

Echevarria Settles On Colton Mayoralty As His Next Political Stepping Stone

By Mark Gutglueck

In a move deemed favorable by those in his personal circle, among his professional associates and his supporters and viewed with alarm by some of his colleagues and political reformers, Councilman John Echevarria is going to run for Colton Mayor in this year's election.

Echevarria, who was born and raised in San Bernardino, went into a career in law enforce-



John Echevarria

ment, starting with the Upland Police Department in 1999, the same year he moved to Colton. In 2002, he made a lat-

eral transfer to the San Bernardino Police Department. In November 2020, a little more than two years after he had been promoted to sergeant with the SBPD, he was elected as Colton's District 5 city council representative.

At that time, the Colton City Council, led by a mayor elected at large, consisted of six members representing six districts within the 16.06-square mile

city. That was set to change, however.

In 2018, Colton's voters, with 5,321 in favor and 4,469 opposed, had passed Measure R, which called for reducing the seven-member mayor and council unit from a mayor elected at large and six council members elected by the constituents in a half dozen districts to a council consisting of an at-large mayor and four council members from

as many districts.

In accordance with the terms of Measure R, in the November 2020 election, districts 3, 5 and 6 were up for election, but only for 2-year terms. Districts 1, 2, and 4 were not up for election in 2020. In the November 2022 election, all districts in Colton were contested, with the new districts 3 and 4 being conducted with 4-years at stake and districts 1 and 2 involving See P 2

Slammed By Cal Attorney General, The Courts, Schools Superintendent & Governor, CVUSD Board Vindicated By Supreme Court

Thirty months in the coming, the controlling right-wing faction on the Chino Valley Unified School District was vindicated on Monday by the U.S. Supreme Court, which gave strong indication it will side with the district against the virtual monolith of California's state government and its public education system with regard to the question of minor student privacy vs. parental rights.

It was Chino Valley Unified School District – or more accurately four of its five board members – who led the way in challenging the “progressive” orthodoxy that had been adopted by virtually every one of the State of California's 1,015 school districts which held that students who at school present themselves as being of a gender different from that one imputed to them at birth are entitled to prevent their parents or legal guardians from knowing about that transition if that is their choice.

A surprisingly well kept secret was that for several years schools furnished students requiring them a “changing room,” an on-campus facility in which a student who had departed from home wearing clothes traditionally associated with his or her biological gender could change into clothes which by current stylistic and fashion trends are iden- See P 3

San Manuel Tribe Wants Save Our Forest's Federal Lawsuit Against USFS Dismissed

U.S. District Judge Jesus Bernal may decide as early as Monday, March 9 whether to dismiss a lawsuit brought by a group of environmentalists aimed at protecting the ecology of a specific canyon near the top of the San Bernardino Mountains by preventing water originating at an elevation roughly a mile above sea level from being diverted into a pipeline to a bottling water

operation collection site in the foothills above the City of San Bernardino.

Almost five years ago, on April 23, 2021, the California State Water Resources Control Board issued a tentative order to the bottler of Arrowhead Spring Water to discontinue diverting water from Strawberry Canyon at 5,200-foot to 5,600-foot elevation in the San Bernardino Mountains for use in its

Arrowhead Spring Water bottling operation.

After much back and forth between the Water Resources Control Board, including extensive hearings which took place between August 2021 and July 2023, in which hydrological, biological and legal experts representing both sides testified, in September 2023 that cease and desist order was finalized against the bottler, Blu-

eTriton Brands.

The U.S. Forest Service was responsible for the management of the property in Strawberry Canyon, insofar as it is federal land within the San Bernardino National Forest.. When the United States Forest Service failed to follow its own policies and regulations for issuing special use permits and did not ensure that the Water Resources Control Board's

order was enforced, the Save Our Forest Association in June 2024 sued the US Forest Service in an effort to force it to prevent the company from drafting any water from that mountain source.

Water originating in the San Bernardino Mountains and using the Arrowhead brand in one form or another had been marketed at least since 1909. Questions See P 5

Yucaipa, Despite Measure S Inflow, Not Far Ahead Of The Fiscal Curve

Despite the City of Yucaipa reaping nearly a third more in sales tax income than it previously anticipated bringing in as a result of the passage of Measure S in 2024, the city's financial picture has only marginally improved, Yucaipa Finance Director Phil White told the city council during a mid-

year budget review at the February 23 city council meeting.

According to graphs and charts and a verbal summary that White provided, at the beginning of the fiscal year in July, it was projected that the city would see \$43.912, 589 in revenues over the course of 2025-26 and that there See P 3

Disregard For Inmates Health & Safety Undercuts Legitimacy Of & Support For Illegal Alien Roundup

The third known death in slightly over five months at the Adelanto Detention Center, operated for the U.S. Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement by the GEO Group, occurred on February 27

The recent spate of deaths there, taking place during the stepped-up deportation

effort initiated by the Donald Trump Administration last year, closely approaches a match with what occurred at the facility in 2017, the first year of President Trump's first term.

The most recent death was that of Alberto Gutiérrez Reyes, who died at the Victor Valley Global Medical Center

in the city of Victorville at 12:58 a.m., less than hour after midnight on Friday, February 27. He had been transported there the previous day from the Adelanto Detention Center after collapsing and losing consciousness.

hours earlier in the hospital where he was transferred af- See P 3

Spurning Settlement, County Gambling Paying Outside Firm \$5.4 M Can Win Foster Parenting Suit

After having approved the payment of \$3.95 million to the law firm of Miller Barondess \$3,950,000 over the last two-and-a-half years, the board of supervisors is set to approve at is meeting next Tuesday providing the law firm with another \$1.45 million in a gamble to see if a credible defense can be made of the county's Department of Children

and Family Services, which is accused of allowing foster children in the county to have been abused, mistreated or neglected.

Those knowledgeable about the matter, which has manifested in a class action lawsuit, titled Gary G., et al v. Gavin Newson, et al, say former County Counsel Tom Bunton and current County Counsel Laura

Feingold have consistently missed an opportunity to cut an exit for the county by making realistic concessions with regard to the county's culpability and simultaneously standing down the inflated and spurious elements of the litigation to arrive at a settlement. That route would likely have brought the matter to a close for less than the \$5.4 million in legal fees

the county is to pay out in legal fees alone, they say, while the prospect of the county yet being on the hook for millions of more dollars when the case goes to trial continues.

On May 30, 2023, San Bernardino County was served with the lawsuit, litigation challenging certain California and San Bernardino County policies and procedures

controlling the care of foster children.

Proposed as a class action lawsuit by the New York-based public interest group A Better Childhood, it currently involves 11 children as plaintiffs while purposed to be extended “on behalf of all others similarly situated.” Plaintiffs in the complaint have been changed to pseudonyms to maintain the See P 3

Echevarria Has A Bevy Of Backers Among Colton Residents & Outside The City Who See Him As The Leader The Hub City Needs Going Forward *from front page*

2-year terms.

The neighborhood in which Echevarria resided, which had been contained within District 4, In 2022, Echevarria was retained on the council, this time representing District 4.

Echevarria has his admirers. Many see him in a very positive light based upon his professional standing and accomplishments. As a first responder in emergency situation and an upholder of the law, those who are safety-minded, establishmentarian in their approach to life and pro-law enforcement in their general bearing consider Echevarria to be a resolute {good egg}, a model of virtue who embodies the finest instincts and attributes, making him undeniably well-suited to serve as community leader. And Echevarria is not just any policeman, but one who advanced to the rank of detective, then sergeant and now lieutenant. Having now been a policeman for 26 years, assuming his excursion into elected posts does not move him into higher political office, it is anticipated that before he retires after achieving 34 years in the law enforcement profession in 2033, he will move into an even higher position with the San Bernardino Police Department's Command Staff than the Western District Commander post he now holds, almost assuredly as a police captain, possibly as assistant police chief and perhaps even police chief when San Bernardino Police Chief Darren Goodman retires.

Some of those in Colton have no problem acknowledging Echevarria's value to the people of Colton.

"My councilman's better than yours," is a constant refrain of District 4 resident Jacqueline Maypray.

"John Echevarria's constituents are blessed to have a man like him in a leadership role fighting

for them and their community!" according to Marti Christiansen.

Accordingly, a network has gotten behind Echevarria to encourage him to move up the political evolutionary chain. It is no secret that they, and Echevarria himself, have their sights set on that of San Bernardino County Fifth District supervisor, a position in the California Assembly, the California Senate or perhaps the United States Congress. While the elected position he now holds – Colton Fourth District councilman – might prove to be an adequate or even more than adequate base from which to vault into one of those elected billets, the position of Colton mayor has greater prestige than that of councilman. For that reason, Echevarria is seeking to claim the mayor's gavel from Frank Navarro in November, whether Navarro is ready to surrender it willingly or not.

As attractive of a candidate as Echevarria is on paper and to his supporters and professional and personal associates, paradoxically there are aspects to his fast-moving political ambition which are for many people, both inside and outside of Colton, troubling. While some of those issues may be a matter of superficiality or style or perspective, there are meaningful and deep matters of substance involved which are moving individuals and forces into position to snuff Echevarria's electioneering hopes into oblivion and remove him as a horse at the gate in the Inland Empire's political sweepstakes entirely.

Among San Bernardino County's 24 cities and incorporated towns, 14, more than half – Chino, Montclair, Upland, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Fontana, Rialto, Colton, Grand Terrace, San Bernardino, Needles, Barstow, Adelanto and Apple Valley – elect their mayor directly. The

other 10 – Chino Hills, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands, Big Bear, Yucaipa, Yucca Valley, Twentynine Palms, Victorville and Hesperia – entrust the members of the council to choose from among themselves on whom the honorific of wielding the mayoral gavel is to be conferred.

In the fourteen cities where a mayor is elected, the timing of the mayoral election is a subtle though very real matter of political import. No city in the county, on a normal basis, holds the elections for all of its elective posts simultaneously. Now that all cities and towns in San Bernardino County that previously held their municipal elections in odd-numbered years have discontinued that practice, their mayoral/city council elections take place at staggered intervals in even-numbered years, such that the election of some mayors and council members around the county occur in presidential election years and some fall in gubernatorial election years. Now that Colton has reduced its city council/mayor panel to five members, only San Bernardino, with its seven council members and a mayor, and Needles, with its six council members and a mayor, have council/mayor panels of more than five.

As a consequence of these staggered elections, in those cities where the mayor is elected directly, there is at least one member or hopeful member of the council and in some cases two or three members of the council or hopefuls who run for election or must stand for reelection in the same year and in the same balloting that the mayor runs. There are also members of the council in those cities where the mayor is directly elected who run for election or stand for election in the year where the mayor is in midterm and is not running for election. Thus, for some incumbent council members – those whose electoral term is the same as the mayor's in their city – who must risk their incumbency as

a council member to run against an incumbent mayor. Conversely, there are politicians – incumbent members of a city council in a city with a directly elected mayor whose terms is staggered from their own council term – who do not risk their incumbency as a council member if they choose to challenge the incumbent mayor. In the case of an officeholder – a council member – whose term is staggered from that of the mayor, if he or she runs for mayor and is unsuccessful, he or she will remain on the council to complete his or her term that he or she was elected to two years previously. In the case of a council member whose term corresponds with that of the mayor's term who takes it upon himself or herself to run for mayor and loses, he or she will not remain in office past the month following the election, given that one cannot run for both mayor and council member at the same time.

In Colton as it now stands, the council members or hopefuls in District 1 and in District 2 stand for election or reelection in presidential election years. The council members or those seeking office in District 3 and in District 4 stand for election or reelection in years corresponding with California's gubernatorial election, as does the mayor. In this way, because of the timing of the elections in Colton, for Echevarria to run for mayor, he must risk losing his incumbency on the council. If he manages to win in the 2026 race for mayor, which in this case presumably means defeating the incumbent, Frank Navarro, he will remain in political office. If, however, he does not succeed in unseating Navarro in the November 3, 2026 election, he will have to leave office in December 2026, when the winners of the previous month's election are sworn in to serve over the next four years.

One element of the paradox that Echevarria embodies is his status as a vaunted law enforcement officer. As noted, for establishment-

The San Bernardino County

Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.

The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with

Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

Call (951) 567-1936

to learn of locations where the Sentinel is available or to provide news tips

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 951 567 1936

Message Line 951-567 1936

tarians or those fond of law and order who have a positive impression of police in general, Echevarria is likely to garner their votes. Nevertheless, Echevarria's appeal in this way is indistinguishable from the classic identification of the ideal police officer – a personality of command presence. Police officers expect, indeed demand, respect in the form of obedience from those they encounter. They brook no meaningful discussion beyond that of their own choosing and tolerate no arguing or reasoning that will lead to anything other than the outcome and resolution they expect. There is no give and take, no consideration of alternatives, no debate and no compromise in dealing with a police officer in the field. In Echevarria's five years in elected office, the formula he has applied in governing has been a replication of how he comports himself in his professional life. Where there have been differences of opinion, if he has the political muscle on his side, which is usually the case in the form of the votes of Second District Councilwoman Kelly Chastain and First District Councilman David Toro who have gravitated into an alliance or semi-alliance with him on the council dais, things go Echevarria's way. There is no middle ground, no compromise. In those very rare cases where there have been policy disagreements and he did not have the requisite votes to prevail because either Chastain or Toro was not with him

on that particular issue, he simply lost. There was no effort at finding middle ground or compromising. The art and skill of compromise is not an element of Echevarria's political armory that he has cultivated. He defaults, virtually always, to his command presence, the expectation that his mere presence and will to prevail will prevail.

It is not widely known how financially rewarding being a police officer has been for Echevarria. Police officers in San Bernardino are very well paid. In Echevarria's case, he is now approaching making half of a million dollars per year, all told, for his service as a police lieutenant. In 2023, the last year for which figures are available, Echevarria, then a sergeant, was paid \$179,137 in base salary, another \$44,103 in overtime, together with \$16,567 in pay additions and perquisites, together with \$178,787.12 in benefits and deferred compensation, which included \$125,196.12 deposited into his retirement fund, for a total annual compensation of \$418,594.12. With his promotion to lieutenant and other raises, at present, Echevarria is being paid, in total, somewhere between \$470,000 and \$480,000 in 2026.

His run for mayor, if successful, would complicate salary and contract negotiations between the city and the Colton Police Officers Association. Colton police officers, at present, are paid at a scale that is calculated at 76.7835

Continued on Page 4

County Hoping Outside Law Firm Will Save Its Bacon In Face Of Suit Filed On Behalf Of Neglected Foster Children *from front page*

children's anonymity.

The pseudonymed plaintiffs are Gary G. born on December 8, 2021 in Apple Valley; Xander B. born on August 26, 2010, living in a group home in Chino; Francesca B. born on August 4, 2012 in Apple Valley and Delilah B. born on April 10, 2014 in New Mexico, both

currently living in a foster home in Covina; Teddy H. born on March 5, 2019, living in a foster home in Victorville. Kevin E. and Sam E., twins born in California on January 20, 2010, living in a foster home in Cathedral City; Henry P. born in Alaska on July 13, 2007, who lives in a foster home in Hunting-

ton Beach.

According to the suit, the named plaintiffs "are all children in the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services's custody who have suffered harm at the hands of the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services.

does not adequately vet foster homes before placing children, such as plaintiffs, in them. In fact, the San Bernardino County Department

of Children and Family Services even lacks proper procedures and practices to screen out known abusers from serving as foster parents. Once the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services places foster children in foster homes, it also fails to adequately monitor the foster children to ensure their safety. Caseworkers fail to make enough home visits to determine whether foster children are safe

in their placements. The San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services also does not provide adequate case planning for Plaintiffs or the other foster children in its custody."

In addition, according to the suit, the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services "lacks adequate short-term emergency placements for foster children who need them. Defendants

further permit the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services' caseworkers to carry caseloads that are too high to possibly meet the standards they must satisfy under the law. In fact, the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services' caseworkers often carry caseloads five or six times higher than national professional standards recommend. *Continued on Page 14*

Multiple Deaths, Some Preventable, Of Those Awaiting Deportation At Privately-Run ICE Prison In Adelanto *from front page*

ter losing consciousness at the Adelanto Detention Center.

"My husband died due to medical negligence. For days he was asking for help and they never paid any attention to him," said Martinez, her voice breaking.

Gutiérrez, born in Veracruz, Mexico, emigrated to the United States in 2001, and had never registered with the U.S.

government as a tourist or alien employed in the country. He had no visa, no work permit nor a green card. He had lived primarily in the Los Angeles area, working under the table and undetected by authorities in the construction industry.

Gutiérrez was arrested by Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents on January

9, 2025 in the Echo Park District of Central Los Angeles in what was a predominantly Latino neighborhood.

