

Colton City Council Gearing Up To Provide Itself With A 400 Percent Pay Hike

By Mark Gutglueck
The Colton City Council is fixing to give itself a 400 percent raise, a move which will make its five members the second-most financially burdensome set of municipal officials in San Bernardino County when the cost of their remuneration is considered from the standpoint of the per capita cost borne by city residents.

The move comes three years after the council induced Colton’s voters to pass Measure S, which imposed on them and those shopping in the Hub City a one-cent per dollar sales tax. In the few days since the city council on a 3-to-2 vote on November 4 instructed city staff to ready a resolution and ordinance that will raise the \$400 per month stipend council members receive to attend two meetings per

month to \$1,600, some residents have expressed the view that the council, in particular those members who stumped for the approval of the tax measure, misled and misdirected the voters by promising the money would be used for “general municipal services and to ward off a budget deficit and service reductions,” rather than to line their own pockets. Some of those residents, while

conceding the council for a considerable time had forgone a pay increase and was perhaps entitled to a modest stipend adjustment, were nonetheless taken aback by the way in which the three moved in to grant themselves the maximum increase they can claim under California law.

The council did not take action to institute the increases Tuesday

night, but directed city staff to draft the documents needed to effectuate the change, including a payment schedule, a city code adjustment, an ordinance and resolution to do so at its next meeting. That direction came from council members Kelly Chastain, John Echevarria and David Toro. It was opposed by Councilman Gonzales and Mayor . Based on statements at **See P 2**

Documents
Withheld From
Two Dissident
County School
Board Members

By Carlos Avalos
Officials and personnel with the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Office withheld communications from the California Fair Political Practices Commission to at least two of the members of the San Bernardino County Board of Education.

In San Bernardino County, as in most of the other 57 counties in California, there are a multiplicity of entities and independently elected individuals who have stewardship over public education processes.

Throughout the county there are 33 school districts, including 20 unified school districts, 11 elementary school districts and two high school districts. Each of those districts, which serve a localized area within the county, is overseen by elected board members, who have the authority to hire a superintendent to, essentially lead the district and administer its educational programs.

In addition, the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, whose authority does not extend to the operation of the various school districts in the county but rather function as an intermediary between the state and the county’s school districts, and provide advocacy for the districts with regard to specialized requests for state and federal assistance, and to facilitate a wide range of services to support students, families, and educators. This includes monitoring educational programs, offering direct support through spe- **See P 2**

San Bernadino Councilwoman Sues City Over PD’s Political Use Of Criminal Database

San Bernardino Councilwoman Treasure Ortiz on Wednesday filed a lawsuit against the City of San Bernardino, the union representing its police officers and five former city employees in Riverside Federal Court, alleging members of the San Bernardino Police Department used federal, state and local databases that are restricted to law enforce-

ment activity for political purposes in an effort to prevent her 2024 election.

Ortiz was elected to represent San Bernardino’s 7th Ward on the city council in 2024, capturing the top spot but less than a majority of the vote in that year’s March primary when she outpolled the incumbent, Damon Alexander, and former City Attorney

Jim Penman. Ortiz then prevailed in the November 2024 run-off against Penman, capturing 3,929 votes of 55.78 percent to Penman’s 3,115 votes or 44.22 percent.

Ortiz previously competed, unsuccessfully, for mayor in 2022, finishing fourth in a field of &,7, and came up short in 2019 when she ran to represent the city’s 3rd Ward. Those followed

her unsuccessful bid in 2018 to obtain appointment to replace James Ramos as San Bernardino County Third District supervisor following his election to the California Assembly.

Ortiz’s long-recognized political ambition has gone hand-in-hand with her criticism of the governmental and political establishment, characterized by her acerbic

observations about the integrity and wisdom of various officeholders and high-ranking governmental staff.

Ortiz’s approach has had the effect of uniting sitting politicians and certain interest groups against her, in some cases consisting of unlikely coalitions of incumbent politicians who were not previously aligned or affiliated and in**See P 3**

Jake Haro Given 25-Years-To-Life In The Killing of Baby Emmanuel

Jake Haro, who on October 16 abruptly pleaded guilty to killing his 7-month-old son, was given a 25-years-to-life prison term for that crime at his sentencing hearing on Monday, November 3.

Tacked on to that time will be 180 days for filing a false police report, which occurred when he and his wife initially

contacted authorities about their child’s “disappearance” in August. The long arm of the law having at last caught up with him, he will also be required to serve the entirety of a 6-year sentence for having severely physically abused Emmanuel’s now 7-year-old half sister, as a result of his having violated the conditional **See P 3**

Saldivar Charged With 9 Felonies, Single Misdemeanor With 7 Enhancements For Killing Nuñez& Mad Flight

Angelo Jose Saldivar, who on October 27 gunned down San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Deputy Andrew Nuñez, on November 5 entered not guilty pleas on ten criminal charges and denied seven felony enhancements filed against him by the San Bernardino County District Attorney’s Office two days previously.

Nunez was killed while responding to a domestic disturbance call involving Saldivar and his wife. Saldivar then led Nuñez’s sheriff’s department colleagues and other law enforcement officers on a harrowing chase sometimes reaching 150 miles per hour across six jurisdictions as he fled on a motorcycle.

On November 3, 2025, the San Bernardino County District Attorney’s Office charged Saldivar with one count of violating PC 187(a) – murder; one count of violating PC207(a) – attempted kidnapping; four counts of violating PC245(b) – assault with a semiautomatic firearm; one count of PC246.3(a) – discharge of a **See P 3**

Death On The Morongo Valley Highway: Where Is The Line Between Mishap & Murder?

James Tappon and Christopher Garcia are dead. They might still be alive if others had been more careful or a bit less hotheaded. Were they killed unnecessarily? Most certainly. Were they murdered? Should those critically involved be held accountable? What will society – in this case the Morongo community – decide? Or will it decide at all? With

what moral authority can it speak?

On On October 31 at 3:01 p.m., Frank Stiffens, 68, of Yucca Valley was driving his 2009 Dodge Durango north and Tappon, 69. was driving a 2015 Fort Fiesta south on Yucca Mesa Road north of Sunflower Drive.

From what California Highway Patrol investigators can piece together, the Durango drifted

across the solid double yellow line and the left front of Stiffens’ vehicle smashed into the left front ofTappon’s car, resulting in major damage to both vehicles. Stibbens was seriously injured. Tappon, into whom the driver compartment had folded, was killed.

Stibbens, who was hospitalized, has, based on investigators’ conclusions, been charged with

murder, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated and two counts of driving under the influence causing injury. Upon his release from the hospital, he was jailed at West Valley Detention Center, and is being held on \$1 million bond.

Stibbens was arraigned before Judge Sarah Oliver on Wednesday morning November

5. Prosecutors presented a folder relating to Stibbens containing the CHP’s preliminary findings with regard to the October 31 collision and Stibbens driving/vehicle code/criminal history in San Bernardino County.

Inn 2007, he was charged and convicted of violating PC273.5(A)-M: inflicting corporal injury on a spouse or cohabitant, a **See P 2**

Stibbons Had A History Of Getting Behind The Wheel While Liquored Up Before Crash That Killed Tappan *from front page*

misdemeanor, for which he was sentenced to 180 days in jail.

In 2011 Stibbons was charged with VC23152(A)-M: driving under the influence, a misdemeanor, and pleaded no contest to the charge in 2012.

In 2011, he was charged and convicted with driving under the influence and convicted.

In 2012, Stibbons was charged with driving

while intoxicated and driving without a license and with driving while his license was suspended for driving while intoxicated. In 2013 the driving while intoxicated and driving with a license that was suspended for driving while intoxicated charges were dismissed and he was convicted of driving a vehicle without a license.

In 2020 he was charged with driving

under the influence and driving while his license was suspended for having driven under the influence. He entered a guilty plea to VC23103(a)-M: wet reckless driving, a misdemeanor. Wet reckless driving is a plea reduction provided by the court in driving under the influence cases. Stibbons obtained this disposition by agreeing to attend and complete the Senate Bill 38 alcohol rehabilitation program.

In 2024 Stibbons was charged with driving

while his license was suspended for driving under the influence and with speeding. In 2015, both of those charges were dismissed.

During the November 5 arraignment hearing, Judge Oliver heard his not guilty pleas to PC187: murder; PC191.5(A)-F.; gross vehicular manslaughter; VC23153(A)-F, driving under the influence and causing bodily injury, as well as his denials of the sentencing enhancements/special allegations of having been previously

convicted of driving under the influence, and a sentencing enhancement for causing great bodily injury while driving intoxicated. She confirmed continuing his bail at \$1 million and appointed the public defender's office to represent him.

Stibbons is to appear before Judge Oliver on November 12 for a pre-preliminary hearing before Judge James Taylor for a preliminary hearing on November 13.

On October 27 at around 7:30 p.m., 50-year-old Christopher

Garcia was driving his wife's Chevy Malibu on Highway 62, also known as the Twentynine Palms Highway, in Morongo Valley.

In the car was his wife, Christina, whom he had married in June, and his 6-year-old stepdaughter. Even before they had gotten to near the top of the Morongo Grade, where he turned off onto Hess Boulevard to continue home, the driver of a vehicle behind them – a pickup truck – was, according to

Continued on Page 7

Núñez Arrived At Domestic Disturbance Between Saldivar & His Wife *from front page*

firearm; one count of violating PC236 – false imprisonment by violence; one count of violating PC243(e)(1) – battery on a spouse and one count of violating VC 2800.2(a) – evading an officer.

The district attorney's office also included a PC12022.53 sentencing enhancement/special allegations with the murder charge, the attempted

kidnapping charge, the four counts of assault with a semiautomatic firearm and the one count of discharge of a firearm pertaining to murder to avoid arrest, murder of a police officer, personal and intentional discharge of a firearm and the use of a firearm in commission of the assaults. The four assault charges relate to Saldivar's alleged intimidation of those who on October 27 called the sheriff's department to report what appeared to be a violent and escalating confrontation between Saldivar and his ex-wife.

Deputies responded at around 12:30 pm on Monday, October 27 to reports of a disturbance, including what was believed to be the discharge of a firearm at 12346 Hollyhock Drive Unit 2 in Rancho Cucamonga, the residence of Saldivar's ex-wife, Veronica Garcia Saldivar, also known as Veronica Garcia Zaragosa. Veronica had obtained a finalized divorce decree in July. Neighbors reported to the sheriff's dispatch center that Saldivar was trying force Veronica into a car at gunpoint.

Núñez, 27, a five-year

veteran of the sheriff's department who had been stationed in Rancho Cucamonga for four of those years, was either the first or the second deputy to arrive as members of the sheriff's department converged on the Hollyhock Drive residence.

Both Angelo and Veronica are known to have owned numerous firearms, although it is not clear whether the sheriff's department had institutional knowledge about their gun ownership or whether, if the department had that information, the re-

sponding deputies were warned.

Upon the arrival of the deputies, Angelo apparently retreated into the condominium he once shared with his wife and their teenage daughter. It is believed, but has not been confirmed, that he may have armed himself with at least one and perhaps two of his wife's firearms at that point.

After remaining for a short time inside the condominium, Angelo Saldivar emerged, at which point Núñez was the closest deputy to the condominium's entrance. It is not clear

whether Núñez had oriented himself properly as to location or whether he knew that the domestic disturbance was centered at Unit 2 at the 12346 Hollyhock Drive address or an adjoining unit or property. To the nearby residents who were observing the goings-on, it did not appear that Núñez, who was standing near his patrol unit with the driver's side door open, saw Angelo Saldivar on the porch or, if he did, recognized he was the individual at the center of the incident he had been called to.

Continued on Page 5

Investigators Paradoxically Cut To The Heart Of the Haro Case But Simultaneously Missed Out On Some Important Clues & Evidence *from front page*

parole he was granted when that earlier sentence was suspended. As a consequence, barring some unforeseen eventuality, Haro, 32, will remain imprisoned for the next 31 years.

