANJAEYA MANAGEMENT LLC

FBN 2024000481 The following person is doing business as: BOB'S MARKET. 998 N H STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; MAILING ADDRESS 998 N H STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GURVINDER SINGH

Public Notices

ardino on: MAY 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.

FBN 2024000481 The following person is doing business as: EAGLE MAGNETIC CARE. 16415 TULLOCK ST FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 16415 TULLOCK ST FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ERIKA C AGUILAR

FBN 2024000467 The following person is doing business as: IVY NAILS SALON. 1505 S RIVERSIDE AVE UNIT A RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS 7343 MOUNTAIN LAUREL DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TONY L CHIEM

FBN 20240004805 The following person is doing business as: NIKUNJUMAR PATEL, MANAGING MEMBER. Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 17, 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.

FBN 20240004680 The following person is doing business as: AGUIRRE CUSTOM CABINETS AND STONE. 8321 TOPAZ AVE OAK HILLS, CA 92344; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JESUS AGUIRRE LEON

Public Notices

ing business as: IVY NAILS SALON. 1505 S RIVERSIDE AVE UNIT A RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS 7343 MOUNTAIN LAUREL DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TONY L CHIEM

FBN 20240004609 The following person is doing business as: GM SOLUTIONS. 8550 ROBINIA ST FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 8550 ROBINIA ST FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GONZALO MORA

FBN 20240004708 The following person is doing business as: AGUIRRE CUSTOM CABINETS AND STONE. 8321 TOPAZ AVE OAK HILLS, CA 92344; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JESUS AGUIRRE LEON

FBN 20240003207 The following person is doing business as: A'S PLUMBING AND DRAIN CLEANING. 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; MAILING ADDRESS 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAMUEL N ARQUIETA

Public Notices

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/ JESUS AGUIRRE LEON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 16, 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.

FBN 20240004705 The following person is doing business as: MAGANA'S TIRE SHOP. 14601 VALLEY BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 1263 N FILLMORE AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RODRIGO MAGANA

FBN 20240003207 The following person is doing business as: A'S PLUMBING AND DRAIN CLEANING. 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; MAILING ADDRESS 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAMUEL N ARQUIETA

FBN 20240003225 The following person is doing business as: OUTDOORADSRIVERLUX. 429 N K STREET NEEDLES, CA 92363; MAILING ADDRESS 23400 BLUE GARDENIA LANE MURRIETA, CA 92562; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MICHAEL WEST

FBN 20240003225 The following person is doing business as: OUTDOORADSRIVERLUX. 429 N K STREET NEEDLES, CA 92363. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the

Public Notices

BB21202409MT FBN 20240004729 The following person is doing business as: RUBY'S VIDEO EDITING. 8845 BLANCHARD AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 8845 BLANCHARD AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RUBY V VALDIVIA

FBN 20240003207 The following person is doing business as: A'S PLUMBING AND DRAIN CLEANING. 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; MAILING ADDRESS 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAMUEL N ARQUIETA

FBN 20240002940 The following person is doing business as: LUSH PRINT CO. 999 N. WATERMAN AVE STE A-23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; MAILING ADDRESS 999 N. WATERMAN AVE STE A-23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO COCCO LUSH INC

FBN 20240003225 The following person is doing business as: OUTDOORADSRIVERLUX. 429 N K STREET NEEDLES, CA 92363. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the

Public Notices

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/ MICHAEL WEST, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 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.

FBN 20240003224 The following person is doing business as: EPICURE SOLUTIONS. 23915 SPRINGWATER RD UNIT #2 CRESTLINE, CA 92325; MAILING ADDRESS P.O BOX 1202 REDLANDS, CA 92373; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO THOMAS WRIGHT

FBN 20240003207 The following person is doing business as: A'S PLUMBING AND DRAIN CLEANING. 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; MAILING ADDRESS 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAMUEL N ARQUIETA

FBN 20240003153 The following person is doing business as: ZAPATO AUTO SALES CORP. 363 WEST 6TH STREET SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; MAILING ADDRESS 363 W 6TH ST SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ZAPATO AUTO SALE CORP

Public Notices

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 04/05/2024, 04/12/2024, 04/19/2024, 04/26/2024 CN-BB14202412MT CORRECTION DATES 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024, 06/07/2024, 06/14/2024