Gutiérrez, 48, was with his wife, Patricia Martinez, going to a restaurant for breakfast that Friday morning when the couple was spotted by a roving team of Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents at 10:44 a.m. When the uniformed agents passed near him, Gutiérrez bolted. The agents gave chase and arrested him, taking him to the ground

as they did so, injuring his arm, knee and banging his head on the concrete.

Gutiérrez's wife, Patricia Martinez, who is originally from Nayarit and has a residency permit, was not arrested.

After being taken into custody, Gutiérrez was held in a holding cell known as B17 at the Immigration and Customs Enforcement facility within the federal complex in downtown Los Angeles. There, while sleeping on the floor in a cold room with lami-

nated paper sheets as bedding, Gutiérrez developed a cough that persisted. Two days after his arrest, Gutiérrez was transferred to the Adelanto Detention Center.

The Adelanto Detention Center, also known as the Adelanto ICE Processing Center, is operated by the GEO Group, a private, for-profit prison corporation, operates in California. The GEO Group manages the facility under contract with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). It is the

fifth largest immigration detention centers in the United States, with a high daily population, frequently exceeding 1,800 detainees. The comparable facilities throughout the country that exceed its capacity are the ERO El Paso Camp East Montana facility in Texas, which averages approximately 2,954 inmates per day; The South Texas Family Residential Center in Dilley, Texas that has the capacity to hold up to 2,400 people, generally *Continued on Page 14*

Yucaipa Yet Engaging In Overall Deficit Spending Despite Local Sales Tax Override *from front page*

would be expenditures of \$22,195,396 over the same period. The city handles its general fund and public safety fund on separate ledgers, even though money from the general fund is utilized to make up for the income to cost differential that is an institutional reality in Yucaipa in terms of its public safety operation. Over the same 12-month period,

according to White, in the city's public safety fund, \$6,738,000 in revenue was anticipated and \$30,437,687 in expenditures were expected to cover the cost of its law enforcement service contract with the sheriff's department and pay for fire protection service from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection over the course of July 1,

2025 to June 30, 2026, as well as covering the city's provision of paramedic service and code enforcement.

White said the mid-fiscal year adjustment staff has made on those projections shows some the city gaining ground gains with regard to the general fund and losing ground with its public safety fund.

White said of the transfers in to the general fund, which he also referred to as inflow, had changed

from \$43,912,589 to \$44,176,785 and that the \$43,582,834 in expenditures or, as he put it, outflows, overall, which included sending money from the general fund to cover the massive shortages in the public safety fund. At the same time, he said, it appears that the spending on public safety will jump from the earlier projection of \$30,437,687 to \$31,657,730.

While the city is on track to accrue a \$593,591 surplus in its

general fund as of June 30, 2026, White showed documents that pegged public safety fund income of \$30,537,687, including money brought over from the general fund, adjusted public safety expenditures of \$31,657,730, which translated into a deficit of \$1,120,043 on public safety spending in the current fiscal year.

"In the public safety fund," White said, using approximate numbers, "we have amended inflows of \$30,500,000,

amended outflows of \$31,600,000, so we have a budgetary deficit of \$1,120,043. So we've got roughly a \$500,000 net budgetary deficit up until tonight. That is reflective of what we have adopted and all the amendments along the way."

The numbers White provided were extrapolated from what was in the city's accounts kept for its two main operating funds — the general fund and the public safety fund — as of midnight *Continued on Page 17*

After The 2022 Election, The CVUSD Board, Which Had Previously Drifted Leftward On The Political Spectrum Shifted Hard To The Right *from front page*

tified with the opposite gender and where, at the end of the school day, the student could change back into the clothes he or she was wearing upon leaving home that morn-

ing. Moreover, schools and teachers in California were required to treat transgender students according to their gender identity, addressing those students while on campus and in the classroom by the name and pronouns — she or he, him or her — name each student specified. Further, while teachers were called upon to use the names and pronouns of the student's choosing or preference in daily school room settings, they were re-

quired, when meeting in person with the parents of a transgender student during back-to-school nights or parent-teacher conferences or in any written communications with the parents or their guardians to refer to the students by the names given to them by their parents and make no mention of the student's change in gender identity on campus.

From 2018 until 2022, the direction of the Chino Valley Unified School District was in the hands,

essentially, of a progressive 3-to-2 ruling majority on the school board. In November 2022, with Board Member Joe Shaffer not seeking reelection, Sonja Shaw defeating Christine Gagnier in the Governing Board Area 3 race and Jon Monroe capturing a position on the school board representing Governing Board Area 4, control of the district transitioned to a 4-to-1 right wing ruling coalition on the board. Eight months later, in July 2023, on a

4-to-1 vote the district's board members adopted a parental notification policy, whereby the district's teachers were required to inform parents within three days if one of their children assumed a gender identity different from the sexual identification they were given at birth and/or what appeared on his or her birth certificate. That parental notification policy, put in place by members Shaw, Monroe, James Na, and Andrew Cruz prevailing

over Board Member Don Bridge, was groundbreaking, as the district was the first in the state to codify such a requirement. In adopting the policy, the board majority did so openly and with much fanfare. This resulted in, before the vote to adopt the policy was made, a letter from California Attorney General Rob Bonta to the district board, in which he stated his opposition to the parental notification and vowed to take action *Continued on Page 15*

While Engaging In Public Service As A Police Officer And City Councilman, Echevarria Is Serving Himself To Combined Salary & Benefits of \$440,000 Per Year

from page 2

percent of what police officers in San Bernardino are paid. Were Echevarria to become mayor, the police union almost assuredly would use his salary as a bargaining issue, quite likely starting with a demand that Colton officers be remunerated at a level in line with what the mayor is being paid to San Bernardino officers, starting with a comparison between what Colton is paying its police lieutenants vis-à-vis what San Bernardino is paying Echevarria. Echevarria would not be in a position, given his salary and benefits, to counter that, in comparison, Colton police officers are not underpaid.

The reality is, however, that Colton is simply not in a position to escalate pay for its employees beyond what it is already paying them.

As noted, Echevarria's level of remuneration as a police officer in San Bernardino is not widely known, neither generally nor in San Bernardino nor in Colton. The celebration of him as a dedicated and hardworking peace officer and first responder, which has been a part of his past electioneering efforts and which, it is anticipated, is to be a major element of the appeal to voters in the 2026 mayoral race, would be undercut, perhaps marginally or perhaps significantly, were it to be widely disclosed that he is being paid nearly a half of a million dollars annually in his role as a police lieutenant.

Impacting on the question of whether in his roles as a public servant he is indeed serving the public or actually serving himself is a controversy Echevarria involved himself in recently, when the the Colton City Council, by a 3-to-2 margin in which the ruling coalition of Chastain, Toro and Echevarria prevailed, in November voted to up the city council's pay by 364 percent.

In all the time that Echevarria had been serving as city council member, from December 2020 until December 2024 he had been paid \$400 per month with a vehicle allowance of \$220 per month. In 2023, the council took action to up the monthly stipend from from \$400 to \$440 and the automobile allowance from \$220 to \$242, effective as of December 2024.

In November 2025, Echevarria, Toro and Chastain, over the objections of Mayor Frank Navarro and Councilman Luis Gonzalez, voted to consolidate the stipend and automobile allowance into a single monthly payment of \$1,600, the maximum amount that could be provided to a city council of a city with a population in the 50,000-to-75,000-population range. That change is to be effective in December 2026.

In casting his vote in favor of the pay increase for the council, Echevarria insisted his support of the change did not touch on wanting to boost his own remuneration but rather on making certain that holding office in Colton, which he, Toro and Chastain noted requires a considerable time commitment, is not seen as so monetarily unrewarding that those who have decent leadership skills forego seeking office because they must give up more financially rewarding opportunities outside the arena of public service or holding elective office. Echevarria noted that he was himself fortunate enough to be well-paid during his day job, so he did not need the money but that others who were not as well-fixed financially as he was might not run for mayor or city council because doing so would mean they would have to devote time away from what were for them their normal work hours during which they could be supporting themselves and their families. Offering

officeholders the \$1,600 a month would offset for many the financial sacrifice they would have to make to serve as a councilman. Councilwoman or as mayor, Echevarria said.

Hidden, however, is the implication the council/mayoral pay increase would have on Echevarria and his bottom line under a scenario where he draws his professional career as a law enforcement officer to a close early to intensify his political career. For most law enforcement officers in California, including those employed by the City of San Bernardino, their employment benefits include eligibility to retire at the age of 50 and begin drawing a pension equal to the officer's highest annual salary times 3 percent times the number of years they were employed in the law enforcement field. Thus, an officer who began working for a police department or law enforcement agency on his 21st birthday and retires at the age of 50 would be eligible to get a pension equal to 87 percent [29 years times 3%] of the highest salary he (or she) received from the public entity – i.e., the police department – that employed him (or her) during those 29 years. In many or even most cases, those employed as police officers do not retire immediately upon reaching the age of 50 but instead extend their employment until having worked 33-and-one-third years in the law enforcement field, at which point he (or she) is entitled to 100 percent of his (or her) annual highest salary while employed as a police officer.

Echevarria now has more than 26 years invested in his career as a law enforcement officer, such that at the age of 50 he would be – as of the current date, if he were to withdraw from employment right now – qualified to draw roughly a pension of roughly \$172,056.76 [equal to his current annual salary of \$216,423.60 X 3 percent time 26.5 years]. It is reasonable to anticipate that he will advance, before he retires from the San

Bernardino Police Department to the rank of captain, which will likely provide him with an annual salary of roughly \$275,000 per year by late 2032, when he will have achieved 33-and-a-third years in law enforcement, entitling him to a pension equal to 100 percent of his salary.

It is reasonable to expect that Echevarria, given his political ambition, would, upon achieving the post of mayor, seek, at the earliest practical date, higher office, be that San Bernardino County Fifth District supervisor or a position in the California Assembly or the California State Senate. His prospects of unseating current Fifth District County Supervisor Joe Baca Jr would be relatively slim, given Baca's hold on the post. Given Assemblyman James Ramos's hold on the 45th Assembly District and his personal wealth which has been previously and can be again used to bankroll his electioneering efforts, would likely render Echevarria's challenge of Ramos to be even less likely to succeed than a race against Baca. It would thus appear that Echevarria's effort to move up the political ladder in 2028 would involve seeking to succeed Eloise Gomez-Reyes, who is prevented by California's term limit law from seeking state legislative office after her current term, as California state senator in the 29th District. As Echevarria, if successful in running for the State Senate in 2028, would need to resign from his position with the San Bernardino Police Department in December 2028 to be sworn in as a state senator, he would have at that point roughly 29-and-one-third to 29-and-one-half years as a police officer under his belt. This would entitle him to an annual pension for the rest of his life of somewhere between \$202,028.38 [his anticipated \$229,603.80 salary as lieutenant in 2028 X 3 percent X 29.33 years] and \$203,199.36 [his anticipated \$229,603.80 salary as lieutenant in 2028 X 3 percent X 29.5

years] if he remains in the rank of lieutenant or somewhere between \$221,734.80 [his anticipated \$252,000 salary as captain in 2028 X 3 percent X 29.33 years] and \$223,020 [his anticipated \$252,000 salary as captain in 2028 X 3 percent X 29.5 years].

Thus, if Echevarria leaves the police force to become state senator in December 2028, he will need to sacrifice the difference between the \$275,000 per year pension he will receive after retiring as what is likely to be a police captain and the pension in the range between \$202,028.38 and \$223,020 he will pull by retiring roughly four years early to move into heavy duty elective politics, a difference of somewhere between, approximately, \$51,000 to \$72,000.

Viewed from this perspective, Echevarria's vote in November 2025 to up his pay and that of his colleagues on the Colton City Council can be seen as being somewhat more venal than he stated at the time. The \$1,600 per month stipend to be paid to the mayor and council members in Colton beginning in December 2026 translates to an annual salary of \$19,200 per year. Coming as it does from a governmental entity, that \$19,200 will be added to the maximum amount of money Echevarria will be paid while employed as either a police lieutenant or police captain if he retires in December 2028 to move into position as a state senator. That \$19,200 added to his anticipated \$229,603.80 salary as lieutenant in 2028 or to his anticipated \$252,000 salary as captain in 2028 would boost the multiplicand in his pension calculation to either \$248,803.80 or \$271,200, boosting the pension he will receive over the course of the rest of his life.

While his supporters and Echevarria himself represent him as a someone who is serious about the responsibility he is taking on and committed to studying the issues he must deal with in the decision-making process, those involved

in Colton government observe that he often appears to be winging it, without any sort of in-depth understanding of the issues brought before the city council and that he lacks institutional knowledge of the city or what has taken place there historically or going back to any time before he was elected to the city council, including occurrences or matters of significance from ten, 15, 20, 25, 30 or 40 years ago.

In this regard, his not being up on the issues coming before the council or the facts in which the ongoing decision being made are grounded in has resulted in some awkward moments where he begins to pressure either city staff or his council colleagues for the city to take action or move things in a certain direction that is out of keeping with reality. This combined with his police officer personality in which he uses his presumed authority to order those with whom he comes into contact around and make assertions that are factually incorrect has rubbed many at Colton City Hall the wrong way.

One of those pertained to the use of revenue that was being generated as a consequence of the passage of Measure S in November 2022. Measure S called for levying an additional 1 percent sales tax on transactions within the Colton City Limits to be used to support general government services and ensure the city could maintain its essential functions. While the proposal called for utilizing the money for maintaining funding to continue various municipal programs, including police patrols and fire protection, it was not promoted as a tax specifically intended to increase public safety initiatives but to employed to shore up the city's finances generally. It is a peculiarity of California law that initiatives to create new taxes or increase existing taxes earmarked for a specific purpose, called a special tax, require two-thirds voter approval to be put into

Continued on Page 6

Nestlé And Blue Triton Were Drafting 62.56 Million Gallons Of H₂O Out Of The Forest Per Year For Annual Permit Fees of \$524 And \$2,500 *from front page*

have long existed, however, as to whether the water rights originally claimed, attributed or granted to Arrowhead Puritas, the corporate predecessor to Arrowhead Spring Water, pertain to the current source of the water drawn at the 5,200-foot elevation level from Strawberry Creek in what is known as Strawberry Canyon rather than water drawn farther down the mountain at around the 2,000-foot above sea level.

In 1929, the California Consolidated Waters Company was formed to merge three Los Angeles-based companies that bottled and distributed "Arrowhead Water," "Puritas Water" and "Liquid Steam." The property, bottling operations, water distribution and administration of Arrowhead Springs Company, Puritas of California Consumers Company and the water bottling division of Merchants Ice and Storage were all administered by California Consolidated Waters Company.

In August 1930, California Consolidated Waters, on the basis of a single pipeline permit that was not based on any water rights and without having obtained a diversion permit or any further valid authorization or rights, started diverting spring water from a single "bedrock crevice" spring in the San Bernardino National Forest along Strawberry Creek at an elevation of 5,600 feet. Subsequently, in 1933 and 1934, the company put in place tunnels, ultimately accompanied by boreholes and horizontal wells at or near the headwaters of Strawberry Creek or a slightly lower elevation in Strawberry Canyon. Strawberry Creek was noted in maps and springs studies prior to the diversion to be a perennial stream which was fed by abundant flowing headwaters springs. The Arrowhead Water Bottling Company, under various names and corporate configura-

tions, including divisions of Standard Oil of California and Rheem Manufacturing, continued to operate, drawing water from Strawberry Canyon throughout the 20th Century.

In 1969, the Arrowhead Water Bottling Company was acquired by the Coca Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles and in 1978, Chicago-based Northwest Industries acquired Arrowhead Puritas when it bought Coca Cola Bottling of Los Angeles. In 1982, Northwest Industries unloaded Coca Cola Bottling of Los Angeles to Beatrice Foods. BCI subsequently acquired Beatrice in a leveraged buyout.

While under BCI's control, the U.S. Forest Service-issued Arrowhead Puritas water drafting permit in Strawberry Canyon expired, and the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company applied to extend the permit. In 1987, while that application was still pending, Perrier purchased the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company.

The then-pending water extraction permit renewal required a U.S. Forest Service review of the water drafting arrangement and its environmental/ecological impact, which the U.S. Forest Service then did not have the immediately available resources to carry out. In a gesture of compromise, Perrier was allowed, pending the eventual Forest Service review, to continue to operate in Strawberry Canyon by simply continuing to pay the \$524-per year fee to perpetuate the water extraction under the terms of the expired permit. In 1992, when Nestlé acquired the Arrowhead brand from Perrier, it inherited the Strawberry Canyon operation and continued to pay the \$524 annual fee without renewing the permit, which at that time existed under the name of the "Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water

Co," one that was never listed legally in corporate filings, but which operated under Nestlé Waters of North America, Inc. until it was acquired by BlueTriton Brands on March 31, 2021.