Despite the criminal case against Haro having drawn to a close, the public – and perhaps even court, prosecutorial and law enforcement

authorities – remain in the dark over what, precisely, or even inexactly, happened to Baby Emmanuel.

The case involved, paradoxically, a remarkable set of investigative efficiencies and obtuse acts on the part of the detectives assigned to what is now officially determined to have been a murder, as well as both

the helpful and obstructive efforts of the new-fangled class of social media "influencers."

The extraordinarily twisted and not-totally-resolved case lurched into public consciousness on August 14, when Rebecca Haro, Jake's 41-year-old wife, came forward with a harrowing report of Emmanuel's kidnapping. According to Rebecca, whose story was verified in most of its particulars by Jake, the couple, who lived in the Riverside

County community of Cabazon, had come to Yuciapa late that afternoon with Emmanuel, Emmanuel's three-year-old sibling and Emmanuel's ten-year-old half brother so the ten-year-old could participate in a youth football scrimmage/practice at the outdoor sports complex in the city. She left the complex to go to the nearby Big 5 sporting goods store to purchase a mouthguard for her stepson. When she paused to change Emmanuel's

diaper with the child laid out in on the family vehicle's backseat while the park was parked in the Big 5 parking lot, she claimed, a man came up behind her, greater her in Spanish and then bashed her over the head. When she came to, she said, Emmanuel was gone.

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, which serves as the contract police department in Yucaipa, swung into immediate action upon receiving the report.

An examination of video footage taken from security cameras in the parking lot, nearby stores and the surrounding area did not confirm but did not rule out the veracity of Rebecca's version of events. Her story was in some measure supported by a black left eye she appeared to have sustained in the incident.

An all points bulletin went out for Emmanuel and anyone seen or with a child who resembled him, which led within

Continued on Page 8

County Schools Office Features A Powerful Superintendent & What Is Supposed To Be An Independent School Board *from front page*

cialized programs like special education and alternative education, and collaborating with districts, communities, and other agencies to pro-

mote educational equity and success.

There is also an overarching San Bernardino County Board of Education, which has no direct say over the operation of the county's individual districts, but serves in an oversight capacity with regard to educational issues in general throughout the county. In addition, the county board of education approves the county superintendent if

school's budget, adopts policy goals and recommendations for the county's school districts and serves as an appeal body for student expulsion and transfer cases. The board also works in coordination with the county superintendent of schools to support local school districts through leadership, advocacy, and services, while ensuring the individual districts comply with state and federal

regulations.

The county superintendent of schools, the individual members of the county school board and the individual local school board members are ostensibly independently elected, and the function and operations of the individual school districts are independent from each other and not directly subject to the authority of the other entities. Nevertheless,

the commonality in the local and county school boards' educational purposes, the frequency of similarity in the area of policies, the oversight functions of the county superintendent of schools and the county school board with regard to the local school districts in multiple respects creates an atmosphere of collegiality and congeniality among elected educational offi-

cials in general.

More pointedly, the arrangement by which the county school board controls the purse strings of the county superintendent of schools creates an incentive for the superintendent to form a positive and accommodating relationship with its members.

While a precept of the American reliance on a democratic system to

Continued on Page 6

In Her First Political Go-Round As A Councilwoman And Then As Mayor, Chastain Championed Policies That Exacerbated Colton's Financial Challenges *from page*

those who questioned city policies or Colton City Council decisions in which Chastain voted in the majority.

At the end of 2007, the economic downturn which would become known as “The Great Recession” created severe financial hardship for governmental entities across the country as a consequence of diminishing tax revenue. Cities in Southern California were no exception to that trend. Colton, under the leadership of Chastain, Parrish and Nuami proved particularly ill-equipped to deal with the challenges. Rather than making across-the-board economies that uniformly reduced municipal programs in proportional increments, the three remained intent on maintaining a hierarchical approach to reducing Colton's governmental spending which spared those at the top of the totem pole to the detriment of those at the bottom of the city's structure. Ultimately, Chastain, the Chastain-led council and Parrish settled upon laying off 60 Colton employees, and used Nuami – the grim reaper – to deliver the news to those being axed.

When Parrish made his exit from the city to take on the city manager's post with the City of Covina in 2009, Nuami was not put into the position of interim city manager, but was rather replaced on a temporary basis by Police Chief Bob Miller, partially because of the state law that discouraged a mayor of another city from serving as city manager but also because it was understood that Nuami simply did not have ability to manage a city unsupervised and that he was in place not because of his operational know-how but his ability to be of political value to Chastain and run interference for her.

It was decided that given the hard feelings engendered by the strat-

egy Chastain, Parrish and Nuami used in attempting to overcome the city's financial challenges, it was best that Nuami himself go. Unlike with the other “expendables” at the city, in handing himself a pink slip, Nuami conferred upon himself, with Chastain's concurrence, a “golden parachute,” i.e., a hefty severance package.

Colton hired as Parrish's ultimate replacement, Rod Foster, who had been assistant city manager in both Hesperia and Upland, as well as the acting/interim city manager in Hesperia and the de facto though not official city manager in Upland. Upon coming in to Colton, Foster recognized that the belated strategy that Chastain, Parrish and Nuami had brought to bear in the face of the economic downturn was wholly inadequate and that Colton was yet underneath a fiscal crisis that threatened the city's solvency and had it teetering on the brink of bankruptcy, raising the possibility that it would need to dissolve its charter, relinquish its municipal status and become an administrative zone of San Bernardino County.

Foster, cognizant of who the political wheeling and dealing engaged in by Chastain and Nuami was a major factor in the city's dire financial circumstance and that Chastain's moral authority, understanding of practical circumstance and control over the city council as it was then composed was at best tenuous, effectively ignored here attempts resist his recovery plan and pushed it through. This included imposing on all city employees, including himself, a ten percent reduction in pay.

In the run-up to 2010 election, the financial mismanagement of the city during Chastain's tenure as mayor was obvious and a multitude of scandals had taken

their toll upon Chastain's reputation. She was swept from office in November, and former Colton Community Development Director Zamora was elected to replace her as mayor. In 2016, Chastain sought to get back into the political game, running again in District 3 against the then incumbent, Frank Navarro, who handily beat her, 1,127 votes or 61.69 percent to 700 votes or 38.31 percent. In 2022, as Colton was effectuating a reduction of the city council from a mayor elected at large along with six council positions representing six separate districts to a mayor elected at large with four council positions representing as many districts, Chastain mounted another political comeback attempt. In the redrawn council map, Chastain had been placed into the new District 2, which was represented by Kenneth Koperski, then the District 3 incumbent. In that year's Colton Municipal Election, voters had also been asked to consider Measure S, a one cent per dollar sales tax initiative. Placed on the ballot by the city council, Measure S was needed, city officials said, because the city, which was no longer in danger of having to disincorporate, was nevertheless still behind the eight ball financially. In promoting Measure S, a handbill put out by the city council stated the approximate \$9,500,000 to be generated in sales tax annually if the measure passed would be used exclusively to supplement the city's “general municipal services, including fire, police, and emergency 911 medical response, repair streets, sidewalks and street light, clean and maintain parks, recreational, and community facilities, provide library services, as well as fund after-school programs, provide services for senior citizens, homelessness response; and engage in gang/drug interdiction and crime prevention,” a city document that essentially promoted the measure stated. “In re-

cent years, the city's ability to maintain these services has become more challenging due to operating costs rising at a faster pace than revenues. The city has been operating with fewer employees, has instituted a hiring freeze, and has been applying for grants. Based on current projections, unless a new revenue source is identified, the city faces substantial budget deficits and service reductions. Measure S provides a way to close the budget gap.”

Chastain, in her campaign and independently, went on record as being opposed to Measure S.

While Measure S received an overwhelming endorsement of 5,110 or 66.7 percent of the voters throughout the city with 2,551 or 33.3 percent in opposition, in the city's Second District, Chastain brought in 952 or 59.06 percent of the vote to defeat Koperski, who polled or 660 votes or 40.94 percent.

In laying out the options with regard to the increase in council pay, city staff said the council could take no action and leave the current arrangement, by which the council receives a \$440 per month stipend and a \$242 per month vehicle allowance in place. It further stated the city council could elect to give itself what the staff report characterized as a “modest increase” [to] \$800-1,000 monthly total compensation” to consist of “a modest increase of \$558-758 salary + \$242 auto allowance, or consolidated into a single \$800-1,000 salary.” According to the report provided by city staff, “This level matches averages in cities like Highland (population 57,000; approximately \$800 monthly) or Apple Valley (population 75,000; approximately \$800). This level provides a measured response to inflation without approaching the state maximum.” On the positive side, according to staff, this “addresses basic cost of living and opportunity costs for part-time service” makes for a “low fiscal burden [which] encour-

ages public support [and] promotes equity without overcommitting resources, potentially improving candidate pools.” On the downside, paying the council that amount “may not fully resolve recruitment barriers in a high-cost region like the Inland Empire” Colton would still lag behind some cities which have increased their council compensation in the aftermath of a state law – Senate Bill 329 – which allows general law cities to up council pay to \$1,600 per month, such that in the future the council would need to engage in a further review of the compensation level and adjust it upward “if inflation persists.”

The staff report also said the council should contemplate giving itself a “moderate increase [to] \$1,200-1,400 monthly total compensation,” which the report described as “a balanced midpoint within the statutory bracket, e.g., \$958 salary + \$242 auto allowance, or consolidated \$1,200 salary.” This was presented as being “rational and comparable” to council salaries provided in other jurisdictions such as 73,000-population Redlands and 51,000-population Redlands, which pay their council members approximately \$1,400. “It balances the need to address intensified duties (e.g., regional collaboration on housing and infrastructure) with fiscal responsibility,” the staff report states. This would, on the good side, according to city staff, provide “meaningful recognition of time commitments and cost pressures, potentially attracting more diverse candidates” and foster “equity with staff raises” while serving as a “midpoint” salary that “avoids extremes while signaling commitment to effective governance.” It would have “moderate taxpayer impact,” the report said, and “might not fully compete with higher-paying nearby cities.”

According to the staff report, the city council had the option of pro-

viding its members with the “full statutory maximum [of] \$1,600 monthly total compensation” which would “maximize the population-based cap under Government Code Section 36516, structured as sub-option A, retain[ing the] automobile allowance [by providing] \$1,358 salary + \$242 auto allowance or sub-option B, consolidat[ing] and eliminating the] automobile allowance) [with a] single \$1,600 salary. The report said this was “rationale and comparable” to “cities like Lodi (San Joaquin County, population 67,000; approved \$1,600 in 2024 post-SB 329) [and] in the Inland Empire, [where] smaller cities lag [but] larger ones like San Bernardino (\$3,125 monthly, higher bracket) and Riverside (\$3,811 monthly) show trends toward fuller utilization of the state law caps.” On the positive side, according to the report, this “fully compensates for responsibilities and inflation, enhancing diversity and retention (e.g., reducing financial barriers for non-wealthy candidates); aligns with SB 329's intent to update outdated caps.” On the downside, according to the staff report, going to a stipend of \$1,600 would have the “highest fiscal impact [and be] perceived as [a] significant raise despite historical underutilization [of pay increase options.”

The staff report cautioned the council that “Any adjustment to city council and mayor compensation would result in increased expenditures from the general fund, with the exact amount varying based on the selected option and level of increase. For instance, modest adjustments could add several thousand dollars annually, while adopting the full statutory maximum might increase costs by tens of thousands. These impacts would only materialize upon full implementation after the next municipal election, ensuring no immediate budget strain during current terms. Overall, the fiscal implications

Continued on Page 6

After Ambusing Nuñez, Saldivar Mounted His Motorcycle To Make An Unsuccessful High Speed Effort To Flee *from page 3*

var then raised the gun and fired a single shot at Nuñez, who was no more than 50 to 55 feet away, hitting him in the head.