FBN 20240003097 The following person is doing business as: ACTION MOBILE HOMES. 1511 W HOLT BLVD STE F ONTARIO, CA 91762; MAILING ADDRESS 1511 W HOLT BLVD STE F ONTARIO, CA 91762 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUN 01, 1993 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20240003153 The following person is doing business as: ZAPATO AUTO SALES CORP. 363 WEST 6TH STREET SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; MAILING ADDRESS 363 W 6TH ST SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ZAPATO AUTO SALE CORP

FBN 20240003153 The following person is doing business as: ZAPATO AUTO SALES CORP. 363 WEST 6TH STREET SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; MAILING ADDRESS 363 W 6TH ST SUITE 13 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ZAPATO AUTO SALE CORP

Floating The Concept Of Having The Riverside County DA Go After Villaseñor's Father May Get The San Bernardino County DA The Desired Results *from page 9*

location where a minor can obtain access to it. A Penal Code § 25100 violation can be prosecuted as either a felony or a misdemeanor. Were a criminal charge against Jose Ramiro Villaseñor on the basis of his violation of Penal Code § 25100 to be filed, a wedge would be driven between DeLimon, as Sebastian Villaseñor's legal counsel, and Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, since this would introduce a conflict between the legal interests of the father and son. Were such a

conflict to be introduced into the circumstance by the filing of a Penal Code § 25100 charge against Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, it is possible, perhaps even likely, that Jose Ramiro Villaseñor would discontinue his bankrolling of his son's defense. Such an eventuality, which would conceivably result in the San Bernardino County Public Defender's Office substituting in as Sebastian's legal counsel, would redound to the benefit of the district attorney's office, potentially putting it into a better position to map its way out of the conundrum it finds itself in with the Sebastian Villaseñor prosecution.

The circumstance is complicated by the consideration that Eastvale lies across the San Bernardino County/Riverside County boundary

from Ontario. Thus, the Penal Code § 25100 charge against Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, if indeed it is to be filed, would be handled by the Riverside County District Attorney's Office in Riverside County Superior Court. While there is no indication that Riverside County authorities are in any way contemplating a Penal Code § 25100 charge or any charges whatsoever against Jose Ramiro Villaseñor, it is a simple truism that Riverside County District Attorney Mike Hestrin, who has been his county's top prosecutor since 2015, and Anderson have maintained an open, cordial and cooperative relationship. It is widely anticipated Hestrin would extend his fellow top prosecutor agency-to-agency privilege and quickly move to have his

deputy prosecutors assist the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office on any case or cases in which there is an overlap between the San Bernardino County and Riverside County jurisdictions.

As of Monday, there were what well placed individuals said were "intense" and "ruthless" discussions ongoing between representatives of the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office and DeLimon. The *Sentinel* is reliably informed that those talks, which ironically involved a degree of intimidation on the part of prosecutors, have resulted in a tentative agreement to have Sebastian Villaseñor plead guilty to some order of a crime under Penal Code § 136, most likely Penal Code § 136.1, which prohibits dissuading, intimidating

and/or tampering with a witness.

Penal Code § 136.1 can be charged as a misdemeanor or a felony. If prosecuted as a misdemeanor, it can result in a sentence of up to a year in county jail and a \$1,000 fine. Felony witness dissuasion, intimidation or tampering can result in a sentence of up to four years in state prison and a \$10,000 fine. The deal, which has not been finalized, would tentatively entail, the *Sentinel* is informed, Villaseñor, if convicted on the misdemeanor version of Penal Code § 136.1, remaining in jail no longer than the one-year duration contained within the statute, minus time already served, or, if he is convicted on the felony version of Penal Code § 136.1, being favored with a recommendation by pros-

ecutors that any time in state prison be waived, such that he is sentenced only to time served. The deal will involve probation that would specify an intense mental health treatment regimen.

Neither the district attorney's office nor its official spokeswoman, Jacqueline Rodriguez, responded to efforts by the *Sentinel* to obtain confirmation of its efforts to arrive at a plea bargain relating to the prosecution of Villaseñor.

Generically, Anderson has stated that he is providing the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office with "ethical and committed leadership" which has "restored ethics and fairness" to the way prosecutions are handled within the county.