Nestlé's intensive water-drafting activity, which had long been decried by environmentalists, came under increasing fire as a statewide drought, which lasted for more than five years after it first manifested in 2011, advanced.

In 2015, environmental groups were gearing up to file a lawsuit claiming the U.S. Forest Service had violated protocols and harmed the ecology of the mountain by allowing Nestlé Waters North America to continue its operations in Strawberry Canyon for 28 years after its permit expired. At that point, the Forest Service moved to make an environmental review. In the meantime, Nestlé continued its water extraction, pumping an average of 62.56 million gallons of water annually from the San Bernardino Mountains.

Among those was the Save Our Forest Association, Inc., which began writing to the US Forest Service protesting Nestlé's use of the expired special use permit to divert the water from Strawberry Canyon, below Rimforest, to its water bottling plants. The United States Forest Service never responded to multiple requests for a meeting to discuss and review the environmental impacts of this long standing spring water diversion from our San Bernardino National Forest.

In April 2016, the United States Forest Service held a public scoping meeting, at which it proposed a 5-year National Environmental Policy Act Study to determine the possible impacts of the water diversions. The Save Our Forest Association objected to this plan and recommended a no action alternative in the National Environmental Policy Act study with no further water diversion for bottling and spring

water capture at the bottom of the canyon with monitoring to determine if any excess water flow existed.

Environmentalists lodged protests with the water rights division of the California Water Resources Control Board, alleging Nestlé was diverting water without rights, making unreasonable use of the water it was taking, failing to monitor the amount drawn or make an accurate accounting of the water it was taking, and wreaking environmental damage by its action. Following a two-year investigation, state officials arrived at a tentative determination that Nestlé could continue to divert up to 26 acre-feet of water (8.47 million gallons) per year. Nestlé had gone far beyond the water drafting limit the company was entitled to, the State Water Resources Control Board said, and was actually drafting 192 acre-feet (62.56 million gallons), such that 166 acre-feet (54.09 million gallons) the company was taking on an annual basis was unauthorized, according to a report released on December 21, 2017. Nestlé, however, continued to draft water from Strawberry Canyon well in excess of 26 acre-feet of water annually, running to an amount near or exceeding its historic 192 acre-feet annual use pattern.

It was in response to citizen complaints regarding this that the California State Water Resources Board issued the April 23, 2021 draft cease and desist order, leading to the public hearings and finalized September 19, 2023 order which followed. In March 2021, Nestlé's parent company, Nestlé S.A., a corporate conglomerate headquartered in Vevey, Vaud, Switzerland, had sold its Nestlé Waters North America division, with the exception of its bottling rights to Perrier, to One Rock Capital Partners, LLC, in partnership with Metropoulos & Company. Nestlé Waters North America operations pertaining to bottling drink-

ing water in the United States and Canada, including eight of the leading water bottling operations in the United States, upon the sale being completed to One Rock Capital and Metropoulos, was redubbed BlueTriton Brands.

Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water is among the most iconic of the brands now in the possession of BlueTriton. To the chagrin of the company, the California State Water Resources Control Board's finalized determination on September 19, 2023 to issue the cease & desist order entailed a finding that "BlueTriton does not have any water rights that authorize these diversions and uses." Despite the California State Water Resources Control Board's ruling, the U.S. Forest Service had extended the Strawberry Canyon water extraction permit first issued to BCI in the 1980s under the auspices of what the Forest Service now refers to as a "land use" fee that has grown from the previous the \$524 per year to \$2,500 annually.

On June 25, the Save Our Forest Association, represented by attorneys Rachel Doughty and Jennifer Rae Lovko filed suit in United States District Court in Riverside against the U.S. Forest Service and Michael Nobles in his official capacity as the acting district ranger for the San Bernardino National Forest, "challenging the U.S. Forest Service decision to allow BlueTriton Brands, Inc.'s illegal occupancy of San Bernardino National Forest and its tributary Springs."

According to the suit, BlueTriton Brands does not have, nor can it obtain or maintain, a valid special use permit from the U.S. Forest Service. With this illegal occupancy, BlueTriton Brands has engaged and will continue to engage in the diversion of substantially all of the water from the San Bernardino National Forest's Strawberry Canyon, negatively impacting the for-

est, local communities, and downstream users." According to the lawsuit, "Strawberry Creek is a tributary to the Santa Ana River and part of the Santa Ana River Watershed. The United States Geologic Service documented that Strawberry Creek is a recharge source for the Bunker Hill Basin. The dry and diminished Strawberry Creek has led to impaired riparian fauna and flora and a creek that cannot support fish, like the native Speckled Dace, as fish need water to survive. BlueTriton Brands' occupancy has dewatered Strawberry Creek and diverted natural springs leaving Strawberry Creek with only intermittent pooling water and fractured habitats. The Santa Ana River Watershed was decreed to have no water available for appropriation decades ago and is fully appropriated. The Bunker Hill Basin remains in deficit, giving diminished water for agricultural and nearly a million people. BlueTriton Brands is taking the Strawberry Creek water that should be recharging the basin. Plaintiff files this complaint to prevent the United States Forest Service from continuing to allow BlueTriton Brands' occupancy and diversion of water in violation of the Federal Land Policy Management Act, The National Forest Management Act, the Administrative Procedure Act and the National Environmental Policy Act."

According to the lawsuit the "Federal Land Policy Management Act [r]equires that public land be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values; that, where appropriate, will preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human oc-

Continued on Page 16

Observers Say Echevarria's Reputation For Being A Superman Capable Of Being In Multiple Places At Once Is Too Good To Be True *from page 4*

effect. Initiatives to create new taxes or increase existing taxes that are not designated for any specific purpose, called a general tax, need only get majority approval – 50 percent plus one vote – to be passed and go into effect. While Echevarria was one of those who joined with Mayor Frank Navarro, Councilman David Toro and Treasurer Aurelio DeLa Torre in promoting the Measure I proposal, as a consequence of his general lack of knowledge regarding local government and governance generally, Echevarria did not recognize the nuance with regard to special taxes and general taxes, and that presenting a tax as a general tax would give it a greater chance of passage because it had a much lower – one vote more than 50 percent – threshold for passage than that for a special tax – two-thirds or 66.667 percent.

Substantial discussions took place during the run-up to the November 2022 election about how the estimated \$9.5 million to be generated by Measure S was to be utilized. A consensus was arrived at which included using a portion of the money to hire six police officers to backfill the officers that had been lost in 2009 during the economic downturn, as the city's finances were at a low ebb, police officers left the department and funding to fill the positions did not materialize. A reality for the city at that point was that the department was unable to attract applicants for the police job because other police departments were offering hiring starting salaries for its officers.

The city was in the course of raising the department's starting salary for new police recruits and had appropriated money to hire six officers. At that point,

Echevarria, prior to the six officers being hired, leapt into the breach, claiming the city had not kept faith with its commitment to the voters who had approved Measure S. He wrongfully characterized Measure S as a special public safety tax, ignored that six officers were in hiring pipeline, demanded that three further police officers be hired, called for the hiring of a single additional firefighter and accused both staff and members of the city council of plotting behind his back, despite public safety programs getting 70 percent of the Measure S funding. His slamming of everyone else did not sit well with those he targeted in his comments and led to not just the belief that Echevarria did not know what he was talking about but counter-accusations to that effect.

Echevarria's ignorance and confusion with regard to what is actually going on at Colton City Hall is a byproduct, a good number believe, in his having spread himself too thin.

Echevarria is referred to by a fair number of Colton's residents as "Superman." That epithet is one made both seriously and sarcastically, and is based upon his prodigious claims of accomplishments. In addition to being a police lieutenant in San Bernardino, a job which requires the devotion of at least 40 hours per week and another four to eight hours of overtime, and a councilman in Colton, Echevarria is involved in an impressive number of outside activities as well as one's related to his public positions that go well beyond the call of duty. He is the founder and president of a running club, through which he participates 5K and 3K runs at various locations, generally on weekends, in far flung places such as Big Bear Lake and Ventura. He regularly attends Mass on Sunday. He has been active in the Colton Chamber of Commerce, along with the Rotary Club and Lion's Club. At the end of the year in 2024, he posted on Facebook,

"When you gave me the privilege of representing you on the Colton city Council, I promised you that I would report back to you annually what I've done as your representative." Echevarria then claimed he had, in 2024, engaged in "251 local visits/spotlights, 401 telephonic/zoom meetings, 23 training seminars and another 21 training seminars, made 20 district appointments, engaged in 404 local media highlights, facilitated 848 citizen concerns, hosted or attended 187 meetings, put out 74 informational bulletins, had 4,644 constituent contacts, attended 88 local government events, participated in 51 community clean ups, participated or attended 101 community engagement events, attended 98 council meeting, participated in 33 special commission or emergency meetings and put out 15 press releases."

For many, those claims came across as a bit suspect, as in the entirety of 2024, the full city council met only 25 in regularly scheduled and special meetings throughout 2024, though his reference may have been to not just those agendaized meeting but another 73 one-on-one meetings he had with his council colleagues.

There doesn't appear to be anyone who is questioning Echevarria's energy and active approach. From this standpoint, indeed, he comes across as "Superman," capable of moving at superspeed, carrying out dozens or even scores of tasks in the time the average person can tend to three or four or five. Still, a common lament is that while he is present physically, Echevarria is not fully mentally engaged while he is out and about, and is insufficiently focused on the business he is engaged in, and therefore unfamiliar with the action he is taking or the items he is voting upon, to some degree just going through the motions, not giving the matters his constituents have entrusted him with overseeing the amount of attention they need to be cogently dealt with.

This harkens to Eche-

varria's previously referenced lack of institutional memory when it comes to civic issues in Colton, a curious condition for a city council member who wants to be mayor. In the late 1990s, Colton was consumed by scandal when then-Mayor Karl Gaytan and council members Don Sanders and James Grimsby and former Councilman Abe Beltran were arrested by the FBI and charged with soliciting and accepting bribes and convicted. Gaytan, Sanders and Grimsby were removed from office. Money was, it was revealed, flowing in omnidirectionally to mayors and council members from those with business before the city whose projects, contracts and franchises were subject to approval by mayoral and council votes. The affair that had touched off the revelations pertained to the 1995/1996 closing out of the city's sanitation department and the awarding of the trash hauling franchise to Taormina Industries. A report generated by former Riverside County Deputy District Attorney Mark McDonald, who had been hired by the city at the instigation of then-Police Chief Bernie Lundsford and then-City Attorney Julie Biggs determined that Taormina had bribed former Mayor George Fulp, Councilman Sanders and Councilman Beltran to get them to override the determination of an independent consultant, Richard Tagore-Erwin and the company he headed, the R.W. Beck Company, that the city's maiden trash hauling franchise should be awarded to Burrtec Industries following an open bidding process. Instead, Fulp, Sanders and Beltran strong-armed Tagore-Erwin into altering his report on the bid analysis to indicate that Taormina industries should be considered a qualified applicant for the franchise and intimidated then-City Manager Malik Freeman and then-Assistant City Manager Daryl Parrish into authoring a report recommending passage of an item placed on the

city council's May 16, 1996 meeting agenda to confer the franchise upon Taormina. At that meeting, the city council, by a 6-to-1 margin, with then-Councilman John Hutton dissenting, approved the franchise contract with Taormina.

Thereafter, at multiple junctures, successive city council's extended the city's trash franchise with Taormina and its corporate successor, Republic Industries and then Taormina/Republic's corporate successor, CR&R. In 2023, with the City of Colton not having held an open bidding process on the city's trash franchise for more than two-and-a-half decades since the original graft-tainted process in which Taormina was chosen over the company, Burrtec, deemed best qualified to be entrusted with the franchise, the ruling coalition of Chastain, Toro and Echevarria, over the objections of Mayor Navarro and Councilman Gonzalez as well as City Manager Bill Smith and his senior administrative officers at City Hall, began moving toward rolling the trash franchise over once more and extending the arrangement with Taormina's corporate successor, CR&R until 2037, such that Colton would go 40 years without subjecting one of its major franchises to an open public bid process. Ultimately, in February 2024, Chastain, Toro and Echevarria voted to extend CR&R's hold on the franchise until 2037.

During the council's process in considering the extension of CR&R's franchise and granting it, the council took a vote at its September 18, 2023 meeting on a motion made by Chastain and seconded by Echevarria, to extend the CR&R trash hauling franchise from 2026 until 2036. That motion failed on a 2-to-3 vote, with councilmen Toro and Gonzalez and Mayor Navarro in opposition. Toro then made a motion to have the city council conduct a public workshop to go over the proposal to extend the franchise contract without conducting a public bidding process.

That passed on a 3-to-2 vote, with Chastain, Echevarria and Toro prevailing. That workshop was held on November 1, 2023. The consideration of the franchise extension was continued, ultimately to the city council meeting of February 20, 2024. At that meeting, the council by a 3-to-2 vote, with Chastain, Toro and Echevarria prevailing over the dissenting Navarro and Gonzalez, extended the city's trash franchise for the third time with Taormina/Republic/CR&R, locking in a contract that has been prolonged for 40 years without any competitive bid process.

Echevarria's vote on September 18, 2023 to extend the CR&R trash hauling franchise from 2026 until 2036 appears to have been a violation of California Government Code Section 84308, commonly known as the Levine Act, which prohibits a local official, both elected and appointed, from voting on or participating in any matter or decision-making process impacting a person or company from whom or from which the official has received a political donation of \$500 or more within either a year before or a year after the donation is made. In Echevarria's case, on December 15, 2022, he received \$1,497.50 donation from CR&R.

Under California Government Code Section 84308's so-called 12-month rule, elected officials must must recuse themselves from proceedings involving licenses, permits, entitlements or contracts if they received more than \$500 from a party/participant within the preceding 12 months. Under California Government Code Section 84308's so-called post-decision restriction, elected officials cannot accept more than \$500 from a party/participant for 12 months after the final decision.

Knowing and willful violations of California Government Code Section 8430 can be prosecuted as a misdemeanor, which may include fines of up to the greater of

Continued on Page 14

At Every Turn, The State Of California's Executive, Legislative, Legal & Educational Officials Thwarted Chino School District's Parental Notification Policy *from page 3*

against the district if it went forward with parental notification. California Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond, concerned that Chino Valley Unified's action in this regard might touch off a contagious round of similar policy adoptions in districts throughout the state, flew down from Sacramento to lobby against the policy at the board meeting when it was voted upon. Both Bonta and Thurmond characterized the policy as one that was hostile to the interests of the transsexual community, and they emphasized that many transsexual youths have parents who would be unaccepting of their life choices and would potentially subject them to physical and psychological abuse if they learned that they had assumed a variant gender. Despite the opposition, the board majority adopted the policy. A little more than a month later, just as the 2023-24 school year was getting under way, Bonta, in his capacity as California attorney general, sued the Chino Valley Unified School District in an effort to prevent it from implementing the policy, and stem the trend of other districts elsewhere in the state from following suit. In filing that suit, Bonta characterized the policy as "destructive" and "downright dangerous," while asserting that the policy "puts transgender and gender nonconforming students in danger of imminent, irreparable harm from the consequences of forced disclosures" and that as a consequence of the school district action, such students were "under threat" and "in fear," facing "the risk of emotional, physical, and psychological harm from non-affirming or unaccepting parents or guardians." The policy, according to the attorney general "unlawfully discriminates against

transgender and gender nonconforming students, subjecting them to disparate treatment, harassment, and abuse, mental, emotional, and physical." Bonta asserted that the need to prevent "mental harm, emotional harm and physical harm" to those students who are products of families who are not accepting of their choice to deviate from their birth or biological gender trumps the right of all parents to be informed of their children's sexual identity choice. Bonta's filing put the new policy on hold and on September 6, 2023, San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge Thomas Garza granted the State of California a temporary restraining order prohibiting the Chino Valley Unified School District from enforcing the policy. Ultimately, the matter was transferred to the courtroom of San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge Michael Sachs. Judge Sachs, reacting to Bonta's claim that the district's forced disclosure provisions discriminate against transgender students who are "singled out" and that it ran afoul of California Education Code Sections 200 and 220 and Government Code section 11135 meant to ensure equal rights and opportunities for every student and prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender identity and gender expression, permanentized the restraining order preventing the policy's enforcement. According to Judge Sachs, the provision of the policy requiring that faculty in essence "out" transgender students to their parents was discriminatory based on sex, violating both the California Constitution's and U.S. Constitution's equal protection clauses. In making his ruling, however, Sachs stated that the provision of the policy which pertained to informing parents

whenever their children's transcripts or official records were altered fell within the rubric of the U.S. Constitution. The district took that guidance to heart and in March 2024 revamped the policy, making no mention of sexuality or gender transition, instead mandating that parents be notified when their children's official school records were changed. This, from a practical standpoint, was inclusive of the intent contained in the policy adopted in July 2023, achieving what the advocates of parental disclosure wanted, while maneuvering around the legal constraints Bonta had constructed. In a sure sign that Shaw, Na, Cruz and Monroe had scored a victory and hit a nerve, state officials then moved to preempt parental disclosure altogether by having Assembly Member Chris Ward, D-San Diego, author AB 1955, prohibiting schools from making a practice of notifying parents if their children are assuming a gender different from the one assigned them at birth. The bill was passed by both of California's legislative houses and was signed into law by Governor Newsom on Monday, July 15, 2024. Almost as soon as Governor Newsom's signature was dry, the Chino Valley Unified School District and parents Oscar Avila, Monica Botts, Jason Craig, Kristi Hays, Cole Mann, Victor Romero, Gheorghe Rosca, Jr. and Leslie Sawyer, represented by attorney Emily Ray of the Austin, Texas-based Liberty Justice Center, sued Governor Gavin Newsom, California Attorney General Rob Bonta and California Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond in an effort to prevent the enforcement of AB 1955. As this legal back-and-forth was raging in state court, Mirabelli vs. Olson, which had been filed on April 27, 1983, was wending its way through federal court. In Mirabelli vs. Olson, Elizabeth Mirabelli and

Lori Ann West, middle school teachers in the Escondido Union School District, together with a group of parents who were not identified by name filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California against the Escondido Union School District Board of Education, the California State Board of Education, the California Department of Education and State Superintendent of Schools Tony Thurmond over a district policy which required them to dissemble and outright mislead parents when they were faced with a situation in which students have assumed a gender at a variance with their natural sex. The suit contended that California school districts, in accordance with guidance provided by the California Department of Education, forced teachers to deceive parents if a student requested to go by a new name or pronouns at school. The lawsuit stated teachers were required to use "any pronouns or a gender-specific name requested by the student during school, while reverting to biological pronouns and legal names when speaking with parents in order to actively hide information about their child's gender identity from them." Mirabelli and West contended in the suit that their First Amendment rights were violated by the district in its requirement that they lie to parents.