There are conflicting reports as to whether Saldivar fired more shots at other deputies on the scene, or if the gun shots heard by some bystanders were ones fired by deputies positioned outside the bystanders’ line of sight. Saldivar apparently went back into the condominium, at some point either exiting the condominium from an alternate exit at the back of the building or finding his way into the enclosure of another unit, and from there making his way to his motorcycle. As he was heading away, wearing a backpack and dark helmet and visor, he was spotted by deputies, who gave chase up Day Creek Boulevard. Saldivar then made his way onto the 210 Freeway headed west. There ensued a chase, with the motorcycle far ahead of the pack, accelerating

to a speed well in excess of 120 miles per hour and, at one point for a short distance, reaching nearly 150 miles per hour, as Saldivar, blasted past cars traveling at 55, 60, 65, and 70 miles per hour.

He continued west on the 210, but at Fruit Street, he exited from the freeway, turned south and then abruptly got back onto the freeway, heading east. He sped along, zooming to well above 100 miles per hour for a span, weaving through the slower traffic but then slowing to a more conventional speed in the 65-to-75-mile-per hour range, as if he were trying to blend in with the other vehicles on the freeway. At that point, however, such a tactic was virtually impossible, as the Highway Patrol, the Claremont Police Department, the La Verne Police Department, the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department had joined the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department in the pursuit, and his dangerous and erratic activity had resulted in at least two helicopters – one with a law enforcement agency and another with a television station following him from overhead.

At one point, a pur-

suing CHP motorcycle caught up with him while he was attempting to cruise along inconspicuously after having dropped into the range of 60-to-65 miles per hour, and he accelerated away once more. At what he took to be a comfortable distance in front of the CHP motorcycle, he slowed once more and took both hands off the handlebars as he armed himself with a handgun he pulled out of his backpack and appeared to be loading it with bullets. As he was nearing Campus Avenue in Upland, Saldivar and his motorcycle were about to pass on the left, as had been the case several hundred times over the previous fifteen minutes or so, another slower-moving vehicle in the Diamond Lane, a gray Toyota. Unbeknownst to Saldivar, at the wheel of the Toyota was an off-duty San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department narcotics division detective.

As the motorcycle closed the distance behind it, the Toyota made an at first subtle drift to its left followed by a somewhat sharper movement across the yellow line separating the Diamond Lane from the inner freeway shoulder. Saldiver reacted to

adjust, but at the speed he was traveling at that point – about 68 miles per hour – not in time to avoid having the motorcycle’s front tire plunge into the Toyota’s driver’s side of the car. The impact launched Saldivar in an arc headed over the hood of the car as the driver deftly steered right, avoiding hitting Saldivar who flipped in mid-air and landed on his back on the inner shoulder of the road.

It appeared that two firearms that were in the backpack fell out onto the pavement, when Saldivar’s arms came out of the rucksack’s straps as he was tumbling before coming into contact with the ground.

The motorcycle, meanwhile, careened more sharply leftward than the rider it had now lost, hitting into the retaining while between the eastbound and westbound lanes of the freeway, then bouncing and flipping to come down, temporarily, on Salvidar, as both the bike’s and the man’s momentum carried them eastward.

Within three minutes, at least 21 law enforcement vehicles were parked across four of the lanes west and behind where Saldivar came to rest. Several officers

swarmed him, and he was taken into custody. He was airlifted to a hospital after being tended to by paramedics.

He was deemed to be in condition to allow him to leave the hospital. He was transferred to the West Valley Detention Center, where he was placed on a no-bail hold and was booked into custody on suspicion of violating PC245(B) assault on a person with a semiautomatic firearm, violating PC422(A) willfully threatening to engage in criminal activity with the intention of terrorizing a victim or victims and PC417(B) brandishing or exhibiting a loaded firearm at or near a day care center where youth programs are being conducted. He was not booked on a murder charge.

Saldivar was scheduled to appear for arraignment on November 4 before Judge Shannon Faherty but did not appear, at which point he was rescheduled to appear later before Judge Faherty, but had not yet been transported to court by 10 a.m., whereupon his hearing was rescheduled for 11 a.m. before Judge katrina West. He still had not been transported to court from

where he was held.

On November 5, he appeared before Judge Shannon Faherty. Representing the People of California was San Bernardino County Deputy district Attorney Jonathan Robbins. Saldivar was represented by Deputy Public Defender Andrew Moll.

Saldivar pleaded not guilty to the murder, four assault with a semi-automatic fire on a person, discharge of a firearm with gross negligence, evading a peace officer with wanton disregard for safety, false imprisonment and battery on a former spouse charges and denying the special allegations accompanying seven of those charges.

Judge Faherty confirmed the public defender’s office as his legal representative. She then set his pre-preliminary hearing and for confirmation of counsel for November 10 at 8:30 am in Department R18 at the Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse before Judge Maggie Yang. He is also scheduled to be denied bail at that hearing. Judge Faherty scheduled his preliminary hearing for November 12 at 8:30 am, also before Judge Maggie Yang.

--Mark Gutglueck

It Appears, And Police Chief Indicated, The San Bernardino Police Union Accessed A Law Enforcement Database To Formulate A Political Attack On Councilwoman *from page 2*

the CLETS file relating to Ortiz. Goodman told Ortiz and Beard that there was no conceivable legitimate law enforcement operational justification for the department accessing Ortiz’s file.

Ortiz was elected in November and on on March 28, 2025, more than three months after having been sworn in to office, she filed a \$2 million claim against the city over the police department’s access if the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System to obtain information relating to her and the application of that data in the campaign against her. The San Bernardino City Coun-

cil rejected that claim on May 5, 2025.

In making that rejection, the city claimed Desrochers had done nothing untoward, wrong or illegal.

“The city’s review of this matter determined that the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, also known as CLETS, was lawfully accessed by authorized law enforcement personnel in March of 2020,” Mayor Helen Tran said on May 5. “The city’s investigation finds the claim to be frivolous, filed in bad faith, dishonest and an attempt to swindle the city of San Bernardino out of \$2 million.”

According to Mayor Tran, “In her initial report of the matter to Chief Goodman, and in numerous social-media posts and recorded videos, she [Ortiz] stated that she has never been arrested. Following a thorough review of facts and circumstances surrounding the original report to Mr. Goodman and the claim that she filed, the city finds the information in the claim to be false and dishonest. For the reasons uncovered during the investigation into her allegations and a review of this claim, the city denies the claim.”

Under California law, those seeking redress against a governmental entity alleging to have been wronged, damaged or injured by the governmental entity or its employees have six months

from the date of the injury or the date of the discovery of the injury to file a claim, where upon the governmental entity has 45 days to acknowledge or reject the claim. A citizen then has six months from the time of the rejection of the claim to file suit in state court or, if a denial is not registered within 45 days, two years to file suit.

In making its denial of Ortiz’s claim, the city when beyond its usual protocol of simply rejecting the claim to asserting that not only was there no substance to Ortiz’s allegations, but accusing her of dishonesty and daring her to proceed further in the legal process. Tran stated that if Ortiz were to file suit within the six month window then open to her to do so, “the city is put-

ting her and her attorney on notice it will seek to recover all attorney’s fees in cause and accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure Furthermore, given that the false claims were filed under the penalty of perjury and it is a crime to make a knowingly false claim against a police officer, the potential criminal conduct associated with the claim is being reviewed.”

Tran, who suggested that Ortiz’s credibility in general and as a public official was already shot, said that Ortiz was further playing with fire and risking even greater damage to her reputation in that the city was not going to observe the normal rules of confidentiality applied when public officials have embroiled themselves in controversy.

“Given that the filing of a \$2 million claim by a sitting council member is highly unusual and has been the subject of news and social media reports, the city will release information related to the investigation that was conducted and reviewed in connection with the claim,” Tran said.

In the ensuing five-plus months, the city made good on its threat, doing so in a series of statement made both on and off the record, the upshot of which was that Ortiz, whose stock-in-trade consists of vituperative, incendiary and deprecating comments against and regard to all order of public officials, is capable of dishing it out but cannot take it. Ortiz’s accusations were mired in self-serving truths, half-truths, quar-

Continued on Page 7

In Colton, Voting Block/Ruling Council Coalition Involving Chastain, Toro and Echevarria Has Evolved Of Late
from page 4

are manageable within the city’s budget, but they should be weighed against other priorities such as public services and infrastructure investments.”

It was Chastain who was the prime mover in having the city staff present the discussion of the council pay increase to the city.

Unstated in the staff report is that it is the revenue coming into the city as a consequence of the sales tax override approved with the passage of Measure S that is making increasing the city council stipend feasible. In pressing for the increase, it has been Chastain’s position that since she was not on the city council when Measure S was proposed, she was not a member of the city council as

it was then composed when a commitment was made to use the funds for civic needs other than a pay increase for the city council and since she was herself opposed to Measure S, she is not bound by the commitment the city made to the city’s voters in appealing to them to support the sales tax override initiative.

Chastain combined forces with Fourth District Councilman John Echevarria and First District Councilman David Toro in directing that staff provide them with an item relating to the council salary increase at an upcoming meeting.

Observers were alarmed at indications the trio were motivated by pecuniary interest in giving staff that direction.

Echevarria, who began his career in law enforcement with the Upland Police Department in 1996 and joined the San Bernardino Police Department in 2002, will be eligible to retire and receive a pension

equal to 100 percent of his highest level of pay in 2030, putting him on a trajectory to collect \$224,119 on a yearly basis for the rest of his life based on his law enforcement career alone. The increase to his council compensation on top of his pay from the City of San Bernardino carries with it the possibility his pension could be increased to as much as \$240,000 per year, depending on how long he remains in elected office.

Toro, who was first elected to the city council in 2006, is Colton’s longest consecutively and currently serving councilman. His more recent statements asserting that members of the council merited higher pay clashed with his past statements that suggested the financial benefit of holding public office should not be a consideration in an individual’s decision or willingness to seek election.

A pattern has emerged over the past two years in which Chastain, Echevarria and Toro have

supported items before the council which have had a significant monetary impact on franchisees, project proponents and businesses. Meanwhile, those entities positively impacted by those votes have expressed an interest in supporting the trio in the furtherance of their political careers. The Colton City Clerk’s Office, under former city clerks Helen Ramos, Eileen Gomez, Carolina Padilla, Acting City Clerk Stephanie and current City Clerk Isaac Suchil have an established tradition of making it virtually impossible for citizens examine the California Form 460 documents filed with the Colton City Clerk’s Office which disclose the donations provided to the city’s mayor and city council members. Unlike virtually every other city or town in San Bernardino County, Colton does not post the city’s elected officials’ Form 460 campaign disclosure documents on its website. Nor are the 460 documents available for

perusal at the city clerk’s office at City Hall. This lack of transparency, coupled with the lock-step voting among Chastain, Echevarria and Toro, has contributed to the perception that there is a hidden commonality of financial support for at least three-fifths of the current council that is driving public policy in Colton.

Simultaneously, the staff report pertaining to the council stipend increase options cited “potentially improving candidate pools” and “potentially attracting more diverse candidates,” while Chastain, Echevarria and Toro gave indication that they were supporting the stipend increase to infuse the council with new blood by bringing in new members to replace all or some of the council’s current five members, who have served an average of more than 12 years in office. None, however, have given indication that they are considering leaving office or abandoning the

power of incumbency. Statistically, incumbents fare significantly better in getting reelected than do their opponents in challenging them. The Colton City Council has taken no action to compel the Colton City Clerk to make available for public scrutiny the Form 460s they file which show the political advantage they maintain over their challengers and would-be challengers in terms of fundraising. These factors taken together, some Colton residents have said, are an indication that Chastain, Echevarria and Toro were being disingenuous at best when they asserted that upping the council’s pay would diversify or otherwise increase the pool of candidates for city council or result in a changeover of the council’s membership.

Chastain, who pegged the stipend currently provided to the council at \$682 per month, said she and her colleagues were being remunerated at a rate below the State

Continued on Page 13

Death On The Highway In Morongo Valley
from page 4

On October 27 at around 7:30 p.m., 50-year-old Christopher Garcia was driving his wife’s Chevy Malibu on Highway 62, also known as the Twentynine Palms Highway, in Morongo Valley.