-Mark Gutglueck

Garcia Facing Seven Felonies, 13 Enhancements & Two Consecutive Sentence Conditions For Killing McDonald *from page 8*

represented by Deputy District Attorney Jason Gueltzow. Garcia was represented by attorney William Sasnet.

Not guilty pleas were entered on the seven

felonies - PC187(A)-F, PC664-PC215(A)-F, PC664-PC211-F2, PC664-PC187(A)-F, PC664-PC187(A)-F, PC245(B)-F and PC245(B)-F - and the

13 sentencing enhancements - PC12022.53(C)-E, PC12022.53(B)-E, PC12022.53(D)-E, PC12022.53(B)-E, PC12022.53(C)-E, PC12022.53(C)-E, PC12022.53(B)-E, PC12022.53(D)-E, PC12022.53(C)-E, PC12022.53(B)-E, PC12022.53(C)-E and PC12022.53(B)-E - al-

leged against him. In addition, he pleaded not guilty with regard to what the district attorney's office alleges were conditional circumstances related to the crimes he is charged with - two separate PC12022.5(A)-(D)-A use-of-a-firearm conditions - which if affirmed at trial would require

that any sentences he is given on those crimes run consecutively rather than concurrently.

Officials with the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center stated McDonald, who had enlisted in the Marines in 2010, was serving at the time of his death as an operational contract support specialist.

The base in reaction to his death solemnly pronounced, "The base command is grieving along with the McDonald family and Sergeant McDonald's fellow Marines and is working diligently to provide them with all necessary support during this very painful time."

-Mark Gutglueck

Despite Violating The U.S. Constitution On Second Amendment Grounds, Fontana's Political Sign Ordinance Will Stand Unless It is Contested In A Court Challenge *from page 8*

regulate signs based on content. I can't give you a definitive and binding legal opinion based solely on my limited five-to-ten minute reading and analysis of the resolution and ordinance, but as I look at the resolution, it appears to violate the First Amendment."

Beyond that, the intent of imposing the fee is dubious, Loy said.

"If they are going to extend that type of benefit to one class, if they

are going to allow those who pay the fee to post their signs, that is selectively extending a benefit based on the content of speech," he said. "They are still distinguishing or discriminating based on the type or content of the signs. That in itself creates a serious question based on its compliance with the First Amendment."

Loy acknowledged that given its authority and control over the machinery of municipal government and the enforcement of the city's codes, the city council is in a position to impose an unconstitutional ordinance until someone or some entity legally challenges what it is doing.

"That is the process and how it works," Loy said, indicating that residents merely resenting the regulations con-

tained in the ordinance or verbally objecting to them will not prevent the ordinance from being

Begrudgingly, The Rest Of The SB City Council Finds Itself Conceding That Maybe Calvin Was Right About Montoya After All *from page 5*

an opportunity to rebut the evidence against her had been under way in the offices of Vanir Tower since last month, under the guidance of Montoya.

With the revelations of the last two weeks, however, taken together with Montoya's demise, the head of steam driving the censure effort against Calvin may have been attenuated, at least somewhat. Of consideration is

enforced. He said a legal challenge would need to be mounted to prevent the ordinance from re-

that Calvin, who failed to qualify for the ballot during what should have been her first council re-elective effort in March 2024 after her maiden election to the city coun-



Kim Calvin

cil in 2020, lost this year's election in which she ran as a write-in candidate to Mario Flores, and thus will leave office in December, making her censure largely

maining on the books.

"The remedy is for someone to take it to court and have a judge

moot. More pointedly, however, it was Calvin who since shortly after Montoya was selected as city manager led the charge in assailing his managerial approach and in particular questioned his closeness to Stifel Financial Services, his willingness to hire the company without any competitive bidding and the letter of intent to work with the company on bond issuances he unilaterally drafted and signed in January, while the rest of the council docilely went along with Montoya's action. The shift in the council's collective perception of Montoya that has taken place this month might have bled into the view

decide whether it should be enforced or not," he said.

-Mark Gutglueck

a majority of its members had about what they previously considered to be Calvin's negative attitude and lack of willingness to be a team player on a team being managed by Montoya. It remains to be seen whether the council as a whole will perpetuate under Clayton the direction it gave to Montoya to move forward with Calvin's censure hearing, which could come as early as next month.

There remains speculation that the council may request Clayton to explore rescinding Montoya's firing of Whitehorn. There has been no indication yet, however, of the city making such a move.