The matter was heard by U.S. District Judge Roger T. Benitez in federal court in San Diego. Ultimately, in a sharp rebuke to Bonta and Thurmond and by extension to Governor Gavin Newsom, the Democrat-dominated legislature in Sacramento and public school educators throughout the state, Judge Benitez on December 22, 2025 in a 52-page decision struck down California schools' policies preventing teachers from informing parents if their offspring while on campus are assuming a gender iden-

tity at a variance with that assigned them as a consequence of their outward biology at birth. Judge Benitez declared so-called "parental exclusion policies" to be unconstitutional and an inherent violation of parents' rights.

Judge Benitez's order granted summary judgment in favor of the plaintiffs, and he issued a permanent injunction effectively preventing schools or school districts from stopping teachers from disclosing to parents the gender identity their children have adopted in a school or classroom setting or in any way punishing those teachers for doing so. The injunction prevented schools from requiring that teachers or educators lie to parents. The ruling applied to all public-school districts in California, eradicating the parental exclusion policies in place in other California school districts.

Judge Benitez's ruling and order had direct and tremendous bearing on not only the decisions made in state court, obviating the finding and ruling by Judge Sachs, but impacting the suit brought by the Chino Valley Joint Unified School District in July 2024 and rendering AB 1955 unenforceable. The injunction granted by Judge Benitez in Mirabelli et al. v. Olson et al. was a practical bar to the government in general, California state officials and California school employee preventing parents from being cut off from information pertaining to their children or being able to oversee the medical treatment their children receive. Heartened by Judge Benitez's ruling were the majority of the school board in the Chino Valley and board members with nearly a dozen school districts around the state which either questioned the practice of purposely leaving parents in the dark about the in-classroom/on-campus comportment of their own children or explicitly mandated that parents be informed of their chil-

dren's putative gender transition and were sued, sanctioned or prevented by state officials and state courts for doing so. In short order, however, their effervescence was flattened when Attorney General Bonta, on his own behalf and representing Thurmond and the California Department of Education, Governor Newsom, the state legislature and the vast majority of California's public school districts, appealed Judge Benitez's ruling to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Thereupon, the Ninth Circuit, in agreeing to hear Bonta's appeal, granted the state a stay pending the appeal while it is being heard.

In response, the lawyers for Mirabella and West, along with the parents who had joined in the suit, consisting of the law firm of LiMandri & Jonna LLP and the Thomas More Society, a conservative Roman Catholic public interest law firm based in Chicago, made an immediate appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, seeking an early resolution of the dispute with regard to Judge Benitez's ruling and asking that the stay issued by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit be lifted.

Under the LiMandri & Jonna LLP/Thomas More Society request, the U.S. Supreme Court was asked to reinstate Judge Benitez's restraining order while the California Attorney General's appeal was being considered.

In a response that was made somewhat more quickly than many anticipated, the U.S. Supreme Court allowed Judge Benitez's order to remain in effect and signaled the State of California's parental exclusion policy is not likely to withstand the test of federal court system scrutiny.

Though the Supreme Court's March 2 response to the LiMandri & Jonna LLP/Thomas More Society request did not constitute a decision unequivocally upholding Judge Benitez, it provided an indication that *Continued on Page 17*

Public Notices

SUMMONS – (FAMILY LAW) NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): WILLIAM E McCREE YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. Read the information below and on the next page. Lo han demandado. Lea la informacion a continuacion y en la pagina siguiente. PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): TAMIYA AYELEYABRAMS AFRIFA CASE NUMBER F A M S B 2 5 0 7 1 0 0 You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this Summons and Petition are served on you to file a Response (Form FL-120) at the court and have a copy served on the petitioner. A letter or phone call will not protect you. If you do not file your Response on time, the court may make orders affecting your marriage or domestic partnership, your property, and custody of your children. You may be ordered to pay support and attorney fees and costs. For legal advice, contact a lawyer immediately. Get help finding a lawyer at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.cagov/selfhelp), at the California Legal Services Website (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), or by contacting your local county bar association. Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de haber recibido la entrega legal de esta Citacion y Peticion para presentar una Respuesta (formulario FL-120) ante la corte y efectuar la entrega legal de una copia al demandante. Una carta o llamada telefonica o una audiencia de la corte no basta para protegerlo. Si no presenta su Respuesta a tiempo, la corte puede dar ordenes que afecten su matrimonio o pareja de hecho, sus bienes y la custodia de sus hijos. La corte tambien le puede ordenar que pague manutencion, y honorarios y costos legales. Para asesoramiento legal, pongase en contacto de inmediato con un abogado. Puede obtener informacion para encontrar un abogado en el Contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en el sitio web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogados de su condado. NOTICE – Restraining orders on page 2: These restraining orders are effective against both spouses or domestic partners until the petition is dismissed, a judgment is entered, or the court makes further orders. They are enforceable anywhere in California by any law enforcement office who has received or seen a copy of them. AVISO – Las ordenes de restricción se encuentran en la pagina 2 : Las ordenes de restricción estan en vigencia en cuanto a ambos conyuges o miembros de la pareja de hecho hasta que se despida la peticion, se emita un fallo o la corte de otras ordenes. Cualquiera agencia del orden publico que haya recibido o visto una copia de estas ordenes puede hacerlas acatar en cualquier lugar de California. FEE WAIVER : If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the clerk for a fee waiver form. The court may order you to pay back all or part of the fees and costs that the court waived for you or the other party. Exencion de cuotas : Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida al secretario un formulario de execion de cuotas. La corte puede ordenar que usted pague, ya sea en parte o por completo, las cuotas y costos de la corte previamente exentos a peticion de usted o de la otra parte. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y direccion de la corte son): SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 351 N ARROWHEAD AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415 The name, address and tele-

Public Notices

phone number of petitioner's attorney, or petitioner without an attorney, are: (El nombre, direccion y numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante si no tiene abogado, son): TAMIYA AYELEYABRAMS AFRIFA 16907 ORANGEWAY #208 FONTANA, CA 92335 (909) 676-7309 Filed: OCTOBER 20, 2025 by Daisy Albitar, Deputy clerk (Asistente) for Clerk of the Court (Secretario) STANDARD FAMILY LAW RESTRAINING ORDERS Starting immediately, you and your spouse or domestic partner are restrained from: 1. removing the minor children of the parties from the state or applying for a new or replacement passport for those minor children without the prior written consent of the other party or an order of the court; 2. cashing, borrowing against, canceling, transferring, disposing of, or changing the beneficiaries of any insurance or other coverage, including life, health, automobile, and disability, held for the benefit of the parties and their minor children; 3. transferring, encumbering, hypothecating, concealing, or in any way disposing of any property, real or personal, whether community, quasi-community, or separate, without the written consent of the other party or an order of the court, except in the usual course of business or for the necessities of life; and 4. creating a nonprobate transfer or modifying a nonprobate transfer in a manner that affects the disposition of property subject to the transfer, without the written consent of the other party or an order of the court. Before revocation of a nonprobate transfer can take effect or a right of survivorship to property can be eliminated, notice of the change must be filed and served on the other party. You must notify each other of any proposed extraordinary expenditures at least five business days prior to incurring these extraordinary expenditures and account to the court for all extraordinary expenditures made after these restraining orders are effective. However, you may use community property, quasi-community property, or your own separate property to pay an attorney to help you or to pay court costs. ORDENES DE RESTRICCIÓN ESTÁNDAR DE DERECHO FAMILIAR En forma inmediata, usted y su cónyuge o pareja de hecho tienen prohibido: 1. llevarse del estado de California a los hijos menores de las partes, o solicitar un pasaporte nuevo o de repuesto para los hijos menores, sin el consentimiento previo por escrito de la otra parte o sin una orden de la corte; 2. cobrar, pedir prestado, cancelar, transferir, deshacerse o cambiar el nombre de los beneficiarios de cualquier seguro u otro tipo de cobertura, como de vida, salud, vehículo y discapacidad, que tenga como beneficiario(s) a las partes y su(s) hijo(s) menor(es); 3. transferir, gravar, hipotecar, ocultar o deshacerse de cualquier manera de cualquier propiedad, inmueble o personal, ya sea comunitaria, cuasicomunitaria o separada, sin el consentimiento escrito de la otra parte o una orden de la corte, excepto en el curso habitual de actividades personales y comerciales o para satisfacer las necesidades de la vida; y 4. crear o modificar una transferencia no testamentaria de manera que afecte la asignación de una propiedad sujeta a transferencia, sin el consentimiento por escrito de la otra parte o una orden de la corte. Antes de que se pueda eliminar la revocación de una transferencia no testamentaria, se debe presentar ante la corte un aviso del cambio y hacer una entrega legal de dicho aviso a la otra parte. Cada parte tiene que notificar a la otra sobre cualquier gasto extraordinario propuesto por lo menos cinco días hábiles antes de realizarlo, y rendir cuenta a la corte de to-

Public Notices

dos los gastos extraordinarios realizados después de que estas ordenes de restricción hayan entrado en vigencia. No obstante, puede usar propiedad comunitaria, cuasicomunitaria o suya separada para pagar a un abogado que lo ayude o para pagar los costos de la corte. NOTICE—ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE: Do you or someone in your household need affordable health insurance? If so, you should apply for Covered California. Covered California can help reduce the cost you pay towards high quality affordable health care. For more information, visit www.coveredca.com. Or call Covered California at 1-800-300-1506 AVISO—ACCESO A SEGURO DE SALUD MÁS ECONÓMICO: ¿Necesita seguro de salud a un costo asequible, ya sea para usted o alguien en su hogar? Si es así, puede presentar una solicitud con Covered California. Covered California lo puede ayudar a reducir el costo que paga por seguro de salud asequible y de alta calidad. Para obtener más información, visite www.coveredca.com. O llame a Covered California al 1-800-300-0213 WARNING—IMPORTANT INFORMATION California law provides that, for purposes of division of property upon dissolution of a marriage or domestic partnership or upon legal separation, property acquired by the parties during marriage or domestic partnership in joint form is presumed to be community property. If either party to this action should die before the jointly held community property is divided, the language in the deed that characterizes how title is held (i.e., joint tenancy, tenants in common, or community property) will be controlling, and not the community property presumption. You should consult your attorney if you want the community property presumption to be written into the recorded title to the property. ADVERTENCIA—IMPORTANTE INFORMACIÓN De acuerdo a la ley de California, las propiedades adquiridas por las partes durante su matrimonio o pareja de hecho en forma conjunta se consideran propiedad comunitaria para fines de la división de bienes que ocurre cuando se produce una disolución o separación legal del matrimonio o pareja de hecho. Si cualquiera de las partes de este caso llega a fallecer antes de que se divida la propiedad comunitaria de tenencia conjunta, el destino de la misma quedará determinado por las cláusulas de la escritura correspondiente que describen su tenencia (por ej., tenencia conjunta, tenencia en común o propiedad comunitaria) y no por la presunción de propiedad comunitaria. Si quiere que la presunción comunitaria quede registrada en la escritura de la propiedad, debería consultar con un abogado. Published in The San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2602844 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner AMANDA LISE MORENO filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: AMANDA LISE MORENO to AMANDA LISE DIOLATA 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

Public Notices

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: March 25, 2026 Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S27 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SAN Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition. Dated: 2/11/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Mariah Mora, Deputy Court Clerk Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN2026000848 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as LEGENDARY FITNESS 290 N. BENSON AVE STE. 13 UPLAND, CA 91786: TWILA KNIGHT POULIOT [and] MATT POULIOT [and] TIFANI McCLANAHAN [and] LOREN McCLANAHAN Business Mailing Address: 290 N. BENSON AVE STE. 13 UPLAND, CA 91786 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/ TWILA KNIGHT POULIOT, General Partner Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/02/2026 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 K2885 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN2026000707 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as KOYLA INDIAN RESTAURANT 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: B&G ENTERPRISES, INC. 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Business Mailing Address: 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 24, 2026. 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/ BALWINDER SINGH, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on:

Public Notices

02/02/2026 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 K2885 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20260001008 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as RUN DOGGIE RUN 937 N MILLARD AVE RIALTO, CA 92376: LISSINIA LAGUILAR Business Mailing Address: 937 N MILLARD AVE 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: 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/ LISSINIA LAGUILAR Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/10/2026 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 J9535 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20260001058 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as WAX'D BY SHAYNA 536 E FOOTHILL BLVD STE 7 UPLAND, CA 91786: SHAYNA MOORER Business Mailing Address: 16980 NISQUALI RD, P202 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A. By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. /s/ SHAYNA MOORER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/11/2026 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 J8719 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20260001060 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as LSP LUX MEHAL 15195 BEARTREE ST FONTANA, CA 92336: HIMALAYAN EARTH INC 15195 BEARTREE ST FONTANA, CA 92336 Business Mailing Address: 15195 BEARTREE ST FONTANA, CA 92336 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: N/A.

Public Notices

entity doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as XPLOR 3D DESIGN 573 E G ST 1/2 COLTON, CA 92324: JONATHAN R GARCIA REYES is abandoning its fictitious business name. The original FBN number was FBN20250009058. The original date of filing was 9/25/2025 Business Mailing Address: 1040 S MOUNT VERNON AVE STE G-256 COLTON, CA 92324 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A. By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. /s/ JONATHAN R GARCIA REYES Abandonment statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 1/16/2025 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 J9676 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20260000707 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as KOYLA INDIAN RESTAURANT 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: B&G ENTERPRISES, INC. 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Business Mailing Address: 8140 HAVEN AVE STE 101 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 24, 2026. 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/ BALWINDER SINGH, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/02/2026 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 K2885 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20250012118 The following person is doing business as: SAVINA'S CARGO & EXPRESS. 14384 IVY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 14384 IVY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EMMA W CABRERA 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/ EMMA W CABRERA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 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

Public Notices

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. /s/ JASBIR S SANGHA, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/11/2026 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026. FBN20260001090 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as AIRE SERV OF UPLAND – NORTH RANCHO CUCAMONGA 1777 W ARROW RTE STE 302 UPLAND, CA 91786 : ALWAYS LOOKING FORWARD, INC 1777 W ARROW RTE STE 302 UPLAND, CA 91786 Business Mailing Address: 6988 MANGO ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number B20260023110. 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/ ALEXANDER WEITH, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/12/2026 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 K9236 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 February 13, 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

Public Notices

business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/23/2026, 01/30/2026, 02/06/2026, 02/13/2026 CNBB4202602MT

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ALFRED A. RAMOS

CASE NO. PROVA2600114

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ALFRED A. RAMOS: a petition for probate has been filed by MICHELLE A. RAMOS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION for Probate requests that MICHELLE A. RAMOS 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 March 23, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at 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.