In the car was his wife, Christina, whom he had married in June, and his 6-year-old stepdaughter. Even before they had gotten to near the top of the Morongo Grade, where he turned off onto Hess Boulevard to continue home, the driver of a vehicle behind them – a pickup truck – was, according to witnesses, “road raging.”

After the Malibu made the turn onto Hess and continued a short way at a relatively leisurely pace, the pickup made the turn, as well. In no time, since it was traveling faster, the pickup was on the Malibu’s tail. As Garcia slowed to stop at the intersection

of Hess and Senilis, the driver of the tailgating pickup flashed his vehicle’s high beams and then moved forward to bump into the back of the Malibu.

Christopher Garcia got out of his wife’s car and walked back to the truck. A verbal altercation ensued. After the shouting ended, Christopher Garcia began to walk back to the Malibu.

According to a statement from Christina, she got out of the car just as the argument was ending and her husband was walking back to my car, the driver of the pickup put his vehicle in reverse, backed up, and accelerated forward, ramming into the back of the Malibu, in which her 6-year-old daughter was yet seated. The pickup drive backed up once more and then veered left around the Malibu, striking Christopher Garcia and knocking him down in the process. Christopher was dragged under the pickup into the intersection.

According to Chris-

tine Garcia, when she reached her husband, he was still breathing.

A call reporting what had occurred came into the Morongo Valley emergency dispatch center at 7:38 p.m.

According to the sheriff’s department, “The California Highway Patrol was initially dispatched to the location for a vehicle versus pedestrian and possible hit

Subtle & Substantial Differences Have Surfaced Among Elected Educational Leaders
from page 3

provide the leadership of governmental agencies across the board and both up and down the hierarchy of jurisdictional authority is that those elected officials overseeing those agencies and jurisdictions should be independent of one another, the cordial relationships that have sprung up among many, indeed a vast majority,

and run. CHP requested deputies after they arrived on scene, because they determined the victim was intentionally struck by a vehicle.”

Christina Garcia said she did not get a good look at the pickup truck’s driver.

It was ascertained almost immediately after the Highway Patrol and a paramedic unit arrived that Christopher Garcia

of the officeholders in San Bernardino County’s educational system have compromised their autonomy. Rarely, although with enough frequency to be of note, there have been public education officials in San Bernardino County who have had both subtle and sharp differences with their fellow or sister board members or with county superintendent of schools.

With regard to those differences, there have been varying degrees of civility and acrimony as the disagreements these entail have been as-

was dead. Deputies for more than 11 hours remained at the scene, directing occasional traffic around the intersection, while Garcia’s body remained in place and both homicide and traffic investigators surveyed the area around where the death had occurred.

The sheriff’s department secured some trace evidence at the scene. The Malibu was

simulated into policies, standards or actions. In some cases, discussion and debate has ensued, with varying degrees of impact or effect, sometimes shifting or changing an approach or overall policy, sometimes to negligible effect, sometimes with no change in course whatsoever other than the airing of differing or different views. In other cases, those in the minority have found themselves disregarded and their ideas ignored entirely.

Sometimes the differences were ones relating to educational technique

seized as evidence and was towed away to the Morongo Valley Sheriff’s Department Station. Some clues as to the driver of the pickup are in the possession of the sheriff’s department, but no information is being publicly released, as, according to the department, “The investigation is continuing.”



and efficacy and/or the advisability or inadvisability innovative deviation from traditional methods of learning. Sometimes the difference extended to philosophy or social trends, attitudinal considerations and tolerance toward changing societal mores as well as the ideological, philosophical, religious or political preferences and affiliations of the board members.

On occasion, the differences pertained to venal motivation on the part of one board member, a set of board mem-

Continued on Page 15

City Disputes That
The Police Union
Utilized Confidential
Law Enforcement
Files In A Vendetta
Against Council-
woman *from page 5*

ter-truths, misleading assertions and outright falsehoods, the city propounded. No illegal or improper running of her name through law enforcement databases had taken place, it was asserted, and when she had been the subject of those searches, those queries grew out of a legitimate investigation or law enforcement operation. Most pointedly, it was hammered home, Chief Goodman had not said many of the things Ortiz attributed to him and she was misrepresenting the substance and meaning of other things that he had in fact said.

The reality was, city employees and officials said, there was much information in law enforcement databases that did not paint Ortiz in a pleasing light, and it would be just fine with them if Ortiz did file suit so that those salacious and uncomplimentary tidbits could be exposed in open court or in discovery documents as part of the litigative process.

As the November 5 deadline for Ortiz to file her suit grew closer and closer, day-by-day, week-by-week and month-by-month, the pronouncements from San Bernardino officials grew ever more definite, cocky and rude in predicting that Ortiz would not file suit.

With a dramatic flourish, Grand Terrace-based attorney Peter Schlueter, at what would have been the final day to file a lawsuit in state court, filed a lawsuit against the city on behalf of Ortiz, not ins San Bernardino County Superior Court but in federal court. Named in the suit are the City of San Bernardino, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association, former acting San Bernardino Police Chief Eric McBride, Desrochers, Police Officers

Association President Jose Loera, Penman and Goodman along with ten unnamed John Does.

The city was caught somewhat flatfooted by the filing of the suit, so much so that it turned to an attorney, Stephen Larson, who had previously represented a plaintiff in his and his company's successful lawsuit against the City of San Bernardino.

Whereas in 2024, Ortiz, who had yet to be elected to the city council, had what was, or appeared to be, the assistance and close support of Chief Goodman in her effort to stand off the political attacks utilizing information extrapolated from law enforcement databases, the police chief's readiness to back Ortiz after she was in office and on the losing side of a 7-to-1 divide between her and her six council colleagues and the mayor had been greatly attenuated by early 2025. Ortiz, after being sworn into office in December 2024, had worked quietly behind the scenes and in the back halls of San Bernardino's municipal offices to have the city come to terms with the police department's use of its facilities and assets for political purposes and hold those she believed had used confidential law enforcement data to account. When that did not occur, she filed her claim on March 28.

At that point, Goodman clearly sided with Tran, six of the members of the council, the city, the police department and the union. Statements were circulated that did not quote Goodman verbatim, but which disavowed the statements which Ortiz had attributed to him during their interaction in August and September of 2024, one in which she said Goodman said that it was Desrochers who in 2020 had accessed the CLETS database relating to her and the 2006 9-1-1 call for assistance during a domestic disturbance, that Desrochers had no legitimate basis to make the 2020 CLETS inquiry

with regard to Ortiz, that if Desrochers had still been employed with the department he would have terminated him and that he was going to make a criminal case referral with regard to Desrochers' unauthorized use of the department's electronic database.

Highly disconcerting for the city is that both Ortiz and Schlueter have released portions of a transcript of the August 30, 2024 meeting between Goodman, Ortiz and Beard. Those transcripts provide what is purported to be verbatim statements during the back-and-forth dialogue between Ortiz and Goodman. This implies that the entire conversation was audio-recorded.

Several of the statements in the transcript attributed to Goodman essentially verify that element of Ortiz's overall narrative, which is that Desrochers violated not only department policy but the law in accessing the CLETS database in an effort to find information that would prove politically damaging to Ortiz, that Goodman considered Desrochers' action to be illegal and to constitute misconduct for which he should have been fired.

The City of San Bernardino, which is no stranger to civil suits filed against it by residents, citizens, individuals and occasionally its own employees, finds itself in the forum of state court defending itself with regard to those cases, as that is the most common venue for such matters filed against it. It has a number of go-to lawyers to work on its behalf in fighting these suits, including ones with the law firm of Best Best & Krieger, with which City Attorney Sonia Carvalho is a partner, as well as other attorneys specializing in specific areas of the law. In this case, however, Ortiz and Schlueter have hauled the city into federal court. One of the reasons the city turned to Larson is that he was formerly a federal judge. The city's hope is that Larson will be able

to map an exit from the imbroglio with Ortiz in an expeditious manner that will not entail adverse publicity or extensive expense.

In the immediate aftermath of the filing of the suit, observers were quick to point out that despite whatever skill and familiarity with the federal court system that Larson might be able to bring to bear, even if he is somehow able to succeed in preventing the

recording of the August contents from the August 30, 2024 meeting between Goodman, Ortiz and Beard from being introduced as evidence at trial on the basis that it is illegal to make such recordings in California without the consent of all parties so recorded, he will not be able to ameliorate the damage to the city's reputation from its having claimed that Goodman never made the statements he

can presumably be heard making on that recording.

For their part, Ortiz and Schlueter maintain that "This conversation was not meant to be confidential; it discussed evidence of a crime by a third party, statements made to law enforcement can be used in a criminal case, and the participants knew that Plaintiff [Ortiz] was recording the conversation."

Two Men Dead In
Vehicular Homicides *from page 3*

witnesses, "road raging."

After the Malibu made the turn onto Hess and continued a short way at a relatively leisurely pace, the pickup made the turn, as well. In no time, since it was traveling faster, the pickup was on the Malibu's tail. As Garcia slowed to stop at the intersection of Hess and Senilis, the driver of the tailgating pickup flashed his vehicle's high beams and then moved forward to bump into the back of the Malibu.

Christopher Garcia got out of his wife's car and walked back to the truck. A verbal altercation ensued. After the shouting ended, Christopher Garcia began to walk back to the Malibu.

According to a statement from Christina, she got out of the car just as the argument was ending and her husband was walking back to my car, the driver of the pickup put his vehicle in reverse, backed up, and accelerated forward, ramming into the back of the Malibu, in which her 6-year-old daughter was yet seated. The pickup drive backed up once more and then veered left around the Malibu, striking Christopher Garcia and knocking him down in the process. Christopher was dragged under the pickup into the intersection.

According to Christine Garcia, when she reached her husband, he was still breathing.

A call reporting what had occurred came into the Morongo Valley

emergency dispatch center at 7:38 p.m.

According to the sheriff's department, "The California Highway Patrol was initially dispatched to the location for a vehicle versus pedestrian and possible hit and run. CHP requested deputies after they arrived on scene, because they determined the victim was intentionally struck by a vehicle."

Christina Garcia said she did not get a good look at the pickup truck's driver.

It was ascertained almost immediately after the Highway Patrol and a paramedic unit arrived

that Christopher Garcia was dead. Deputies for more than 11 hours remained at the scene, directing occasional traffic around the intersection, while Garcia's body remained in place and both homicide and traffic investigators surveyed the area around where the death had occurred.

The sheriff's department secured some trace evidence at the scene. The Malibu was seized as evidence and was towed away to the Morongo Valley Sheriff's Department Station. Some clues as to the driver of the pickup are in the possession of the sheriff's department,



Soup on the rocks.

Campbell's Beef Broth right out of the can and onto ice. Take it straight or add a dash of Worcestershire or lemon peel for a kicky switch. Great way to cool off on a hot day. It's perfect for dieters, too.

Only 16 calories in a 5-ounce serving. Don't even wait for a real hot day; start pouring now. Cheers!

M'm! M'm! Good!

After The Haros' Arrests, Authorities Were Still Trying To Trick Them Into Implicating Themselves In Their Son's Murder *from page 3*

the first 24 hours to a believed sighting of Emmanuel in Kern County near Bakersfield.

While there was instantaneous sympathy and a showing of support for the parents, as the Haros were subjected to further and repeated questioning by investigators, what came across as inconsistencies or implausibilities in Rebecca's story emerged, and a statement to that effect was made by an investigator to a member of the press. When that statement widely circulated on August 18, social media influencers, which to that point had seemed so sympathetic toward and supportive of the Haros, turned on them. From that point forward, the new age journalists began staking out their home, trailing them wherever they went and even began using means previously unheard-of among civilians, extending to accessing cell phone emanations and geo-positioning data recorded at cellphone towers to track their whereabouts on the day of the disappearance and the days and weeks proceeding the report of the disappearance. Within days, the amateur sleuths working in the new media were churning up evidence of both questionable and significant value, including that Rebecca Haro was already bearing a black eye as early as August 4 or 5 and that the family had disposed of Baby Emmanuel's clothing and bed clothes.

Word slipped out, either deliberately or inadvertently, that investigators were looking into the possibility that the child was already dead and his body had been disposed of in the trash, such that by that point his tiny corpse was buried in the East Valley Remediation Facil-

ity landfill or the Lamb Canyon Landfill near Beaumont.

With the social media and traditional press subjecting the Haros to constant pressure, investigators continued probing, questioning the Haros, in particular focusing on Jake. It is believed that Jake during one of these exchanges made an admission that he had killed his son. Circulating on social media shortly thereafter was that he had killed his son by rolling over on him in bed while they were asleep one night.

On August 22, at 6:59 a.m., San Bernardino County Sheriff's deputies in combat gear came onto the Haro's property in Cabazon, where they arrested and cuffed the couple upon serving an arrest warrant, marching them off of the property in the full view of media photographers and videographers for transport to the Robert Presley Detention Center in downtown Riverside, where they were entrusted to the custody of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department.

Based upon the theory that the Haros were responsible for the death of their son and that the report of his kidnapping had been a deliberate falsehood they cooked up to mislead authorities, they were arrested and booked on suspicion of murder and filing a false police report.

There were conflicting reports, the provenance of which were unknown, given as they appeared on various social media outlets without any specific attribution to any authorities or officials, that the child's body had been found and ones that Baby Haro was yet missing.

Meanwhile, reports abounded that investigators with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department were acutely conscious that the case against the Haros had been largely assembled by their counterparts in San Bernardino County. The theory under which they had been arrested and were being

prosecuted was that the murder had occurred in Riverside County. In an effort to strengthen the case against the couple, which was being prosecuted by the Riverside County District Attorney's Office in Riverside County Superior Court, the Riverside County Sheriff's Department undertook to obtain even stronger evidence than had been developed by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department detectives. In the case of Rebecca, deputies held her in a holding cell for nearly five hours before booking her and placing her into a cell on the seventh floor of the Presley Center. Jake was not booked for over ten hours, before he was ultimately moved into custody at the Larry D. Smith Correctional Facility in Banning. During the time Jake and Rebecca were in the holding cells on August 22, the sheriff's department took the opportunity to place into their immediate presence sheriff's employees masquerading as arrestees whose assignments were to befriend them and win their confidence. Thereafter, the man comporting himself as an inmate would re-encounter Jake at the Larry Smith Correctional Facility and Rebecca would come across the female ersatz inmate she had met in the pre-booking holding facility after her booking when she was housed on the 7th floor of the Presley Detention Center. At some point, it was hoped, either Jake or Rebecca or both would convey to their newfound communicant details relating to the death of Emmanuel that would assist in obtaining convictions against them. On August 24,

On August 24, in a ploy to get Rebecca to talk, the Riverside County Sheriff's Department and the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department took Jake Haro on a walking excursion around fire roads and chaparral covered ground near Gilman Springs Road, proximate

to the San Timoteo Badlands, a rugged, hilly area of eroded scrubland that separates Moreno Valley from Beaumont. Members of the media had been alerted that something meaningful was in the offing and had been directed to a location along the 60 Freeway east of Moreno Valley, a lookout point along the side of the freeway from which they were able to see from a distance Jake Haro, clad in his red-orange jail jumpsuit accompanied by a good number of law enforcement personnel. It appeared as if the accused child murderer was guiding his jailers to different spots along where the fire access road met the indigenous chaparral. There was no opportunity to speak with Haro, so much as shout questions to him or overhear his exchanges with the law enforcement officers surrounding him. Those with telephoto lenses on their cameras were able to capture both still and moving images of Jake Haro's "field trip" while yet in custody. The implication was clear: Jake was cooperating with authorities and leading investigators to the body of Emmanuel. Photos and videos were posted to social media sites that day and appeared in the following days newspapers, some of the captions for which strongly suggested that the child's remains had been recovered. A copy of the Monday, August 25 edition of the local Riverside Press-Enterprise, featuring one such photo, was left in the common area on the seventh floor of the Robert Presley Detention Center in downtown Riverside, where Rebecca Haro was housed.

Without saying so directly, authorities sought to leave the public at large with the impression that the child's remains had been found and the case against the parents was an air-tight one and the Riverside County Sheriff's Department and the Riverside County District Attor-

ney's Office were on top of the situation.

There were nevertheless hints in the ether that the decision to arrest the couple was a rash one, done prematurely, and that it could yet turn out that the child was very much alive. Such talk spiked when the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department acknowledged that it had employed "cadaver dogs" in an effort to find the child without success. That provoked some in-temperate remarks from Sheriff Bianco, who instead of perceiving the public's close scrutiny of the case as providing him with more eyes and ears to see the matter from a different perspective than that which he and his investigators were locked into, felt he was being crowded and subject to unwelcome skepticism. He unsubtly suggested that the amateurs who had covered ground in the early phase of the case and had clued the San Bernardino County investigators into some salient facts should simply butt out and leave the investigating to the professionals. Despite that assertion, the questions that naturally proceeded from the arrest of the Haros did not diminish, but intensified, with the central issue being how could the couple be charged with murder when there was no body. And, scores, hundreds, indeed thousands of members of the public wanted to know, if there was no body, what evidence did law enforcement have to indicate the child was dead and why couldn't it be disclosed. Bianco and his department was given some level of assistance when Riverside County District Attorney Mike Hestrin, The district attorney's office lodged charges against both of the Haros, consisting of one charge of murder, Penal Code Section 187, and filing a false police report, Penal Code Section PC 148.5, each. At the Haros scheduled arraignment on August 26, however, the proceedings were abruptly

continued until September 4. Riverside County District Attorney Mike Hestrin and Riverside County Sheriff Chad Bianco, who since early this year has been engaged in a campaign to obtain the Republican nomination for governor next year, on August 27 called a press conference in which they intended to use their combined gravitas to smother the intensifying skepticism about the case. Before a combined crowd of traditional press/radio and television newsmen and new age social media journalists, they sought to obliquely tiptoe around the issue of whether the death of Baby Haro had been confirmed.

When a reporter delved into whether the location of Emmanuel's body was known, Hestrin somewhat glibly deflected the Lack-of-a-body issue, by slyly suggesting, without directly saying, that the body had been located. "Yes," Hestrin said. "We have a pretty strong indication of where the remains of Baby Emmanuel are." He implied but did not specifically state that it was now just a matter of a scientific confirmation being made. "That investigation is ongoing at this time," he said. Later in the press conference, however, Ahmed Bellozo, perhaps the most aggressive and crudest of the new breed of citizen reporters, one who lacks any formal journalistic training or polish, made no pretense of deference to the district attorney or sheriff simply because of their status. Was there or was there not, Bellozo boldly demanded to know, a body? Hestrin, pinned down, had no wiggle room left. "I didn't say I know where the remains are," Hestrin said.

The case remained marred by that lack of crucial evidence. The supporters of the law enforcement establishment as well as those hoping Bianco can overcome his

Continued on Page 14

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER CIV SB 2529637

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JOSE ANTHONIO RUIZ/ MELITON CRISTOBAL BETANCOURT filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JOSE ANTHONIO RUIZ to JOSE ANTHONIO CRISTOBAL RUIZ

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

Notice of Hearing:
Date: December 1, 2025, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S 26

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

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

Dated: 10/17/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa
Abrianna Rodriguez, Deputy Clerk of the Court
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 17, 24 & 31 and November 7, 2025.

FBN20250009652
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
LANDCARE PRO 525 EAST RALSTON AVENUE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404: HECTOR RAMIREZ
Business Mailing Address: 525 EAST RALSTON AVENUE 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/ HECTOR RAMIREZ, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/09/2025

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 J9965

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 17, 24 & 31 and November 7, 2025.

FBN20250009400
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

Public Notices

no County as
PALITEL INC [and] METRO BY T-MOBILE 8922 BEECH AVE UNIT H FONTANA, CA 92335: PALITEL INC 8922 BEECH AVE STE H FONTANA, CA 92335

Business Mailing Address: 8922 BEECH AVE UNIT H FONTANA, CA 92335
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: JANUARY 13, 2013.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
/s/ BAYAN MUBAREK, CFO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/03/2025

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 K4616

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 17, 24 & 31 and November 7, 2025.

FBN20250009760
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
CLAUDIA'S EVENTS 360 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786: CLAUDIA I BALVANEDA
Business Mailing Address: 7268 MISSOURI ST 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: MAY 13, 2025

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/ CLAUDIA I BALVANEDA, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/14/2025

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 F3010

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 17, 24 & 31 and November 7, 2025.

FBN20250009532
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

WINK ACTIVITIES 4812 SAN JOSE ST MONTCLAIR, CA 91763: DATING LI
Business Mailing Address: 4812 SAN JOSE ST MONTCLAIR, CA 91763

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.

Public Notices

this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ DATING LI, Sole Proprietor
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/08/2025

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 J9965

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 17, 24 & 31 and November 7, 2025.

AMENDED ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

NUMBER CIVSB 2520534

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

ISABELLA ALINA ESCOBAR to MAGNOLIA ISABELLA ESCOBAR

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

Notice of Hearing:
Date: December 5, 2025, Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S 26

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

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

Dated: 10/06/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa
Veronica Gonzalez, Deputy Clerk of the Court
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 and November 7 & 14, 2025.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER SIV SB 2527849,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Ariel Ocampo filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Ariel Ocampo to Alenah Nicole Canales-Rivera,

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

Public Notices

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

Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/13/2025, Time: 09:00 AM, Department: S29The 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 SBCS Ontario in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.
Dated: 10/02/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert Ochoa
Published in the SBCS Ontario on 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025

FBN20250009770
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
JOSEPH W. BRADY, INC.
[and] THE BRADCO COMPANIES
[and] BRADCO DEVELOPMENT
[and] BRADCO DIVERSIFIED
[and] BRADCO HIGH DESERT REPORT
[and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY REAL ESTATE GROUP
12402 INDUSTRIAL BLVD. SUITE B-6 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395: JOSEPH W. BRADY, INC. 12402 INDUSTRIAL BLVD. SUITE B-6 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395

Business Mailing Address: P.O. BOX 2710 VICTORVILLE, CA 92393
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number 1564782
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: December 4, 1989.

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

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/15/2025

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 K4866

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 and November 7 & 14, 2025.

FBN20250009850
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

QUEEN BOOM CLEANING SERVICES 135 N PEPPER AVE SPC 34 RIALTO, CA 92376: EVANGELINA SOLARES MARTINEZ

Business Mailing Address: 135 N PEPPER AVE SPC 34 RIALTO, CA 92376

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: October 16, 2025.

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

Public Notices

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

/s/ EVANGELINA SOLARES MARTINEZ, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/16/2025

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 F3010

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 and November 7 & 14, 2025.

FBN20250009783
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
YOLO MESSAGE #1 655 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786: YOLO MESSAGE #1 655 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786

Business Mailing Address: 655 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. 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/ HONGMEI ZHANG, President

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/15/2025

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 K7325

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 and November 7 & 14, 2025.

FBN20250010000
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

PEW RE-UP CREW 10701 CEDAR AVE #91 BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316: MA G ACIERNO CASTRO [and] MARCOS RODRIGUEZ GARDUNO

Business Mailing Address: 10701 CEDAR AVE #91 BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE.

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

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

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/20/2025

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 F3010

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

Public Notices

tious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 and November 7 & 14, 2025.

FBN20250009820
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

EVEREST GRILL AND WRAPS 1060 E HARRIMAN PL STE C2 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408: DS TECHNOLOGY LLC 137 S PALM AVE HEMET, CA 92543

Business Mailing Address: 1060 E HARRIMAN PL STE C2 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202116110636

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/ DILIP C GHIMIRE, President

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/15/2025

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 K7326

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 24 & 31 & November 7 & 14, 2025.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

ESTHER TORREZ Case NO. PROVA2500798

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that The petition requests the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority., Matthew Torrez be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

ESTHER TORREZ Case NO. PROVA2500798

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that The petition requests the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority., Matthew Torrez be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

Public Notices

representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority.