Attorney for Michelle A. Ramos:

Mathew Alden (California Bar Number 288429)
255 North D Street Suite 200
San Bernardino, CA 92401
(909) 414-0797

mralden123@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BRANKO SAVIC

CASE NO. PROVA2600101

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ALEKSANDRA VUKANIC 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 March 23, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at 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.

Attorney for Aleksandra Vukanic:

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOAN AL-

Public Notices

ICE HOFF
CASE NO. PROV2600044

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SHARON A. BUESCHER 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 April 7, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at San Bernardino County Superior Court Victorville District

Department V-15 - Victorville
14455 Civic Drive, Suite 200
Victorville, CA 92392

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Sharon A. Buescher:
R. SAM PRICE SB 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
454 Cajon Street
REDLANDS, CA 92373
Phone (909) 328 7000
Fax (909) 475 9500
attorneys@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: SPENCER GREGORY LADD

CASE NO. PROVA2600118

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BACARDO WILSON ANDERSON: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by BRITNAY SIERRA ANDERSON

Public Notices

and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of SPENCER GREGORY LADD: a petition for probate has been filed by ELIZABETH RAMIREZ in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ELIZABETH RAMIREZ 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 April 7, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Elizabeth Ramirez:
R. SAM PRICE SB 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
454 Cajon Street
REDLANDS, CA 92373
Phone (909) 328 7000
Fax (909) 475 9500
attorneys@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BACARDO WILSON ANDERSON

CASE NO. PROVA2600120

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BACARDO WILSON ANDERSON: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by BRITNAY SIERRA ANDERSON

Public Notices

in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that BRITNAY SIERRA ANDERSON 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. F-1 at 9:00 a.m. on March 26, 2026.

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Britnay Sierra Anderson:
ANTONIETTE JAU-REGUI (SN 192624)
1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
ajprobate@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVBA 2600093

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner MICHAEL DAVID OLDENDORFF filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

MICHAEL DAVID OLDENDORFF to MICHAEL DAVID GUTIERREZ

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in

Public Notices

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: April 3, 2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: B1

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Barstow District-Civil Division, 235 East Mountain View Street Barstow, Ca 92311

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

Dated: February 17, 2026
Commissioner Jason S. Wilkinson, Judge of the Superior Court

By Brian Gutierrez, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2602992

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner MAIDAH SOHAIL aka MAIDAH HSEN filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

MAIDAH SOHAIL to SEHR ANJUM SOHAIL [and]

MAIDAH HSEN to SEHR ANJUM SOHAIL

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: April 10, 2026, Time: 09:00 AM, Department: S36

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

Dated: February 11, 2026
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

By Janai Piedra, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

FBN20260000103
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

Public Notices

UBERHOLEN ELECTRIC
1252 W 15TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786: XUE J ZHOU

Business Mailing Address:
1252 W 15TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. 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/ XUE J ZHOU, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 01/08/2026

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 K9232

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 February 20 & 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

FBN20260000874
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

PURE MOMENTS MAGNETICS AND MORE 4226 EL MOLINO BLVD CHINO HILLS, CA 91709: ANDRES D RIOS

Business Mailing Address:
4226 EL MOLINO BLVD CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 19, 2026.

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/ ANDRES D RIOS, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/03/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy K1583

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

Published in The San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 20 & 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ELAINE CATHLEEN GRAVES

CASE NO. PROVA2600133

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ELAINE CATHLEEN GRAVES: a petition for probate has been filed by DONALD EUGENE GRAVES in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DONALD EUGENE GRAVES be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the

Personals

\$10,000 REWARD for information regarding girl born August 4, 2001 whose parents (actors) were lost in a theater collapse in Colorado, April 27, 2003. Thomas W. Campbell, Attorney-at-Law 15 Williams St. New York, NY

Civil Service Employee wants to rent suburban detached apartment, 4 or 5 bedrooms 2 baths, will pay cash for the right setting Alfred Willenstein Post Office Box 843 Sempleton, Wis.

PERSONAL Lance Corporal who saw shy governess in rickshaw on the streets of Hong Kong on March 14 would like to meet up with her again. Steve Duvery of St. Louis Missouri.

Public Notices

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

A hearing on the petition will be held March 30, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at

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.

Attorney for Donald Eugene Graves:

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FREDRIC VAUGHN HOLLADAY CASE NO. PRO-VA2600145

To all heirs, beneficiaries,

Public Notices

creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of FREDRIC VAUGHN HOLLADAY: a petition for probate has been filed by NICHOLAS PIERCE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that NICHOLAS PIERCE 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 April 1, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F3 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Nicholas Pierce:

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BRUCE DOUGLAS WINTERS CASE NO. PROV 2600033

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BRUCE DOUGLAS WINTERS: a petition for probate has been filed by DESTINY WINTERS in

Public Notices

the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held March 25, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at

San Bernardino County Superior Court Victorville District

Department V12 - Victorville 14455 Civic Drive Victorville, CA 92392

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

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

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

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

Attorney for Destiny Winters:

RACHEL KING SB 300298 KING LAW FIRM ATTORNEYS AT LAW, INC 34859 FREDERICK STREET, SUITE 108 WILDOMAR, CA 92595 Phone (951) 834 7715 Fax (951) 319 7129 cases@thelawyerking.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6 & 13, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2603171

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioners AMANDA McMULLEN and GAVIN McMULLEN filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

Public Notices

OLIVIA GRACE McMULLEN to JACK CHARLES McMULLEN

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: April 14, 2026 Time: 09:00 AM, Department: S31

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

Dated: February 17, 2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Pricilla Saldana, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2603240

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner ROSALIE ADELINA PADILLA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

ROSALIE ADELINA PADILLA, aka ROSALIE ADELINA GUITERREZ, ROSALIE ADELINA GUITERREZ and ADELINA GUITERREZ TO ROSALIE ALINA PADILLA 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: APRIL 1, 2026 Time: 8:30 a.m. Department: S26 Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino San Bernardino District-Civil

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

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

Gilbert G. Ochoa Judge of the Superior Court. Rosalie Adelina Padilla Published in the San Ber-

Public Notices

nardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001377

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as INFLATABLE SUPPLY CO 9252 HYSOP DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: RAFFI TAVOUKJIAN

Business Mailing Address: 9252 HYSOP DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ RAFFI TAVOUKJIAN, Sole Proprietor Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/23/2026

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 February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001410

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

NEW CENTURY INVESTMENT REALTY 12223 HIGHLAND AVE 106-366 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739: ZOILA MOSCOSO

Business Mailing Address: 12223 HIGHLAND AVE 106-366 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: September 19, 2019.

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

/s/ ZOILA MOSCOSO, Owner Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/24/2026

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 February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260000842

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

OPTIMAL WEALTH NETWORK INSURANCE AGENCY [and] OWN INSURANCE AGENCY [and] OWN SENIOR SOLUTIONS 473 S CARNEGIE DR SUITE 200 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408: OPTIMAL WEALTH NETWORK 473 S CARNEGIE DR SUITE 200 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Business Mailing Address: 473 S CARNEGIE DR SUITE 200 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

The business is conducted by:

Public Notices

A CORPORATION registered with the State of California.

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/ COREY SCALES, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/02/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy J6733

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001460

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

REAL ESTATE AND LENDING SIMPLIFIED 3200 E GUASTI ROAD 100 ONTARIO, CA 91761: REAL ESTATE AND LENDING SIMPLIFIED 3200 E GUASTI ROAD 100 ONTARIO, CA 91761

Business Mailing Address: 1814 LAKEWOOD AVE UPLAND, CA 91784

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number B2026008731

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 20, 2026.

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

/s/ JOHN ABRIL, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/25/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy J6733

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001501

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

BIRDEYE LOANS 3200 E GUASTI ROAD, 100 ONTARIO, CA 91761: REAL ESTATE AND LENDING SIMPLIFIED 3200 E GUASTI ROAD 100 ONTARIO, CA 91761

Business Mailing Address: 1814 LAKEWOOD AVE UPLAND, CA 91784

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number B2026008731

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 20, 2026.

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

/s/ JOHN ABRIL, President Statement filed with the Coun-

Public Notices

ty Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/26/2026

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 on February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001449

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

EMPOWERPATH SUPPORTIVE SERVICES 13597 SHERMAN PL. FONTANA, CA 92336: NAISHA M KENDRIX

Business Mailing Address: 13597 SHERMAN PL. 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: February 3, 2026.

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/ NAISHA M KENDRIX Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/25/2026

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 J9535

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 February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

FBN20260001437

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

SVN/THE BRADCO COMPANIES [and] SVN/BRADCO COMPANIES [and]

SVN/BRADCO TEAM [and] SVN/THE BRADCO HIGH DESERT REPORT [and] SVN/THE BRADCO COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE COMPANY [and]

SVN/BRADCO [and] SVN/BRADCO COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE GROUP 12402 INDUSTRIAL BLVD B6 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395: JOSEPH W. BRADY, INC. 12402 INDUSTRIAL BLVD B6 VICTORVILLE, CA 92393

Business Mailing Address: PO 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: 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/ JOSEPH W. BRADY, President Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/25/2026

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 A9730 Hesperia

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

Public Notices

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 February 27 and March 6, 13 & 20, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JANE ELLEN CUSHING

CASE NO. PROVA2600150 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JANE ELLEN CUSHING: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by P JANE ELLEN CUSHING in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JANE ELLEN CUSHING 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. F-1 at 9:00 a.m. on April 11, 2026 San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Petitioner Paul D. Cushing; Jeff W. LeBlanc - SBN 253200 Anderson & LeBlanc APLC 123 E. 9th Street, Suite 105 Upland, CA 91786 Telephone No: (909) 949-2226

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604252

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG to TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG-WILDER

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: April 13, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S28

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

Dated: 2/27/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Alexis Camacho, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604720

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

ELAINE CROSBY to LOVELY DAY

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: April 13, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S28

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

Dated: 2/27/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Alexis Camacho, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604242

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner TAWNI DANIELLE

FILED WITH THIS COURT FOR A DECREE CHANGING NAMES AS FOLLOWS:

TAWNI DANIELLE FLOT-WILLIAMS to TAWNI DANIELLE WILLIAMS

Public Notices

FLOT-WILLIAMS filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

TAWNI DANIELLE FLOT-WILLIAMS to TAWNI DANIELLE WILLIAMS

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: April 13, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S27

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

Dated: 2/27/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Alexis Camacho, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604252

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG to TRENTON LOUIS ALLMANG-WILDER

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: April 13, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S28

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

Dated: 2/27/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Alexis Camacho, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604720

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

ELAINE CROSBY to LOVELY DAY

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: April 13, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S28

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

Dated: 2/27/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Alexis Camacho, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2604242

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner TAWNI DANIELLE

FILED WITH THIS COURT FOR A DECREE CHANGING NAMES AS FOLLOWS:

TAWNI DANIELLE FLOT-WILLIAMS to TAWNI DANIELLE WILLIAMS

Public Notices

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: April 20, 2026 Time: 9:00 AM, Department: S23

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

Dated: 3/04/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa By Kaliska Montecue-Castro, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV-BA2600136

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner RANA SALEEM MUWANAS filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

RANA SALEEM MUWANAS to RANA SALEEM ANTABEEL

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: April 17, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: B1

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Barstow District-235 East Mountain View Street Barstow, CA 92311

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

Dated: 3/06/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: James R. Baxter By Brian Gutierrez, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

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 SBCS Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 03/02/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

Public Notices

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

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 SBCS Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 03/02/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV-BA2600136

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner RANA SALEEM MUWANAS filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

RANA SALEEM MUWANAS to RANA SALEEM ANTABEEL

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: April 17, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: B1

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Barstow District-235 East Mountain View Street Barstow, CA 92311

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

Dated: 3/06/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: James R. Baxter By Brian Gutierrez, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

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 SBCS Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 03/02/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

Public Notices

02/27/2026 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 J9535

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV-BA2600136

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner RANA SALEEM MUWANAS filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

RANA SALEEM MUWANAS to RANA SALEEM ANTABEEL

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: April 17, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM, Department: B1

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Barstow District-235 East Mountain View Street Barstow, CA 92311

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

Dated: 3/06/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: James R. Baxter By Brian Gutierrez, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 6, 13, 20 & 27, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

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 SBCS Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 03/02/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2604361,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Alejandro Rubalcava Martinez Jr to Evan Alejandro Olazaba,

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: 04/13/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30

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 SBCS Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 03/02/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa

Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

Public Notices

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MICHAEL W MORROW 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/MICHAELWMORROW,OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 02, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202605MT

FBN 20260001678 The following person is doing business as: CHERNANDEZ ROOM & BOARD. 5278 N H ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407;[MAILING ADDRESS 5278 N H ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CHRISTIAN S HERNANDEZ 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

Public Notices

becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ CHRISTIAN S HERNANDEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 03, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202606MT

FBN 2026001709 The following person is doing business as: TINY BUT MIGHTY CLEANING. 7252 ARCHIBALD AVE SUITE 1022 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91710;[MAILING ADDRESS 7252 ARCHIBALD AVE SUITE 1022 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91710]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MYIECHA S ANDERSON 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/ MYIECHA S ANDERSON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 04, 2026 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

Public Notices

it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202607MT

FBN 20260001671 The following person is doing business as: HONEY HUSTLER; DIESEL HUSTLE; HEAVY HUSTLE. 8040 RIGGINS RD PHELAN, CA 92371;[MAILING ADDRESS 8040 RIGGINS RD PHELAN, CA 92371]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RIGOBERTO HERNANDEZ The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAR 02, 2026 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/ RIGOBERTO HERNANDEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 02, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202608MT

Public Notices

FBN 20260001677 The following person is doing business as: HOTWORX-ONTARIO. 3560 E GUASTI ROAD ONTARIO, CA 91761;[MAILING ADDRESS 7544 SHORT-HORN ST CHINO, CA 91708]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO PHYSIX LLC 7544 SHORT-HORN ST CHINO CA 91708 STATE ORGANIZATION CA The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: FEB 27, 2026 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/ JONATHAN AZURIN, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 03, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202609MT

FBN 20260001686 The following person is doing business as: LUNA LAW. 3281 E GUASTI RD SUITE 750 ONTARIO, CA 91761;[MAILING ADDRESS 3281 E GUASTI RD 750 ONTARIO, CA 91761]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUNA LEVERUNG & HOLMES, PC 3281 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO CA 91761 STATE OF INCORPO-

Public Notices

RATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20250087668 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/ DARCY S. LUNA, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 03, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202610MT

FBN 20260001720 The following person is doing business as: CURL QUEEN DOREEN. 16321 MAIN ST STE #210 STUDIO #34 CHINO, CA 91708;[MAILING ADDRESS 16321 MAIN ST STE#210 STUDIO #34 CHINO, CA 91708]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DOREEN AGUIRRE 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/WALLYHADDAD,SECRETARY Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 04, 2026 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 state-

Public Notices

ment expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/05/2026, 03/12/2026, 03/19/2026, 03/26/2026 CNBBI0202612MT

FBN 20260001316 The following person is doing business as: OD.WIII AUTO DETAILING 15660 MALAGA DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 15660 MALAGA DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ODELL D WEEMS III The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 04, 2026 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/ ODELL D WEEMS III Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: FEBRAURY 20, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202613MT

Public Notices

ment expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/05/2026, 03/12/2026, 03/19/2026, 03/26/2026 CNBBI0202612MT

FBN 20260001316 The following person is doing business as: OD.WIII AUTO DETAILING 15660 MALAGA DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 15660 MALAGA DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ODELL D WEEMS III The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 04, 2026 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/ ODELL D WEEMS III Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: FEBRAURY 20, 2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 03/06/2026, 03/13/2026, 03/20/2026, 03/27/2026 CNBBI0202613MT

County Is Paying Lawyers \$625 Per Hour To Contest “Semi-Class Action” Suit Relating To The Local Foster Care System from page 3

mend. Caseworkers with such high caseloads cannot adequately document and implement each foster child’s case plan as mandated by federal and state laws. The San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services CFS also does not provide plaintiffs or other foster children in its custody with timely health or dental assessments.”