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. F1 at 09:00 AM on 11/19/2025 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana Division

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

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

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

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

TAYLOR D FENNEL ESQ:

545 N. MOUNTAIN AVE STE 111 UPLAND CA 91786
Telephone No: 213-346-0033

Published in the SBCS on: 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

ESTHER TORREZ Case NO. PROVA2500798

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that The petition requests the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority., Matthew Torrez be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

Public Notices

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., Matthew Torrez be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. F1 at 09:00 AM on 11/19/2025 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana Division

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

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

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

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

TAYLOR D FENNEL ESQ:
545 N. MOUNTAIN AVE STE 111 UPLAND CA 91786

Telephone No: 213-346-0033

Published in the SBSCS on:

11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JEFFREY HAROLD WEISS

CASE NO. PRO-VA2500844

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JEFFREY HAROLD WEISS:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by RONALD McDANIEL SMITH in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that RONALD McDANIEL SMITH be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

THE PETITION requests 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 in Dept. F-2 at 9:00 a.m. on January 7, 2026

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F2 – Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

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

Ronald McDaniel Smith 16734 Petrus Lane Fontana, CA 92336

Telephone No: (909) 312-8355

msbo49@yahoo.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 7, 14 & 21, 2025.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: STEPHEN RICHARD RUSSO, aka STEVE

CASE NO. PRO-VA2500851

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of STEPHEN RICHARD RUSSO, aka STEVE:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by ANTHONY STEPHEN RUSSO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANTHONY STEPHEN RUSSO be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

THE PETITION requests 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 in Dept. F-2 at 9:00 a.m. on December 9, 2025

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F2 – Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

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

Anthony Stephen Russo 1343 Massachusetts Ave, Apt 201 Riverside, CA 92507

Telephone No: (909) 660-1453

anthonyrusso@me.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 7, 14 & 21, 2025.

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2530895

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner LINDA JOYCE SHARFI filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

LINDA JOYCE SHARFI to LINDA JOYCE GALT

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

Notice of Hearing:
Date: December 22, 2025, Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S 37

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

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

Dated: 10/30/2025

Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Aryanna Sheehee, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2025.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) C I V S B 2 5 0 3 1 2 2 NOTICE TO:

(AVISO DEMANDA-DO):

ROY GOINES, SHARON DAILEY & DOES 1-10 YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): DAVID ROLBIECKI NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below. You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services

Public Notices

program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación. Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechar el caso. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es): Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino 247 W Third Street, San Bernardino California 92415 San Bernardino District- Civil Division Order for publication of summons on complaint of Sharon Dailey made by Donald Alvarez, Judge of the Superior Court DATE(Fecha):October10,2025 Clerk (Secretario), by Veronica Gonzalez, Deputy (Adjunto) The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Yasser Ibrahim, Esquire SBN 330742 Ibrahim & Daugherty Law LLP 380 S. Melrose Dr., Suite 362 Vista, CA 92081 Ph. 949- 933-2984 yasser@advocatesforthepeople.com Published in the San Bernardi-

Public Notices

no County Sentinel on November 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2025.

FBN 20250009924

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

I LUV THREADS 13980 VALLEY VIEW LANE CHINO HILLS, 91709: YVETTE H SCAMPERINO

Business Mailing Address: 13980 VALLEY VIEW LANE CHINO HILLS, 91709

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ YVETTE H SCAMPERINO, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/17/2025

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 K7326

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 November 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2025.

FBN 20250009926

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

DELYS ENTERPRISE 13980 VALLEY VIEW LANE CHINO HILLS, 91709: YVETTE H SCAMPERINO [and] DENISE M LEFEVER

Business Mailing Address: 13980 VALLEY VIEW LANE CHINO HILLS, 91709

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/ YVETTE H SCAMPERINO, Partner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/17/2025

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 K7326

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 November 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2025.

FBN 20250009611

The following person is doing business as: AV HAIR COLLECTIVE. 780 E FOOTHILL BLVD SUITE D2 UPLAND, CA 91786;[MAILING ADDRESS 4880 GRAND AVE ONTARIO, CA 91762]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO VU B HO

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUN 01, 2025 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

Public Notices

that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VU B. HO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 09, 2025 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 10/17/2025, 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025 CNBB42202501MT

FBN

20250009549

The following person is doing business as: BEAUTY BY NOEL. 5148 WASHINGTON AVE CHINO, CA 91710;[MAILING ADDRESS 5148 WASHINGTON AVE CHINO, CA 91710]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NOEL Y WILSON 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/ NOEL Y WILSON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 08, 2025 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 10/17/2025, 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025 CNBB42202502MT

FBN

2025009550

The following person is doing business as: DNA GENERAL STORE. 804 W HIGHLAND AVE SUITE A HIGHLAND, CA 92405;[MAILING ADDRESS 804 W HIGHLAND AVE SUITE A HIGHLAND, CA 92405]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO FGMD LLC 4235 UNIVERSITY PKWY STE #101 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92047 STATE OFORGANIZATION 202462611320 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/ FAHED G MOHANNA, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 08, 2025 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 10/17/2025, 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025 CNBB42202503MT

FBN

20250009735

The following person is doing business as: YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ASIAN MARKET #2. 18793 VALLEY BLVD UNIT D&E BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316;[MAILING ADDRESS 18793 VALLEY BLVD UNIT D&E BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD MARKET, LLC. 738 S WATERMAN AVE STE A11 SAN BERNARDINO CA 92408-2360 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202356519537

Public Notices

another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202505MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025

FBN 20250008630
The following person is doing business as: BIG BEAR JANITORIAL SUPPLY 1602 TUOLUMNE RD BIG BEAR CITY CA 92314;[MAILING ADDRESS P.O BOX 2234 BIG BEAR CITY CA 92314]; COUNTY SAN BERNARDINO LARS T STALFORS; CHRISTOPHER P MATHEWS 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/ LARS T STALFORS, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 12, 2025 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 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202504MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025

FBN 20250008895
The following person is doing business as: PRECISE MOVEMENT 10361 VISTA GROVE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91737;[MAILING ADDRESS 10361 VISTA GROVE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91737]; COUNTY SAN BERNARDINO HAUS OF REAL ESTATE INC 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD, SUITE 112 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730 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: 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/MARTIN YANKOV, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 18, 2025 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 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202511MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025

FBN 20250008138
The following person is doing business as: SUIT EMPORIUM. 4449 MILLS CIRCLE ONTARIO, CA 91764;[MAILING ADDRESS 15101 FAIRFIELD RANCH RD UNIT 8202 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SUIT MATRIX INC 15101 FAIRFIELD RANCH RD APT 8202 CHINO HILLS CA 91709 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20250005081 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAY 07, 2025 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

Public Notices

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/ MILBES MUSTAFA, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 27, 2025 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 08/29/2025, 09/05/2025, 09/12/2025, 09/19/2025 CNBB35202507MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025

FBN 20250007993
The following person is doing business as: MISSHAIR CARE101. 16685 SIERRA LAKES PKWY #18 FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 6125 COOPER AVE FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TRACY I. MOSBY 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/ TRACY I. MOSBY Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 22, 2025 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 08/29/2025, 09/05/2025, 09/12/2025, 09/19/2025 CNBB35202511MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025

FBN 20250010315
The following person is doing business as: PSALMS COFFEE. 14025 IVY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335;[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ; JAIR F ZAMORA PAZOS The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 29, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202501FA

FBN 20250010206
The following person is doing business as: JGMMM. 700 EAST REDLANDS BLVD SUITE U763 REDLANDS, CA 92373;[MAILING ADDRESS 700 EAST REDLANDS BLVD SUITE U763 REDLANDS, CA 92373]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JGMMM, LLC 700 EAST REDLANDS BLVD SUITE U763 REDLANDS CA 92373 STATE OF OR-

Public Notices

GANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202357610286 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/ SCOTT J. COLLINSWORTH, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 27, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202502MT

FBN 20250010283
The following person is doing business as: STRAINS; STRAINS ADELANTO 11420 RANCHO RD ADELANTO, CA 92301;[MAILING ADDRESS 11420 RANCHO RD ADELANTO, CA 92301]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO STRAINS ADELANTO, LLC 11420 RANCHO RD ADELANTO CA 92301 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20250113027 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/ FATIMA ABDULLA, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 29, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202503MT

FBN 20250010258
The following person is doing business as: ALEXI'SNACKS. 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711;[MAILING ADDRESS 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RUBEN MALDONADO OLIN 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/ RUBEN MALDONADO OLIN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 28, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202504MT

FBN 20250010435

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: SKYLARK HOTELS, INC. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408;[MAILING ADDRESS 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SKYLARK HOTELS, INC. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4281623 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/ KALPESH P SOLANKI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 04, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202505MT

FBN 20250010457
The following person is doing business as: SURESTAY PLUS. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408;[MAILING ADDRESS 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SKYLARK HOTELS, INC. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4281623 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/ KALPESH P SOLANKI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 05, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202506MT

FBN 20250010458
The following person is doing business as: SKYLARK HOTELS. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408;[MAILING ADDRESS 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SKYLARK HOTELS, INC. 294 E HOSPITALITY LANE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4281623 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/ KALPESH P SOLANKI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 05, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202507MT

FBN 20250010465
The following person is doing business as: EVEROAK REALTY NETWORK. 10808 FOOTHILL BLVD 160810 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730;[MAILING ADDRESS 27370 HAMMETT CT MORENO VALLEY, CA 92555]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ENOH S UDOFFIA 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/ ENOH S UDOFFIA, SOLE PROPRIETOR Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 06, 2025 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).

The Council Is Making Somewhere Between \$1.83 Per Hour And \$8 Per Hour, Chastain Says *from page 6*

of California’s minimum wage and deserved a raise.

“With that [the \$682 per month], our hourly rate, or wage [is] \$5.35 [per hour] at 30 hours a week or, 20 hours a week, is \$8 [per hour],” she said.

If one looks upon the city council as being devoted to the city full time or 40 hours per week, the pay is even more paltry, Chastain said.

She said council gets \$14 dollars a day and that figures out to \$1.83 an hour for 8 hours.

The council is woefully underpaid for its service to the community, Chastain said.

“The [staff] report does say we are part-time, although we do a lot more than just part-time work,” she said. She characterized the stipend as “insufficient,” saying it had been “40 years since we’ve come forward to talk about this.”

Chastain, who had served as the prime mover in the effort increase the council’s pay by suggesting in 2023 and then earlier this year that the council look at the pay it receives, said upping the stipend would “bring ourselves up to a fair market” figure. She likened raising the council’s remuneration to action taken by the council to raise the salaries of city employees by 10 percent earlier this year.

She said the city council was conscientious about looking af-

Public Notices

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202508MT

FBN 20250009200
The following person is doing business as: LUCY’S BEAUTY SALON & BARBER; LUCY’S BEAUTY SALON. 715 S EUCLID AVE ONTARIO, CA 91762;[MAILING ADDRESS 714 S EUCLID AVE ONTARIO, CA 91762]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUCY’S BEAUTY SALON & BARBER LLC 715 S EUCLID AVE ONTARIO CA 91762 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20250275959 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/ ANGELA GARCIA, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 30, 2025 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 10/10/2025, 10/17/2025, 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025 CNBB41202501MT CORRECTION

Public Notices

DATES 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025

FBN 20250009379
The following person is doing business as: LHD MOBILE TRAILER REPAIR INC. 980 W. EVANS ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411;[MAILING ADDRESS 980 W. EVANS ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LHD MOBILE TRAILER REPAIR INC. 980 W EVANS ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411 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: 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/ MARTA GLORIBEL CERON, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 03, 2025 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 10/10/2025, 10/17/2025, 10/24/2025, 10/31/2025 CNBB41202505MT CORRECTION DATES 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025

ter the needs of residents and city employees but was neglecting itself.

“It seems like we’re always the last,” she said. “I don’t want to make it like we’re making oodles of dollars but also I see we need to bring ourselves up to parity or at least a fair stance.”

Her proposal was not intended, she said, to benefit herself but rather others who might be contemplating getting into politics, beginning with a run for the Colton City Council.

“I’m not looking at it for myself,” she said. “I want to make that clear.” She noted that many others in government, including those in the California State Senate feel the same way, in that they had brought forth and passed legislation that cleared the way for city council members throughout the state to receive stipends that are nearly four times what the Colton City Council members receive. “There’s a lack of people wanting to get into office, especially on the local level. I know it’s supposed to be volunteer [service] or that’s what it was deemed a long time ago, but when you have a family and in today’s wage [scale] at Del Taco you can get about \$20 an hour. I’m looking for, in the future, those individuals that would hopefully come [forward to run for office. I want to] entice people to get on-board, the younger generation.”

With \$16.90 being the minimum wage set to go into effect in California in 2026, Chastain

Continued on Page 14

Councilwoman Chastain Says She Doesn't Want The Raise She Is Advocating For Herself But Rather Colton's Future Politicians from page 13

said, "I hope we can say that we don't have to be, in my eyes, ashamed for coming forward and at least showing a fair wage, especially for those that might be looking at public office in the future, wanting to get into public office. You aren't seeing many young folks getting involved."

In response to suggestions that the council conferring a 400 percent salary increase upon itself was somewhat excessive, Chastain said, "Our base is a lot lower [than what the salary level of those who received a 10 percent increase]."

She said that those members of the council who felt accepting a raise was improper could simply choose to not accept it.

"If anyone wants to opt out, we can at any time," she said.

The Question Now Is Will Haro's Guilty Plea Serve To Benefit Or Hurt His Wife from page 8

Republican Party affiliation in the overwhelmingly Democrat Golden State to become governor next year sought to minimize that problem, pointing out that Hestrin in 2024 had personally successfully handled the prosecution of Owen Skyler Shove, convincing a jury that Shove had killed Aranda Briones in 2019 because she had gotten him expelled from school and hid her body somewhere in the San Bernardino Mountains, despite her body never being found. Still, there was concern about the case against the Haros, as in addition to not having a body, investigators and prosecutors were unable, or had been unable up to that point, to provide a motive for the killing.

Bianco, perhaps somewhat ill-advisedly, grew and testy and highly critical of the media, particularly social media influencers, for their constant harping with regard to the cases anomalies, extending to the inability of detectives to turn up a body or offer definitive proof of any sort that Emmanuel was actually dead.

It came as something of a relief to those involved in the case when on October 16, Jake

Haro entered a guilty plea on the charges of Penal Code §187, second degree murder, signifying that he had not planned to take the life of his son in advance, and two accompanying charges, Penal Code §273A, abuse of a child resulting in death, and Penal Code §148.5, filing a false police report. Jake made his plea directly to the judge overseeing the case, Judge Gary Polk. The district attorney was not a party, at least ostensibly and officially, to the terms of the plea.

The district attorney's office had the option of objecting to the guilty plea arrangement but did not lodge any resistance to Judge Polk accepting Haro's plea. Of note, the district attorney's office, in the personage of Assistant Deputy District Attorney Brandon Smith, who was assigned to prosecute the Haros, could have fought Haro and his attorneys on the issue of second degree murder, but chose not to, most likely because of the accompanying Penal Code §273A admission. While California Penal Code §187, prosecuted as a second degree offense, does not involve or hinge on prior intent, California Penal Code §273a entails an intent element. For that reason, it appears, the district attorney's office was willing to accept Haro's plea with the judge without protest. A Penal Code §187 conviction brings with it a mandatory 15 years to

Councilman Luis González said, "I'm like anyone else. I think extra money is always helpful, sure. Nevertheless, he said, some degree of proportionality was called for. Saying that the councils' decision with regard to how much it was going to pay its members should be one that took the councils' "constituents" – the city's taxpayers – into consideration.

"Where I'd like to lean on this, given our city approved a ten percent increase [for city employees] just recently, the way I see it, the most reasonable move is

life sentence. A Penal Code §273A conviction entails an even stiffer penalty of a mandatory sentence of 25 years to life. The Penal Code §148.5 is a minor consideration, punishable by six months in jail. Under California Penal Code §273a applies to "Any person, having the care or custody of a child who is under eight years of age, who assaults the child by means of force that to a reasonable person would be likely to produce great bodily injury, resulting in the child's death."

Jake Haro's guilty plea brings the curtain down on any realistic criticism that might have been leveled at Bianco or Hestrin over what might have been characterized as a hasty, rash or premature arrest/prosecution in the case. 2026 is due to be an election year for Hestrin, as he must stand for reelection during the June primary to remain in office after the end of next year.

Judge Polk's sentencing of Haro clears up some mystery or details pertaining to the case but leaves unanswered other questions.

Polk had the option of imposing the mandatory 15-years-to life sentence that goes with the Penal Code §187 second degree murder conviction and the mandatory 15-years-to-life sentence that accompanies the Penal Code §273A abuse of a child resulting in death conviction either

to increase the council just ten percent and no more," González said. "That's it. I feel that's fair and consistent with the employees who worked hard and asked for it and we gave it to them. It just makes me feel funny to do any more than that because what's good for them is good for us, the way I see it. Otherwise I can't justify going above that amount." And retaining the auto.

Councilman David Toro, who in years past maintained that the council's focus should not be on the benefits and advantages its mem-

bers can derive personally from holding office but on looking after the interests of Colton's residents and the voters who had selected them to fill the council positions, evinced a change in attitude. He appeared focused on the difference in remuneration that the Colton council members received in comparison to the council members in other cities.

"Ten percent doesn't bring us into parity," Toro said, indicating he was in favor of setting the council's monthly stipend at "\$1,600 with no car allowance."

having had to undergo a tracheotomy, and is now blind, unable to walk or speak, with three to seven percent brain function. She is entirely dependent upon her aunt, her primary caregiver. Judge Moore at the time of Haro's sentencing in 2023 suspended the sentence, placing him on probation. Last year, Haro was contacted by law enforcement and found to be in possession of a firearm, a probation violation. On October 16, he was acknowledge to Judge Polk having violated probation. The original six year sentence, which had been suspended, was reinstated.

Given the 25-year sentence and the six-year sentence, Haro will likely remain in prison until 2056, at which time he will be 63 years old.

What yet remains unresolved is where the remains of Emmanuel Haro are, how, in fact, he died or was killed, and what impact Jake Haro's guilty plea will have on Rebecca.

The precise nature of Jake Haro's statements to investigators, prior to his arrest, at the time of or day of his arrest, his statement to his fellow inmates or the undercover investigator who assumed the guise of an inmate when he was at the Presley Center and Smith Correctional Facility or his willing dialogues with his captors and investigators throughout this ordeal are unknown. As of now,

The council should take everything it is entitled to and leave nothing on the table, he said. "This is a minor increase to get the maximum of what the state says we're allowed," he said.

Mayor Frank Navarro said Chastain's and Toro's focus on how much money they should be paid for the honorific they have been entrusted with is unseemly and wrong.

He observed that Colton is a fiscally conservative city on a tight budget, and that it is up to the city council to set

the child's body has not surface on or at what was formerly the Haros' residence in Cabazon, in any landfill,near the San Timoteo Badlands or anywhere, for that matter. Without the child's body, what trauma Emmanuel suffered while alive or how he died is unknown to the public and, presumably, investigators and prosecutors.

There are reports that in his discussions with investigators, Jake has asserted that Rebecca is innocent. If he testifies to that effect during further proceedings for Rebecca, and if the prosecution can present no evidence or testimony to refute that testimony, the murder charge against her is unlikely to hold.

Because the prosecution was not party to any negotiations with regard to the plea Jake made to Judge Polk, the district attorney's office did not have the opportunity to condition acceptance of the plea upon Jake's agreement to cooperate – i.e., testify as a witness in a way that would be favorable to the prosecution – with the district attorney's office going forward. This is a possible indication that Jake is on a trajectory to take the full fall for his son's death and testify to the effect that Rebecca was not involved in the child's killing, rendering it likely that the prosecution will need to content itself with a conviction against her of being an accessory to murder, most likely after the fact.

Continued on Page 16

Factionalism Has The County Superintendent Of Schools & Three County School Board Members On One Side And Two Board Members On The Other *from page 6*

bers, the county superintendent of schools, staff members employed by the superintendent or the county school board and/or the political supporters of the superintendent and the board members. Substantial amounts of money are spent on educational programs and services, and contracts with vendors or service providers typically involve expenditures of tens of thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars and on occasion of more than a million dollars. More than once or twice, indeed scores of times if not more over the years, local school boards, the county school board or the county superintendent of schools office have utilized their authority to enter into contracts with individuals, entities or companies that have proven to be major donors to the political war chests of those voting to approve those projects. Similarly, some of those companies, entities or individuals which or who have held those contracts have hired the family members or friends or associates of those elected officials who gave approval to those contracts. It has been the case that many elected officials on those boards who were not recipients of political donations or related to or friends or associates of those hired by the contractors, vendors and service providers who profited by those contracts simply supported those contractual arrangements, going along to get along, so as to maintain their collegial and congenial relationships with their colleagues. It has happened, however, that some elected officials, sensing that the contracts the other elected officials were steering them into accepting were not in the best interests of the over-

all educational mission in their district or for the schools in the county as a whole, resisted entering into those contracts, opposing them with their votes. More often than not, those resisting have found themselves labeled as dissidents or naysayers, and find themselves being marginalized. While they are yet insiders by virtue of being elected officials who have a seat at the table of discussion and policy decision, they are often transformed into outside insiders, ones who are officially allowed into the inner sanctum but are yet on the outside looking in.

A case-in-point consists of complaints that were made to the California Fair Political Practices Commission earlier this year, which referenced the manner in which political donations provided to certain San Bernardino County elected education officials was being transferred from the electioneering war chest of the recipient of that money to another elected education official. Some county residents, in particular those watching the San Bernardino County School Board and San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Ted Alejandre, believed that the financial entanglements between some of the board members and Alejandre at the least gave off the appearance of impropriety and that possibly the money that was being passed around and the impact this was having on educational policy went beyond being a matter of perception but crossed the threshold to being implicit and explicit conflicts of interest. Those conflicts, some believe, led to policies advocated by Alejandre and the county board of education that were contrary to, or detracted from, providing the best scholastic atmosphere possible for those enrolled in the county's public schools.

Among those who grew animated about the exchange of money and funding between the

county's top educational officials was Antoinette Jensen, who by profession is an educator. It was she and a small circle of others who brought the matter to the attention of the Fair Political Practices Commission. Public records, including California Form 460 campaign finance disclosure documents which under state law must be filed twice yearly by elected officials and more often during the election years in which they are vying for election or reelection, reveal the extent to which Superintendent Alejandre is tied in with three of the five county school board members.

County Board of Education Member Ryan McEachron, representing Trustee Area A, donated \$1,000 to Alejandre's campaign in April 2025. Two months later, he voted to approve Alejandre's raise to nearly \$350,000. Alejandre had previously donated \$500 to McEachron's 2022 board campaign.

San Bernardino County Board of Education Member Laura Mancha, representing Trustee Area C, gave Alejandre \$1,000 in October 2024 and continues to make decisions regarding his employment. Alejandre donated \$1,000 to her 2020 campaign.

San Bernardino County Board of Education Member Gwen Dowdy-Rodgers received \$500 from Alejandre in 2022 for her board race.

The campaign money being passed around among Alejandre, McEachron, Mancha and Dowdy-Rodgers is perhaps less significant of a consideration than the voting block/ruling coalition on the county board of education that it is a reflection of.