Marcia Robinson Lowry and Jonathan G. Borle, in-house lawyers with A Better Childhood represent the plaintiffs, as do Polly Towill, Daniel Brown, Benjamin O. Aigboboh, Tori Kutzner, Victoria Ayeni, and Alexandria Amerine of the Los Angeles office of the law firm Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton.

Over the more than two years that lawyers with Miller Barondess have been working on

the case, little or no progress toward settlement has been made.

While all of the members of the law firm of Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton working on the case are doing so pro bono, Miller Barondess attorneys, both partners and associates, are being paid \$625 per hour and paralegals are being paid \$225 per hour by the county.

Despite the potential that as many as 5,800 children who have passed through the county’s foster system in recent years could join in the lawsuit as class action plaintiffs, could join in the lawsuit, Lowry, Borle and the lawyers with Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton have had only marginal success in transforming the case into one that might truly be considered class action in scope. At issue is the provability that large numbers of foster children were actually harmed by the San Bernardino County Department of Family Services. There has been a marshaling of facts and evidence to demonstrate there was neglect on

the part of the county and some instances of abuse and mistreatment, but taken from the perspective of 5,800 having been fostered in the county in the last two decades, these appear to be isolated cases. The county could have, those considered to be on top of the matter say, dealt straightforwardly with those but has yet to do so in a meaningful way. The case could thus be limited to the eleven original plaintiffs and a handful of others. The county is in a relatively weak position with regard to a limited set of plaintiffs and in a much stronger position relating to the plaintiffs and Sthe lawyers with are looking scare up.

When a class action includes plaintiffs with and without legitimate cases, the court may decertify the class, split it into sub-classes, or exclude the invalid claims to ensure legal, factual, and typicality requirements are met

A class action lawsuit must generally have common issues that allow for a single, uniform resolution. If the differ-

ences between separate groups of plaintiffs are too vast, the court may determine that individual issues predominate over common ones, causing the class certification to be revoked. Plaintiffs whose claims do not fit the common legal theory or lack evidence may be removed from the class. The court may also create separate sub-classes for different groups of plaintiffs with similar claims, allowing the legitimate case to proceed while dismissing spurious claims outright. Individuals with invalid or different claims may be excluded during the certification process, allowing them to pursue separate, individual litigation if they choose.

If invalid claims are allowed to remain, they risk causing inconsistent judgments or undermining the legitimacy of the entire class action. If a settlement is proposed, the court’s charter of responsibility is to ensure it is fair to all members, which may involve reducing or eliminating payouts to those without legitimate, evidence-backed claims.

In recommending that the board of supervisors extend the contract for legal services with Miller Barondess for another \$1.45 million, County Counsel Feingold hinted, but did not directly state, that lawsuit might be brought to and end within the next sixteen months. She stated, “Total cost of this Agreement is not anticipated to exceed \$700,000 for the remainder of 2025-26 and \$750,000 for 2026-27. The Gary G. lawsuit is a unique and complex litigation matter that requires defense of significant technical policies and procedures used to provide foster care services throughout the county.” Feingold stated.

“The Office of County Counsel selected the firm of Miller Barondess, LLP as the most qualified to defend the County and its employees in the Gary G. lawsuit based on the experience of key personnel and amount of time in practice in this specific area of law. Miller Barondess, LLP has expertise in similar cases and has provided a discounted public agency rate for experienced practitioners in this area of the law. Although litigation is by its nature uncertain, it is anticipated that this case will resolve within 2027-28. The Agreement will end no later than March 10, 2031.”

-Mark Gutglueck

Deaths In ICE Custody from page 3

2,000 detainees. On Wednesday, February 18 Gutiérrez, who had not shaken off the cough he had been nursing since January, grew more acutely ill after being taken out into the prison’s yard for exercise, despite inclement weather, including severe cold and rain. Upon returning to his cell, Gutiérrez was coughing violently and feverish, frequently holds over

Continued on Page 20

Echevarria's Voting Record As A Councilman Shows A Tendency Toward Political Calculation & Favoritism Toward His Backers And Campaign Donors *from page 6*

\$10,000 or three times the amount of the unlawful contribution, as well as jail time for up to one year.

There were numerous business entities in Colton who prior to the city council's vote to extend CR&R's trash hauling franchise in Colton until 2036 expressed dissatisfaction with CR&R's performance going back several years. Those included concerns with regard to health hazards, one of which pertained to CR&R's failure to abide by a requirement that it steam-clean its dumpsters at least once a year, particularly those at eating establishments. Those raising this issue included at least two of Echevarria's political supporters and campaign donors, who said in 2024 that they were baffled and disappointed in Echevarria's unwillingness to insist upon CR&R fulfilling all the requirements of the previous franchise agreement before extending another decade. Some indicated the belief that CR&R had provided Echevarria with some order of an illegal inducement – a quid pro quo in the form of a bribe or kickback – to influence his vote to extend the contract. No tangible proof of that suggestion was ever produced. Others, including some of Echevarria's supporters, said that his tolerance of CR&R's failure to meet all of the criteria specified in the earlier franchise agreement and his willingness to extend CR&R's franchise until 2036 was not an outgrowth of his having received any donations or money from the company but was rather explicated by the consideration that one of his girlfriends worked for CR&R.

The Echevarria paradox – his existential duality – extends right into the heart of his political identity, his identification as a politician.

Just as some intend describing him as “Su-

perman” to be a true compliment and others refer to him in that manner as an ironic insult, there are those who are sincere in describing him as a skillful politician and others who apply that description to him in a deprecatory fashion.

Within the San Bernardino Police Department, there are those at a rank above him, those in capacities equal to his own and those below the level of lieutenant who believe he has a promising future in elective office ahead of him and that after he punches his obligatory ticket as councilman and mayor in Colton he will readily move up the political chain, perhaps to county supervisor, then into the state legislature and perhaps beyond that to Congress. His experience as a street police officer and now in a command role provides him with a perspective that might prove valuable to the community, California and society as a whole if is given a place within the governmental establishment at the County Administrative Building on Arrowhead Avenue in San Bernardino, at the Statehouse in Sacramento or in Washington, D.C. At least a handful of those at the police department see such potential in him. Clearly, having been elected twice in Colton in what are two overlapping but not precisely the same districts shows that there are those who trust him to represent them and their interests at City Hall. To some of his constituents, he is perceived as someone who can make government answerable to them.

At the same time, there are those who recognize him as being a classic politician, someone who can talk out of both sides of his mouth and not only get away with it but move himself on up by doing so.

A first case in point pertains to the wild burros who have prolifer-

ated in Reche Canyon. Attitudes toward the animals varies among those who encounter them while driving along the road that winds southward in the rustic area where the lower part of San Bernardino County abuts the northern end of Riverside County. Some consider them to be not only a nuisance but a hazard in more ways than one that should be, if not outright slaughtered and exterminated, removed from the Canyon elsewhere. Others consider them to be an endearing element of the Canyon and surrounding wildlands. They want them protected and left to freely roam. When approached by a man who made it clear that he wanted to see the donkeys gone and gone forever, Echevarria said he agreed and was working on a way, or ways, to accomplish just that. At the same time, those who are seeking to keep the burros in place consider Echevarria to be an ally.

Another issue is semi-rustic but gradually urbanizing Reche Canyon has been development.

A proposal to build the 2.9-acre Reche Canyon Plaza, to consist of a 24-hour gas station and retail center be located at 2501 Reche Canyon Road, came before the city council for final approval in October 2024. The proponents of the project believed that he was in favor of it. Many residents of the area were opposed to it, saying that they had concerns with regard to traffic and congestion, dangers with regard to vehicle ingress and egress and its incompatibility aesthetically with the canyon and how it would further erode the Reche Canyon district's rural charm.

At the October 1, 2024 meeting, with Councilwoman Chastain absent, Councilman Gonzalez made a motion to deny approval of the project. That motion did not gain a second and therefore was not voted upon. Thereafter, Councilman Toro made a motion to approve the project, which was seconded by Mayor Navarro. The vote was taken. Toro and Navarro voted

to approve the project and Gonzalez opposed it. Echevarria abstained. The project was therefore given the first of two needed approvals.

On October 15, 2024 with Councilwoman Chastain in attendance, the council was scheduled to give a second and final approval to the Reche Canyon Plaza project, what is referred to as a second reading. At that point, knowing that Chastain was in favor of the project, Echevarria joined with Gonzalez in casting a vote against it, such that the project was given final passage on a 3-to-2 vote. Later, when residents of the Reche Canyon area complained that Echevarria had crossed them up, he disputed this, referencing his October 15 vote against the project. Nevertheless, it was understood by several of his constituents who were against the project that on October 1, 2024, when his vote against the project would have shut the door on it by having the matter stall out on a 2-to-2 tie, Echevarria had held out on them by abstaining instead of forthrightly opposing the project. It is incidents such as this that have resulted in Echevarria's reputation as a duplicitous politician.

Last Month, Echevarria's reputation as a calculating political animal deepened when he voted to eradicate the city's so-called “cooling off” period, as it was thereafter accompanied by the announcement of his intent to run for mayor, which put the vote in context.

At its February 17, 2026 meeting, the Colton City Council took up a discussion of removing a provision that has been in the Colton Municipal Code for more than three decades which prohibits former Colton elected officials from being appointed to any city board, city commission or city committee for two years after leaving elected office. Colton Municipal Code Section 2.30.060 states that “No former elected official of the city is eligible for appointment to any board commission or committee for two years following

expiration of the term of his or her elected office.”

Echevarria suggested that the council consider doing away with Colton Municipal Code Section 2.30.060 entirely.

Councilman Gonzalez countered that there were good reasons for limiting the influence of just-departed elected officials and preventing them from extending their control over municipal policy immediately after leaving office. He said previous city councils – in 1993, 2014, 2017 and 2022 – had considered throwing out Colton Municipal Code Section 2.30.060 but ultimately decided to keep it in place. “The two-year cooling-off period is well thought out,” Gonzalez said.

Mayor Navarro, too, opposed Echevarria's request, indicating he believed putting departing elected officials into powerful decision-making or recommendation-making posts at City Hall would be harmful to the city's reputation and public image.

“The two-year window is not strict,” Navarro said. “It's very reasonable and it provides the city with protection.”

Echevarria said the Colton should do away with the limitation, since it would potentially prevent a well qualified former elected city officials such as a mayor, council member, treasurer or city clerk from being able to serve in an appointed capacity. The council members and other elected officials bring a lot to the table based on their extensive experience and knowledge, Echevarria argued. Using that rationale, Echevarria was able to convince Chastain and Toro to vote with him to ditch Colton Municipal Code Section 2.30.060

On February 27, at Loud Burger in Grand Terrace, Echevarria announced he is going to run for mayor.

That announcement explained what Echevarria was attempting to do with the elimination of Colton Municipal Code Section 2.30.060. He is hedging his bets, such that if his mayoral bid proves unsuccessfully, he

can hopefully wangle an appointment to a Colton municipal post or board, most likely the planning commission, and retain his status as a government official in the loop. This will, he believes preserve his electoral viability in running for another government office, such as supervisor or state legislator.

Among some of his constituents, however, Echevarria's use of his current authority as an elected official to change policies that have the effect of enhancing his future political viability in a host of different scenarios smacks of opportunism and personal ambition that has little or nothing to do with serving the public.

A problematic issue attending Echevarria's elected status and his driving political ambition is the conflict growing out of his dual governmental roles – his employment by the City of San Bernardino and his position as an elected official in the immediately adjacent City of Colton. Echevarria comes across as oblivious to any such conflict.

Local government employees holding political office, usually in another municipality or jurisdiction than the one in which they work, is not unheard of throughout California and proliferates in several areas of the state, including San Bernardino County. Nevertheless, there is some degree of controversy over the issue. An elected official votes on standards and pay levels pertaining to the public employees of the city he or she oversees. On occasion or even regularly, those standards or rates of remuneration are used as comparative factors in setting the employee standards or pay in the jurisdiction where that politician works. This entails, some believe, a conflict of interest.

At the federal level, the Hatch Act, passed in 1939, is a law that restricts the political activities of federal government employees to ensure a nonpartisan workforce and prevent political coercion. There

Continued on Page 17

Upset That The Forest Service Was Not Enforcing State H₂O Board's Order, Environmental Coalition Sued *from page 5*

cupancy and use.” The Federal Land Policy Management Act also, according to the lawsuit, “states that the United States shall receive fair market value of the use of the public land and their resources.”

The suit further proclaims that “Defendant United States Forest Service is authorized under the Federal Land Policy Management Act to grant or renew rights of way upon United States Forest Service lands for various special uses, including “pipes, pipelines ... and other facilities and systems for the impoundment, storage, transportation, or distribution of water. However, special use permits for such rights of way must be subject to terms and conditions that ensure compliance with federal and state laws regarding air and water quality and environmental protection, and that “minimize damage to scenic and aesthetic values and fish and wildlife habitat and otherwise protect the environment.”

According to the lawsuit, “The National Forest Management Act the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan, San Bernardino National Forest’s Forest Service Handbook National Environmental Policy Act Administrative Procedure Act requires the United States Forest Service to develop, maintain, and, as appropriate, revise a land and resource management plan for each unit of the National Forest System. The land and resource management plan must ‘provide for ... watershed, wildlife, and fish’ and ‘provide for diversity of plant and animal communities.’ All projects within a national forest must comply with that forest’s land and resource management plan. Here, the United States Forest Service

must comply with the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan which was adopted in 2005. Land and resource management plans must include enforceable design criteria—the rules—that managers legally must operate within in order to achieve desired conditions set forth in the land and resource management plan’s ‘vision.’” Special use permits must include terms and conditions ‘which will . . . Require compliance with State standards for public health and safety, environmental protection, and siting, construction, operation, and maintenance if those standards are more stringent than applicable Federal standards.’ Issuance of a new special use authorization for an existing use is subject to the holder being in compliance with all the terms of existing authorization and must be accompanied by ‘appropriate environmental analysis.’ All proposals for special use also must provide information demonstrating the proposal’s compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and orders.” The suit holds that “In keeping with National Forest Management Act’s mandates, the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan requires that for surface water development projects, ‘instream flows favorable to the maintenance and restoration of riparian dependent and aquatic resources and channel conditions will be required.’ It also requires that surface water diversions and groundwater extractions, including well and spring developments, may only be authorized upon demonstration that the water extracted is in excess to the current and reasonably foreseeable future needs of forest resources; approved extractions must provide for the ‘long-term protection and reasonable use of surface water and groundwater resources.’”

The suit asserts that “The land resource management plan’s mandates

are intended to implement the overarching goals set forth in Part 1 of the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan. One of those goals is that ‘[w]atersheds, streams, groundwater recharge areas, springs, wetlands and aquifers are managed to assure the sustainability of high quantity and quality water. Where new or reauthorized water extraction or diversion is allowed, those facilities should be located to avoid long-term adverse impacts to national forest water and riparian resources.’ The land and resource management plan asks the ‘outcome evaluation question’ for Goal 5.1: ‘Is the national forest making progress toward sustaining Class 1 watershed conditions while reducing the number of Condition Class 2 and 3 watersheds?’ The San Bernardino National Forest land resource management plan incorporates the regarding soil and water conservation practices specific to the San Bernardino National Forest’s Forest Service Handbook. For riparian conservation areas, activities are limited, and watersheds are to be managed to improve degraded riparian areas for native populations of riparian-dependent species. Riparian conservation areas include perennial and intermittent springs, seeps, springs, and inner gorges. The San Bernardino National Forest’s Forest Service Handbook directs that: ‘Existing uses, activities, or occupancy within riparian conservation areas should be evaluated for risks or impacts and mitigated during special use renewal or re-issuance. If mitigation measures are not effective, reassess with the option to modify or eliminate the use, activity or occupancy when impacts are unacceptable.’”

The suit further argues that the forest service is required to review new special use permit applications for surface and ground water extraction and for transport of water across

National Forest System lands to assess the potential impacts on aquatic and riparian ecosystems on or off the forest. The applicants for those permits should be required, the Save Our Forest Association maintains, to demonstrate that the proposed development would meet the riparian management objectives.”

The suit makes the point that “The San Bernardino National Forest’s Service Handbook further directs the United States Forest Service to manage watersheds to “improve or restore degraded riparian areas to proper functioning condition for native populations of riparian-dependent species.”

According to the suit, “The San Bernardino National Forest’s Service Handbook describes the affirmative duty of the USFS to ensure that ‘proof of water right is established prior to issuing or re-issuing [special use permits]’ and that the applicant has complied with ‘applicable environmental laws. . . . Where water use . . . is evident [the USFS must] ensure that all special use permit applicants have secured the appropriate . . . California Department of Fish and Game 1602 Stream Alternation [sic] Agreement . . . before issuing a special use permit that would result in channel alteration.’”