The board consists of two other members: Rita Fernandez-Loof, representing Trustee Area B, and Andrea De Leon, representing Trustee Area E. Fernandez-Loof and De Leon are not aligned with their three colleagues, nor with Alejandre. They did not provide money from their campaign coffers to Ale-

jandre or lend him money to assist him in his reelection effort and he did not help in bankrolling their election campaigns either. In actuality, Alejandre, together with McEachron, Mancha and Dowdy-Rodgers, actively opposed De Leon in her successful run for election in 2020 and in her bid for reelection in 2024.

The factionalization of the county school board, with McEachron, Mancha and Dowdy-Rodgers identifying themselves as solidly aligned with Alejandre, is warily regarded by many in the county as a development that has compromised the decision-making process with regard to important educational issues. There is concern that each of the three board members will consistently remain unwilling to critically appraise any policies hatched by Alejandre and that any two of the three would similarly be favorably disposed toward an idea one of the three would propose, based not on the inherent merit of the proposal but because of the imperative to maintain their ruling coalition. Conversely, their commitment to preserve their control over the board dictates that they hold the line against any initiatives brought forth by Fernandez-Loof or De Leon as a reflexive move to adhere to Alejandre's dominance of the scholastic tenor in the county.

It was apprehension that the political/monetary linkage between elected officials on the same board who together with the superintendent were overseeing the crucial arena of public education might compromise the integrity of the decision-making processes relating to the expenditure of \$370 million per year in educational funding which led to the inquiry with the California Fair Political Practices Commission.

By August the Fair Political Practices Commission staff had begun a review of the reports/complaints made to the

commission with regard to the cross pollination between Alejandre's, Mancha's, McEachron's and Rodgers' political funds and the compromising of the independence between the county school board members and the county superintendent of schools, whose function they were supposed to monitor without bias. While the FPPC staff was evaluating the applicable sections of the government code, education code and the Political Reform Act, three emails from the Fair Political Practices Commission or its staff were sent to the the San Bernardino County Office of Education on August 26, Sept 8 and September 11, alerting officials that a complaint relating to Mancha, McEachron, Rodgers) and Alejandre had been filed, and the FPPC staff was reviewing the information. The email was sent to the SB-CBOE@SBCBOE.org email address to alert all board members and the superintendent that the San Bernardino County Office of Education was under review.

The emails, however, were not passed along to Fernandez-Loof or De Leon.

At the board's September 8 meeting, McEachron, without making either the August 26 or September 8 emails which had come into his possession available to the public, asserted he had been cleared of any wrongdoing relating to political donations that had passed between his and Alejandre's political war chests.

"Basically, the gist of the letter says that there was no validation to the complaint brought against me," McEachron said.

McEachron, according to those who had filed the complaints, mischaracterized their substance. They maintain that the review of the complaint at that point had not progressed beyond the preliminary stage in which a determination as to whether a full-blown investigation should proceed. Since

Fernandez-Loof and De Leon at that point had not been provided with the emails neither was in a position to dispute what McEachron was asserting. Alejandre has since acknowledged that the emails were withheld from Fernandez-Loof and De Leon at his direction, but said the decision was justified, claiming he consulted Deputy County Counsel Richard Luczak with regard to the matter. According to Alejandre, "We did nothing wrong." In short order, Alejandre was able to get staff within the San Bernardino County Office of Education to rally to his defense.

The San Bernardino county Board of Education is the elected governing board that has the responsibility to set policies and oversee the San Bernardino County Office of Education. The San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools is the chief executive officer of the San Bernardino County Office of Education. In San Bernardino County, the county superintendent of schools has subsumed what in most other California counties is commonly referred to as the county office of education. The mechanism for controlling information flow at the San Bernardino County Office of Education consists of the Diligent platform, which went online in December 2023. Under the Diligent system, the sbcboe@sbcboe.org email address was created and positioned as a "contact us" button for the public.

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Chief Technology Officer David Thurston, who is provided with a \$390,000 per year in total compensation, including salary and benefits, said that emails to the sbcboe@sbcboe.org address were never automatically forwarded to all board members. Instead, he said, those communication went to a "team of San Bernardino county Superintendent of

Continued on Page 16

Colton Council Members Fixing To Give Themselves A 400 Percent Raise *from page 14*

an example that embodies austerity and discipline for the community.

“As we sit here talking about compensation, we’re comparing ourselves to our employees,” Navarro said. “Some of our employees work 80 hours, 40 hours, 120 hours. How many hours in our day and in our week and in our month do we put in that we can actually identify as work? True, we go to events, we go to grand openings. At a grand opening, we’re there for a half hour. If you stay longer than a half hour, then you’re just talking

to people. The event is the grand opening, the ribbon cutting. Do we go to other events? Do we go to other meetings other places? Most of those other places give you a stipend for going to the meetings, and you can then get remunerated for that. We’re comparing ourselves to our employees. I don’t think that we can do that. I really, seriously, don’t think that we can do that. We’re talking about ten percent across the board that we did with the labor plan for our employees. Yes, that was to bring them up to parity with our competing agencies that are taking our employees away. Nobody is going to take us away. We’re elected. We’re here for the duration of our term, until we’re either

voted out or we get re-elected, whatever it may be. If we are going to do anything as far as salary, I’m going to support Dr. G’s [Councilman González’s] recommendation at ten percent.”

Navarro said, “I think we have to be realistic as far as our ask, as far as compensation is concerned and be honest with ourselves: Am I worth that much money that I’m asking for? Am I really putting in that many hours for the money I’m asking for? Am I really taking away from my family for the hours I’m putting in? Then there’s the perception from our constituents. Our constituency keeps a close eye on us, believe it or not. If we go forward with this, I think we’re going to have a

short period of time where nobody is going to really support us. I would agree with Dr. G, ten percent now. Moving forward, we can elect to do [a] five percent [increase] annually.”

Councilman Echevarria did not contribute to the discussion. He did, however, vote in support of Chastain’s motion, seconded by Toro, to direct City Manager Bill Smith and his staff to draft an ordinance and resolution to be considered by the council at a future meeting to adopt a monthly payment designation for the mayor and individual council members of \$1,600. That amount is in addition to the \$1,575 monthly health insurance coverage provided to the mayor and council members.

If the council approves the \$1,600 stipend for itself when it is formally presented, the raises will go into effect after the next election, when the mayor and council members elected or re-elected in the November 2026 election are sworn in the following month. At that point, Colton’s council members will see their remuneration exceed that provided to the council members in two comparably-sized cities in San Bernardino County - Yucaipa, with a population of 54,429, where the council members receive a stipend of \$650 per month, and Highland, with a population of 56,999 where the council members are paid \$795 per month.

Colton has a population of 53,528.

Colton’s council members’ pay will yet lag behind that provided to the county’s four largest and wealthiest cities, those being San Bernardino, Fontana, Ontario and Rancho Cucamonga. However, when the pay comparison takes into consideration the population of those cities and considers the number of constituents represented by each council member, if the pay raise for the Colton council is approved, its members will be making more than twice as much per resident as the council members in San Bernardino and Ontario and over three times what the members of the city councils in Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga’s are receiving on a per capita basis.

Fernandez-Loof & De Leon Want Specific Instructions That County Schools Staff Is To Refrain From Screening Or Blocking Their Emails *from page 15*

Schools staff members” who determined which trustees should receive which messages.

According to Thurston, emails to sbcboe@sbcboe.org were “not meant for everybody on the board of education” but rather for staff, who would then decide what to forward to trustees.

Subsequently, Thurston would contradict these assertions, stating emails sent to the SBCBOE@SBCBOE.org email address were meant for all board members.

Other staff members rushed to emphasize that Alejandre was acting within his authority to withhold the emails from Fernandez-Loof and De Leon. They emphasized that there was confusion over the Fair Political Practices Commission’s emails, which included the phrase “Board of Education” in addition to three individual board members – Gwen Dowdy-Rodgers, Laura Mancha, and Ryan McEachron – in the subject line.

This is because Fair Political Practices Commission staff was sending notice that each of the three individual

board members specified – McEachron, Mancha and Dowdy Rodgers – were under review, as was the entire agency – the Board of Education.

Alejandre was himself the subject of the FPPC complaint. He and Dowdy-Rodgers, Mancha and McEachron maintain that what was contained in the Fair Political Practices Commission complaint was of no concern to Fernandez-Loof or De Leon.

If Alejandre’s intent was to keep Fernandez-Loof and De Leon in the dark about the substance of the complaint, he miscalculated.

Fernandez-Loof did not receive the initial August 26 email alerting the entire board and the three individual board members about the FPPC review. On September 8, Fair Political Practices Commission staff sent another email stating that more time was needed to determine if a comprehensive investigation was to be opened. Loof eventually received that email, and was miffed that she didn’t know about and had not received the initial August 26 notice.

Referencing her direct communications

with the FPPC, Fernandez-Loof at the October 13 board meeting told her colleagues, “They told me it [the information contained in the August 26, September 8, and September 11 emails sent from the Fair Political Practices staff] was meant for the entire board, because the board as a whole is also under review.” Alejandre and his staff were directly responsible for not forwarding the August 26 email and the September 8 email to Loof and De Leon.

At the October 13 board meeting, De Leon stated, “It is illegal for anybody to take... and not distribute... to board members... any mail that is being sent to the San Bernardino County Board of Education, sbcboe@sbcboe.org, or has the intent of reaching all five board members.” According to Fernandez-Loof, Fair Political Practices Commission staff informed her that by sending the email to sbcboe@sbcboe.org it was believed the agency was communicating with the entire board and that the emails sent on August 26, September 8, and September 11 were intended to reach all five trustees. In a lengthy discussion about communication protocols at the October 13 meeting, board

members struggled to understand the technical mechanisms controlling their email—and to establish clear rules going forward. It was observed that any system requiring staff to decide which communications reach which elected officials creates the opportunity for the kind of selective withholding that has already occurred. Fernandez-Loof argued for automatic forwarding of all emails sent to the board address. “Right now, when you put a generic email address for one body, the implication is that it is going to go to every member of that body,” she said. Empowering the board’s staff, which is essentially Alejandre’s staff, to determine what communications the board members as a whole or individually are to see, she said would be “viewpoint discrimination.” De Leon proposed creating written protocols for the board secretary to follow when determining which emails to forward, but acknowledged this still required a staff member to make judgment calls. “I don’t want her breaking any laws,” De Leon said of Alejandre’s executive secretary who would be assigned to screen the board’s emails and communications. Public records obtained

by this Sentinel show Fernandez-Loof did not receive multiple other emails from concerned citizens, including messages titled “Potential Misuse of Public Funds” and “Forensic Audit Requested,” despite these being sent to her direct board email address, which Thurston had assured the public was “not monitored” and had “no interception happening.”

In June 2025, County Auditor-Controller Ensen Mason issued a report on the San Bernardino County Superintendent of School’s District Financial Services (DFS) division, which processes financial transactions for 33 K-12 school districts, five community colleges, three Regional Occupational Programs, two Joint Powers Authorities, numerous charter schools, and the superintendent and his office. The audit identified “several procedures and practices that could be improved,” warning of potential “unauthorized commitments and payments” due to weak internal controls over signature verification, invoice review, and vendor management. The report was distributed to the Board of Supervisors, the County CEO, the “San Bernardino County Audit Commit-

tee,” and the Grand Jury.

The County Board of Education, the elected body with statutory fiscal oversight authority under Education Code § 1042, and the body that approves the budget, paying all District Financial Services staff salaries did not receive a copy of the audit. Trustee Rita Fernandez-Loof discovered the audit independently and brought it to the August 11, 2025 board meeting, urging that Mason be invited to explain the findings publicly. To date, no such invitation had been extended. The San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools website includes a page on District Financial Services. The audit report is not posted there. Fernandez-Loof argued during the October 13 meeting for automatic forwarding without staff intervention. The meeting ended without resolution. Board President Dowdy-Rodgers suggested the communication protocols be addressed at a future board workshop, meaning the current system, in which the superintendent’s staff control information flow to their elected overseers, and which was never voted on by the board, remains in place.