The lawsuit cites the National Environmental Policy Act’s declared intention to “encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment,” to help “prevent or eliminate damage to the environment,” and “to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation.” According to the suit, “The National Environmental Policy Act has two fundamental purposes: (1) to guarantee that, before taking an action, federal agencies take a ‘hard look’ at the consequences of that action to ensure that ‘the agency, in reaching its decision, will have available, and will carefully consider, detailed infor-

mation concerning significant environmental impacts;’ and (2) to ensure that ‘the relevant information will be made available to the larger audience that may also play a role in both the decision-making process and the implementation of that decision.’ As a practical matter, National Environmental Policy Act requires comparing a baseline, determined from ‘accurate information and defensible reasoning’ against the conditions expected after approval of a proposed project in order to determine the impact on the environment.” Doughty and Lovko assert on the Save Our Forest Association’s behalf that “Supplemental National Environmental Policy Act analysis is required when ‘there are specific new circumstances or information relevant to the environmental concerns that have bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.’ Supplemental environmental impact statements may also be required when the agency determines that the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act will be furthered by doing so.” The Administrative Procedure Act provides for judicial review of agency action.

Doughty and Lovko maintain “Under the Administrative Procedure Act, a reviewing court must ‘hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions’ found to be ‘arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law’ or ‘unsupported by substantial evidence in the record.’ An agency action is arbitrary and capricious if the agency ‘relied on factors which Congress has not intended it to consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be . . . the product of agency expertise.’ When reviewing agency action

under the Administrative Procedure Act, a court must ensure that the agency reviewed the relevant data and articulated a satisfactory explanation establishing a “rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” According to the suit, the United States Forest Service’s allowing BlueTrion Brands to continue drawing water from Strawberry Creek after the determination by the California Board of Water Resources that it had no valid water rights relating to that water rendered its decision to grant BlueTrion Brands a continuation of the permit arbitrary and capricious, as it had ‘entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem’ that is at issue, which further represented a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

“Under the Administrative Procedure Act, a reviewing court must also set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be without observance of procedure required by law,” according to the suit. According to the lawsuit, Strawberry Creek is tributary to East Twin Creek and the Santa Ana River. The West Fork of Strawberry Creek originates in the San Bernardino National Forest. Both the Headwaters Springs and the Cienega Springs are located within the San Bernardino National Forest. All of the water at issue in this complaint is diverted from the West Fork of Strawberry Creek Watershed, which is within the Strawberry Creek Watershed, and all within the San Bernardino National Forest. In the early 1900s, before any water was diverted from Strawberry Canyon, the canyons near the Arrowhead Hot Springs Hotel were wet and lush. Prior to diversion, Strawberry Creek was a popular fishing stream. United States Geological Survey teams visited and mapped Strawberry Creek Watershed in the late 1890s, establishing

Continued on Page 18

Even With Yucaipa Getting More Revenue From Measure S Sales Tax Override, Yucaipa Still Seeing Public Safety Programs Consuming More Than Half Of Its Overall Budget *from page 3*

on December 31, 2025. His review contrasted the adopted and current budgets against actual revenues and expenditures through that dated.

The review he was a glance at the city's fiscal health "midstream" provided an "opportunity" to make adjustments to the spending plan now, just a little more than

Echevarria *from page 15*

is no such corresponding law at the state level in California. There is a school of thought, however, which holds that a single individual should get a single bite at the apple when it comes to being involved in governance and/or government, and that someone can hold elective governmental office but should not be able to simultaneously work and draw a salary or remuneration as a government employee. In the same way, they contend, citizens should be free to hold a government job, but not simultaneously be permitted to hold an elective office in which they are the ultimate overseers of governmental operations.

In Echevarria's cir-

four months before the fiscal year closes out on June 30, White aid.

"We're halfway through the year with midyear, we should be about 50 percent of that percent to the current budget," White said, an allusion to the Christmas spending season that essentially starts in November and contin-

cumstance, his authority as a police department commander in a city bordering Colton and in a district of San Bernardino that is contiguous to Colton raises even sharper concerns than might be the case with an elected official in one city who happens to work for another city.

Echevarria's role with the San Bernardino PD is that of "western district commander." The city limits on the southern portion of San Bernardino's west side press immediately against Colton's city limits on its northeast side.

This gives Echevarria substantial police authority along San Bernardino's border with Colton, a situation fraught with potential and real issues in which the interests of both cities might differ.

U.S. Supreme Court Leaning 6-To-3 Toward The Chino Valley Unifie's Position On Parental Notification And Away From The Parental Exclusion State Officials Have Propounded *from page 7*

six of the nine Supreme Court justices are disposed to accepting his reasoning with regard to parental rights pretty much straight down the line, and that his decision in *Mirabelli et al. v. Olson et al.* will be sustained, such that in relatively short order parental disclosure rather than parental exclusion will be the law of the land, trumping California educational system policy, which aggressively favors the rights of children to be selectively secretive with regard to their sexuality, extending to preventing their parents from be-

ing aware of how they comport themselves at school.

The Supreme Court, by a 6-to-3 margin, with justices Elaine Kagan, Ketanji Brown Jackson and Sonia Sotomayor dissenting, said that in the head-on dispute over the right of parents to be informed about what is happening with their children overcomes the state's ability to protect the privacy rights of children. The Supreme Court action allows Benitez's injunction to remain in effect while the appeals process channels through its myriad steps to a penultimate deci-

ues for a month, during which sales tax revenue increases dramatically over what occurs during most of the rest of the year.

"The timing of all the [city's] revenues are not fluid throughout the year," White said. "A lot of them are second-half-of-the-year heavy, and same with expenditures."

The California Department of Tax and Fee Administration provides data with regard to the one cent per dollar sales

San Bernardino, for example, has a substantial homeless population, leading all other municipalities in the county in that dubious distinction. In years past, San Bernardino has employed a strategy in which the police department has taken the lead, assisted by the back-up of the city attorney's office, of seeking to reduce the local homeless numbers through intimidation. On San Bernardino's east side, where its own and the City of Loma Linda's city limits coincide, the police department would use heavy-handed tactics in dealing with those living on the streets, delivering an ultimatum that they leave and then transporting them and their belongings in a police vehicle to a location outside the city. Parallel-

If that decision goes in favor of Bonta and the State of California and its educational establishment, LiMandri & Jonna LLP/Thomas More Society will most assuredly appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. If the decision goes against Bonta, et. al, a hard decision will need to be made as to whether posing the question of whether placing the privacy rights of minors above the rights of parents in knowing crucial information about their children as they are raising them before the U.S. Supreme Court as it is presently composed will advance the objective of salvaging the State of California's parental exclusion policy in whole or even part.

A subtle but crucial difference between the

tax revenue that Yucaipa, like all California cities, realizes as the result of the state's base sales tax rate of 7.25 percent. Yucaipa voters in 2024 augmented that with another one percent with the passage of Measure S. Early data provided by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration of the city's share of the 7.25 percent tax was not uniform or consistent over the six months from July 1 to December 31, White said. Available information shows the city

ing this was the issuance of both civil, upon first offense, and criminal, upon subsequent offense or offenses, citations to those who engaged in activity that would encourage the homeless to remain in San Bernardino by providing them with meals or offering them some other type of assistance.

Mt. Vernon Avenue is a north/south corridor which extends through Colton and into San Bernardino on Colton's east side and San Bernardino's west side. It falls within Echevarria's bailiwick as the San Bernardino Police Department's western district commander.

While the San Bernardino Police Department of late, perhaps to Echevarria's credit, has dispensed with the some-

Chino Valley Unified School District's parental notification policy and issues at the heart in the *Mirabelli et al. v. Olson et al.* case is that the district policy relates to parental notification and a requirement that teachers inform parents if their children comport themselves in a certain way while the lawsuit is based upon teachers' free speech and freedom-of-religion rights. Judge Benitez's ruling bridged the gap between parents' constitutional right to know of sexual orientation issues impacting their children at school and the rights of teachers to resist a school district's or the state's imposition of requirements that they dissemble, misrepresent or lie to parents when the subject of sexual orien-

brought in more from the Measure S sales tax collection than was projected.

"At this point, we're starting to see a trend, and it's better than what we had originally estimated," White said. "What we're projecting now, instead of the \$6 million, is \$8 million of Measure S money for fiscal year '26."

White and the rest of the city staff recommended that the city base its spending calculations through the rest

what inhumane practice of intimidating the dispossessed living on the city's streets and alleyways into leaving and simultaneously citing and criminalizing those who assist the homeless, the question remains as to what course of action Echevarria, in his role as western district commander, would take, if the City of San Bernardino resurrects its previously harsh zero tolerance of the homeless and their advocates and friends in the Mt. Vernon corridor, which has become a magnet for the unhoused who have made their way into the city, and whether he would be willing, particularly if he becomes mayor, to have the San Bernardino police officers answerable to him in the county seat re-

tation of students arises. While the *Mirabelli vs. Olson* case was originally filed by two teachers against a single school district, it widened when parents were added onto the plaintiff side and the State of California and several of its agencies and institutions were added to the defendant side.

The Supreme Court did not explicitly lift the stay related to teachers, leaving it unclear as whether teachers have the right to inform parents who are in the dark about their children's comportment at school but do not directly inquire about the issue. The Supreme Court did make clear, however, that if a parent or parents inquire about the subject, faculty members must tell parents whether

of the fiscal year on the increase in measure S revenue, that being the \$2 million difference between \$6 million and \$8 million. The city simultaneously took a minor hit with regard to other subventions, specifically the city's cut of Bradley-Burns sales tax, which means instead of receiving an early prognosticated \$5.7 million, it will see something on the order of \$100,000 less than that, roughly \$5.6 million, accord-

Continued on Page 19

move the denizens of the streets to Colton.

Like virtually every politician, an element of Echevarria's make-up is a strong ego, a belief that he is well suited as a leader. The strength and intensity of his ego is such that within his area of professional expertise – law enforcement – Echevarria believes that at some level she should be provided with special license to oversee and direct the Colton Police Department. Not immediately after he was elected to the city council, but eventually, he grew somewhat heavy handed in his interaction with members of the Colton Police Department, the Sentinel is informed. There was a sense, individuals knowledgeable about police depart-

Continued on Page 20

if their children are exploring or experimenting with employing a gender contrary to their gender identified for them at birth.

Among the members of the Chino Valley Unified School District Board of Trustees who were repeatedly rebuffed by state officials in trying to promote parental notification over the last two-and-a-half years, there was a sense of vindication, as the authority of the U.S. Supreme Court exceeds that of the multiple entities – the California Department of Education, the state legislature, the governor and the California Attorney General's Office – that sought to impose legal restrictions enjoining the district from implementing its own policy.

-Mark Gutglueck

Both Nestlé and BlueTriton Were Sending H₂O At the 5,200 Elevation Level In The Forest Near The Mountaintop Down To The Tribe At Its Hotel At the 2,000-Foot Level In The Foothills *from page 16*

that Strawberry Creek was a perennial stream prior to diversion. United States Geological Survey quadrangle maps show Strawberry Creek as a perennial stream, and the Headwaters Springs and the Cienega Springs, all as blue lines." The suit references the survey work of Engineer W.P. Rowe, who was hired by BlueTriton Brand's corporate predecessor to survey the area. The suit cites this statement from Rowe: "Strawberry creek drains a portion of the south slope of the San Bernardino Mountains. It has its source at a group of springs which issue from the side of Strawberry peak. ... The flow from these springs being deep seated should be fairly regular, especially during the late summer season. The observations show this to be the case. The dependable supply will aggregate about 10 [miner's] inches."

One Miner's Inch is the equivalent of 9 gallons per minute; 1 gallon per minute is the equivalent of 1,440 gallons per day; 1 gallon per minute is the equivalent of 1.61 acre-feet/year. Ten inches year-round even during dry periods, as described by Rowe, converts to 99 gallons per minute.

According to the suit, on July 27, 2018, Forest Ranger Joseph Rechsteiner signed a decision memo memorializing his decision to issue a new special use permit to Nestlé to operate and maintain existing diversion structures in Strawberry Canyon. The suit maintains, "The initial studies provided by the permittee suggest that water extraction is reducing surface flow in Strawberry Creek. Ranger Rechsteiner himself performed only a perfunctory environmental review to support the 2018 decision memo, making findings of no extraordinary circumstances necessitating an

environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, despite the acknowledged 'impaired' status of Strawberry Creek Watershed due to the diversion.

Despite acknowledged changes in management direction since issuance of the 1978 special use permit, no consideration was apparently given to a no action alternative requiring a return to pre-diversion baseline conditions in Strawberry Canyon. On January 22, 2021, Nestlé asked the Forest Service to renew the Nestlé 2018 special use permit for one year, expiring on August 24, 2022. This request was granted, without modification to the 2018 Nestlé special use permit." The suit propounds, "The contents of the Nestlé 2018 special use permit specified that the permit was not renewable, assignable, or transferable. The 2018 special use permit stated: 'Any change in control of the business entity [holding the permit] shall result in termination of this permit.'

On March 31, 2021, the privately held private equity firm of One Rock Capital Partners, LLC, in partnership with the also-privately-held Metropoulos & Co., acquired Nestlé in a leveraged buyout. This sale operated to terminate the Nestlé 2018 special use permit. Accordingly, on April 1, 2021, Nestlé filed with the USFS a 'Request for Revocation' of the August 24, 2018, Nestlé 2018 special use permit, on the basis that Nestlé had 'conveyed all my (our) right, title, and interest in and to the improvements,' the diversion infrastructure, to BlueTriton Brands."

BlueTriton Brands was the follow-on corporate entity to Nestlé Waters of America, which had previously operated the Arrowhead Spring Water Bottling Company.

According to the suit, "On August 18, 2022, Acting Ranger Joseph Rechsteiner signed a special use permit for BlueTriton Brands. This special use permit expired six days later on August 24, 2022. It stated that 'The CA State Water Board enforcement hearing in 2022 may clarify the water rights related to the system and/or uphold the draft cease and desist order issued to the holder in 2021.'" According to the suit, the ultimate finding by the California State Water Resources Board that neither BlueTriton Brands nor any of its corporate predecessors hold or held water rights to the water in Strawberry Canyon, under the applicable restrictions of the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the National Forest Management Act, the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan, San Bernardino National Forest's Forest Service Handbook, National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act requires that the United States Forest Service bring BlueTriton Brand's diversion of water from Strawberry Canyon to a halt.

The suit asks the court to adjudge and declare that the United States Forest Service's actions in issuing the 2018 special use permit to Nestlé and the 2023 special use permit to BlueTriton Brands violated the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the National Forest Management Act, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act and that allowing BlueTriton Brands to continue to operate in Strawberry Canyon without a valid special use permit violates the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the National Forest Management Act and the Administrative Procedure Act.

The suit further asks for the court to vacate and set aside the BlueTriton Brand's 2023 special use permit, the 2018 decision memo, and the National Environmental

Policy Act conclusions supporting the 2018 decision memo while enjoining the United States Forest Service from approving or allowing any third party to divert water from Strawberry Canyon by entry onto forest land unless and until the United States Forest Service has performed a new or supplemental environmental analysis taking into account the historical information illuminated through the California State Water Resources Control Board Hearing, continuing damage to resources on the San Bernardino National Forest, and the failure to meet goals and standards of the San Bernardino National Forest land and resource management plan. This should be topped with, according to Doughty and Lovko, an order to the United States Forest Service to comply with the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the National Forest Management Act, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act in connection with BlueTriton Brand's diversion of water from the Strawberry Creek Watershed and the removal of the water diversion structures in Strawberry Canyon to restore Strawberry Canyon to its condition pre-diversion.

The suit also seeks reimbursement of the Save Our Forest Association's cost in pursuing the suit.

The cease and desist order that was originally issued in draft form by the California State Water Resources Board against Nestlé and which is now in place against BlueTriton was appealed by BlueTriton Brands and assigned to a Fresno Superior Court. Meanwhile, the water diversions continues as BlueTriton and the United States Forest Service negotiated terms of a possible new special use permit despite the California State Water Control Board's determination that BlueTriton holds no water rights in Strawberry Canyon.

Hugh A. Bialecki, the president of the Save Our

Forest Association, said the group he leads had pursued the litigation because "Ten years of letter writing, collecting evidence and testifying to the California State Water Board has not yet resulted in the US Forest Service stopping the water giveaway to Nestlé/BlueTriton Brands. The US Forest Service must be accountable for protecting our natural resources."

Both Nestlé and BlueTriton conveyed water down the mountainside in a pipeline from Strawberry Canyon to near the Arrowhead Springs Hotel, which is now owned by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, also known as the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation. There, some of the water was loaded into trucks by Nestlé and later BlueTriton to be conveyed to a bottling plant, with the rest of the water given to the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation for its use. That water was put into a reservoir or cisterns.

Because a portion of its water supply was being threatened by the lawsuit filed by the Save Our Forest Association against the U.S. Forest Service, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation sought permission to enter into the lawsuit as an intervenor on the basis that it should be allowed to participate in the case because it had a significant interest in the outcome. After it was granted intervenor status, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation filed a motion to have the entirety of the Save Our Forest Association's

lawsuit to be thrown out for a host of reasons, not limited to that BlueTriton, through its corporate predecessors, has historic rights to the water in Strawberry Canyon, that the creation and existence of the San Bernardino National Forest does not interfere with BlueTriton's water rights in Strawberry Canyon, that the Forest Service has recognized BlueTriton's rights to the Strawberry Canyon water for decades and that precedent should be honored, that the State Water Board overstepped its authority in issuing the cease and desist order against BlueTriton in relation to water use in Strawberry Canyon and that the Forest Service is likely to prevail on the merits of its defense in the lawsuit brought by the Save Our Forest Association. According to the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, if the lawsuit against the Forest Service is dismissed, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation will remain committed to working with the Save Our Forest Association to protect the ecology of Strawberry Canyon, which it maintains can be done while still diverting some of the water from Strawberry Canyon to meet the tribes water needs at the Arrowhead Springs Hotel.

The hearing before Judge Bernal is scheduled for 9 a.m. on Monday March 9 in Courtroom 1 at the United States District Court for the Central District of California – Eastern Division in Riverside.

-Mark Gutglueck

Echevarria's Dual SB & Colton Roles Has Already Raised Conflict Concerns: Mayoral Status Would Intensify That *from page 17*

ment operations say, that Echevarria, rather than staying within his lane as a member of the city council and voting with the mayor and his council colleagues to lay out policy and have City Manager Bill Smith administer that policy

by directly dealing with and giving instruction to the city's various department heads, that, at least as far as the police department went, Echevarria was bypassing Smith and having direct and improper contact with Colton Police Henry Dominguez. In 2024, Anthony Vega became police chief. There is growing concern now, as Echevarria is attempting to move into the more dominant role of mayor, that if he is elected to

Continued on Page 20

San Bernardino County Coroner Reports

Coroner's Case #702600098: On Monday, 01/05/2025, at 10:55 p.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded to the 1470 block of E. Highland Avenue in San Bernardino. Gabriel Sanchez, a 48-year-old resident of San Bernardino was pronounced dead on scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702600083: On Sunday, 01/04/2026, at 3:28 PM, Officers of the Barstow Police Department responded to the 2000 block of Lenwood Road in Barstow. Joseph Sternhagen, a 61-year-old resident of East Helena Montana, was pronounced dead on scene. For additional information contact the Barstow Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702600061: On Saturday, 01/03/2026, at 7:16 p.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the 14000 block of Seventh Street in Victorville. Mario Carr, a 33-year-old homeless resident of Victorville, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702600031: On Friday, 01/02/2026, at 04:30 a.m., the Union Pacific Police Department responded to the area of Sierra Avenue and Eastbound Interstate-10 Freeway in Fontana. A 45-year-old male, name is withheld pending notification to next of kin, was pronounced dead on scene. For more information, contact the Union Pacific Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702600023: On Thursday, 01/01/2026, at 07:12 p.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the 11000 block of Bryant Street in Yucaipa for a traffic collision. The pedestrian, Ryan Riddles, a 42-year-old resident of Yucaipa, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information, contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508435: On Wednesday, 12/31/2025, at 9:50 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to Interstate 40 east of Interstate 15 in the city of Barstow for a traffic collision. The pedestrian, Deneco McWilliams, a 23-year-old resident of Barstow was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Cases #702508390, #702508391 and #702508392: On 12/29/2025, a witness reported his friend, later identified as Marcus Muench-Casanova, fell approximately 500 feet from the Devil's Backbone hiking trail in Mt. Baldy. San Bernardino County Sheriff's Deputies, Search & Rescue Teams and Air Rescue responded. The weather conditions were severe. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Airship was called to assist in the search. Marcus was found deceased. His body was recovered and brought to the San Bernardino County Coroner. During the search for Marcus, two additional, unrelated male bodies were found dead on the same slope near where Marcus's body was recovered. These bodies were also recovered and taken to the San Bernardino County Coroner. The same witness described seeing the two men hiking earlier that day on the trail but did not know them. The two males were later identified as Juan Lopez and Bayron Ramos Garcia. According to friends and family, Lopez and Ramos Garcia were known to hike Mt. Baldy on a regular basis. The following 3 individuals died while hiking on Mount Baldy in San Bernardino County on December 29, 2025. 19-year-old male, Marcus Muench-Casanova from Seal Beach, California. : 37-year-old male, Juan Lopez from Guatemala. 36-year-old male, Bayron Ramos Garcia from Los Angeles, California. (Supervising Deputy Coroner E. Fleak, 01/13/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508312: On Friday, 12/26/2025, at 06:43 a.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to Haven Avenue and Jurupa Avenue in Ontario. Pedestrian, name is withheld pending positive identification and notification to next of kin, was pronounced deceased on scene. For further information contact the Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/05/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508277: On Tuesday, 12/23/2025, at 8:49 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to southbound Interstate 15 north of highway 138 in Phelan for a traffic collision. Driver, Daniel Edward Kelleher, a 73-year-old resident of Caldwell, was pronounced on scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/05/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508221: On Saturday, 12/20/2025, at 4:22 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Northbound I-15 Freeway south of the Beech Avenue overpass in Fontana for a traffic collision. Motorcyclist, Christian Moran, a 27-year-old resident of Fort Irwin was transported to Arrowhead Regional Medical Center and was pronounced deceased. For additional information contact California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/05/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508180: On Thursday, 12/18/2025, at 09:32 a.m., the Fontana Police Department responded to the 15000 block of Village Drive E in Fontana. Joseph Murillo, a 39-year-old resident of Fontana, was pronounced dead on scene. For further information contact the Fontana Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/06/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508176: On Thursday, 12/18/2025, at 04:54 a.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to Hwy 127 near the San Bernardino County for a welfare check. Driver, David Marquez IV, a 19-year-old resident of Pahrump Nevada was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information please contact the Barstow office of the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/05/2026)

Coroner's Case #702508122: On Tuesday, 12/16/2025, at 7:05 a.m., California Highway Patrol responded to Eastbound Interstate 40 Freeway, west of Iwo Jima undercrossing in the city of Barstow for a traffic collision. The motorcyclist, Vincent Rodriguez, a 66-year-old resident of Barstow, was pronounced dead on scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 01/05/2026)

The Coroner Reports are reproduced in their original format as authored by department personnel.

Yucaipa Tax Revenue Is Up As Is Its Spending *from page 17*

ing to HDL, a consultant that monitors sales tax revenue issues for the city. "There's been a downward projected sales tax revenue statewide," White said, which he said will "impact Yucaipa's projection." The city will also bring in roughly \$400,000 less than it earlier thought it

would realize from ticket sales at the Yucaipa Performing Arts Center. So, based on the Bradley-Burns sales tax revenue loss, the \$400,000 ticket sales loss, subtotaling \$500,000, balanced against the addition of another \$2 million in measure S revenue, staff is now predicting a net \$1.5 million increase in where total general fund revenue for 2025-26 will be as of June 30, 2026.

The \$44 million in

projected general fund revenue will not be depleted as rapidly by actual spending this year as was projected in the budget, since some staff positions, which were supposed to be filled as the fiscal year progressed remained vacant. This is keeping the city in the black but it has an impact on the provision of municipal services, which is the city's *raison d'être*, White said.

The city has "a lot of

stuff to get done," White said, "but if there's not the people here to process and get it done, there's a bottleneck and the services aren't going out," White said.

City spending on maintenance projects will increase during the remainder of 2025-26, White said.

The city is also likely to put money into other improvements at City Hall, including agenda management software

requested by City Clerk Ana Sauseda, the construction of a digital sign in front of City Hall and the purchase of a new truck to be used by the public works division, the sheriff's department, fire department and other city departments as needed. "The truck is used by Public Works for maintenance of traffic signals, lighting and signage; by Community Services to set up special events and install

banners and lighting; by the city's IT division to maintain communications equipment and cameras; and by public safety personnel for installation and maintenance of automated license plate reader cameras," Development Services Director Fermin Preciado said.

-Mark Gutglueck



Lack Of Medical Care, Seemingly, At The Root Of Deaths At GEO's Adelanto Ice Center *from page 3*

but was not so incapacitated that he could not obtain paperwork to be admitted to a medical facility, which he filled out, at least partially. GEO did not respond in a timely manner. Gutiérrez languished in his cell, periodically asking to be given medical attention.

On Tuesday, February 24, still ill, Gutiérrez appeared in court for a bail hearing. Bail was not granted.

Records are not clear. Between Wednesday, February 25, and Friday, February 27, Gutiérrez was sent to the Victor Valley Global Medical Center in Victorville. It was there that he expired on February 27, 2026. The Mexican Consulate in San Bernardino was notified of his death via email at around 3 a.m. that morning.

Martinez and their son, Erick, who was born in Los Angeles, were notified of Gutiérrez's death just before 8 a.m. that morning.

Gutiérrez's death was preceded less than six months ago by the death of Ismael Ayala-Uribe on September 25, 2025, who was foreign-born and lived in Westminster, eventually becoming documented when he applied for Deferred Action For child Arrivals benefits. Ayala-Uribe died in custody shortly after being returned to the Adelanto facility from the Victor Valley Global Medical Center, where he had been evaluated for an abscess.

The following month, on October 23, 2025, Gabriel Garcia-Aviles, a resident of Orange County, died while in the custody at the Adelanto ICE Processing Center. He was in custody after being arrested during an Immigration and Customs Enforcement raid.

The Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement did not begin to keep and publicly provide statis-

tics with regard to deaths in its facilities until 2019. Nevertheless, the Sentinel, through its archives has at least a partial window on the recurrences of deaths at the Adelanto ICE Processing Center going back to prior to that.

On March 28, 2017, Osmar Epifanio Gonzalez-Gadba, 33, a Nicaraguan national, died while in the custody of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Victor Valley Global Medical Center. The State of California's Certificate of Death, issued June 1, 2017, documented the cause of Gonzalez's death as hypoxic encephalopathy, a brain injury caused by oxygen deprivation to the brain, and hanging. He had committed suicide.

Sergio Alonso Lopez, 55, died on April 13, 2017 while being hospitalized after suffering extensive internal bleeding. Lopez was in the process of being expelled from the country for the fourth time, ha-

ving been deported three times between 1994 and 2017.

Vicente Caceres-Maradiaga died on May 31, 2017, at the age of 44. He was a Honduran immigrant who collapsed while playing soccer at the Adelanto Detention Center and was pronounced dead while being transported to a hospital.

There have been other deaths of inmates at the Adelanto ICE Center.

In May 2014, Raul Ernesto Morales-Ramos, 44, an El Salvadoran who had been in Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody at two other ICE facilities in California since 2010 while he was fighting extradition to El Salvador was sent to the Adelanto Detention Center for unregistered migrants. On April 3, 2015, after experiencing what prison officials called "unusual bleeding," Morales-Ramos was transferred to a hospital in Palmdale. At the hospital, it was determined that Morales Ramos had intesti-

nal cancer that had long gone untreated. He died in the hospital on April 6, 2015. An inquiry later determined that standard medical care contributed to his death.

A federal investigation into Adelanto's first death concluded that the death of Fernando Dominguez could have been prevented. CIVIC and Human Rights Watch recently analyzed the medical records of Raul Ernesto Morales-Ramos, a man who died in 2015 at Adelanto, concluding that subpar medical care contributed to his death.

In 2012, Renando Dominguez, a Mexican immigrant who was incarcerated for being in the country illegally and was awaiting deportation proceedings, died of pneumonia. An follow-up investigation into the circumstances surrounding Dominguez's demise concluded he had "received an unacceptable level of medical care" at the facility, and that his death was avoidable.

There have long been

questions as to whether the Adelanto facility complies with basic standards applied to detention facilities of any type. There have been suggestions both ICE and GEO have allowed diminished standards, medical care protocols and communication with regard to the health and safety of inmates in Adelanto to slip because the inmates are not American citizens. GEO has been accused of a pattern of gross negligence with regard to prisoners that has taken place because the corporation was seeking to maximize its profits in the operation of the facility.

Under both major American political parties, neglect of international prisoners has been neglected.

In 2014, under the Democratic administration of President Barack Obama, an Inspector Generals report concluded that medical care at the Adelanto Detention Center met acceptable standards expected from Immigration and Cus-

tom Enforcement.

A letter sent last November to the Department of Homeland Security and its Secretary, Kristi Noem, decrying the deaths of 25 people who had died in U.S. Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody to that point in 2025 which demanded an explanation of what was happening and what remedies were being pursued was signed by 43 members of Congress, virtually all of whom were Democrats.

Criticism of the Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and its facilities is made, it appears, only by the party that is not in control of the executive branch and thus not in a position to take action impacting the situation. Conversely, members of the party in control of the federal government's executive branch come across as reflexively satisfied with how the prisons holding international prisoners are run.

-Mark Gutglueck

Echevarria's Mayoral Prospect In Large Measure Hinges On Navarro's Future *Plans from page 15*

that post, he will obliterate the traditional separation between municipal elected officials and city staff members and either attempt to, or actually, dictate policy to Vega directly rather than forming a consensus with the rest of the city council as to what that policy should be and working down through the official chain of command through Smith as the city manager to control operations within the police department.

An important factor in whether Echevarria's ambition to take the next step to become Colton mayor will be realized is the individual, Frank Navarro, who is currently Colton mayor. Before being elected mayor in 2018, Navarro was, over the previous six years, District 3 councilman. Prior to that, he was founding member of the civic group Colton First. In his capacities as coun-

cil member and mayor, he has served on several city council subcommittees and as a member and occasional chairman on multiple regional boards and joint powers authority boards, including the Colton Community Development Block Grant Committee, the Colton Finance Committee, the Colton Traffic Safety Committee, the San Bernardino County Local Agency Formation Commission, the Inland Valley Development Agency, the San Bernardino International Airport Authority, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority's Metro Valley Study Session, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority's Transit Committee, the Southern California Association of Governments, the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Council and the Southern California Association of Governments' Transportation Committee.

Navarro, who has a reputation for coming

to city council meetings well prepared and with a command of the information provided in staff reports and engaging in well-informed discussion before votes are taken on controversial or intricately involved issues, has a degree of gravitas that Echevarria lacks and somewhat greater recognition, as well. It is not likely that Echevarria will be able to simply power his way past Navarro if the incumbent opts to seek reelection. Navarro is dealing with last year's death of his wife of more than 50 years. There is an indication that were she alive, he would not be running again, as he previously donated all of the money in his campaign war chest to charity. With her passing however, there is a strong suggestion that he will seek to remain at least one more term as mayor.

Echevarria retains in his electioneering fund, as of the last available documented reporting period last year, \$39,848.02, putting him a leg up on Navarro. Nevertheless, Navarro

has a network of past political donors who could be tapped to make it possible for him, over the course of a potential upcoming campaign, match Echevarria, dollar for dollar, campaign mailer for campaign mailer, newspaper ad for newspaper ad and radio or television spot for radio or television spot.

From his inferior position with regard to name recognition among Colton voters, Echevarria could choose a strategy of attack against the mayor, with a barrage of negative advertising as means of taking away the positive name identification that Navarro has. That however, might prove risky, as Echevarria's personal, associative and political vulnerabilities exist in far greater depth and width than do the incumbent's. Were Navarro to respond in kind, Echevarria

One such example of this is Echevarria's association with San Bernardino's immediate past mayor, John Valdivia. Valdivia, who was San Bernardino's Third Ward councilman from 2012 to

2018, was elected mayor in 2018 and through his fundraising prowess appeared to be heading toward a tremendously successful political career. He was subsumed by scandal, however, as the pay-to-play ethos he embraced in his effort to raise money for his future political campaigns resulted in recurrent accusations of graft and bribery. Despite having more money than all six of his opponents in the 2022 San Bernardino mayoral election, he finished in third place during that year's June Primary, not far ahead of the fourth place candidate. He thus did not get into the November 2022 run-off for mayor and his political career is widely considered to have come to an end. Echevarria's association with Valdivia, their endorsements of each other and the questionable commonality in their respective support networks would potentially provide Navarro with a field day if the 2026 Colton mayoral campaign goes negative.