

Graft Probe Targeting Wapner & Hagman Advances With FBI Raids

By Mark Gutglueck

The homes and offices of Ontario Councilman and mayoral candidate Alan Wapner and Fourth District San Bernardino County Supervisor Curt Hagman were the targets of raids by the FBI on Tuesday July 28.

Both politicians have long been the focus of investigations into pay-to-play politics within the Inland Empire community where they serve as elected officials, as well

as ones into their efforts on behalf of foreign governments, corporations and business interests, including the secreting of what was alleged to be bribe money into the country.

The raids relating to Wapner and Hagman took place inside and outside San Bernardino County, where the duo are both career politicians based in the Fourth Supervisorial District, the most geographically

compact and densely populated of the county's five subjurisdictions. San Bernardino County's Fourth District includes the entirety of the cities of Chino Hills, Chino, Montclair and Ontario, the southern portion of Upland, along with the unincorporated communities of Carbon Canyon, Los Serranos, Velano, Yorba, West End, Prado, Narod, Ballou, Racimo and Guasti.

Hagman's career as

a politician began with his election to the Chino Hills City Council and later ascension to mayor, followed by his election to the California Assembly, his acceding to the position of chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee, and his election as Fourth District San Bernardino County supervisor and reelection to that post three times.

Wapner, who was

employed as a police officer, detective and later a sergeant with the Ontario Police Department, began his political career as a member of the Ontario-Montclair School District Board of Trustees and was first elected to the Ontario City Council in 1994, having been reelected to that post seven times. He is currently vying for Ontario mayor.

In carrying out the raids, FBI See P 2

Chino Hills Man And His Abductor Killed At The End Of A Botched Kidnap Attempt

A Chino Hills man was killed by a business associate during what appears to have been a botched kidnapping attempt Wednesday night.

According to available information Zhengfeng Bo had already gravely wounded Shakur Aikebaer and had acted in concert with his brother, Jianquan Bo in throwing Aikebaer into his car trunk and was

making an effort to leave the scene of the abduction when they were interrupted by responding sheriff's department personnel. After being stopped, Zhengfeng Bo made a somewhat ambiguous show or surrendering and then shot the helpless Aikebaer while he was still in the car's trunk. Sheriff's officers immediately gunned down Zhengfeng Bo in

response.

Zhengfeng's motivation at this point is a mystery and will possibly remain so, as both he and Aikebaer died in the incident, and it is unclear what light the surviving Jianquan Bo will be able to shed on why his brother took the action he did.

A jumble of details has emerged, aided by the availability of both video and audio recordings

of the critical moments that culminated in Aikebaer's and Bo's deaths, but the narrative of events remains disjointed and marred by Bo's quirky behavior at several turns.

What is known is that some time shortly after 10 p.m. on Wednesday, July 29, Zhengfeng Bo, 67, and Jianquan Bo, 66, driving in a gray Nissan Altima arrived in the residential neighborhood in the 2100 block of Monteverde Drive in Chino Hills. One of them went to the electrical panel of the home occupied by Aikebaer, 60, his wife and their three daughters and cut the power. Upon Aikebaer going outside to inspect the fuse box, both Bos confronted him. Aikebaer was shot in the torso by one of the brothers. The See P 4

ed California's 470 wet lakes and reservoirs.

Mom, Live-In Boyfriend Guilty In Toddler's Scalding Death

The San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office's Family Violence Unit on July 28, 2026 secured guilty pleas and convictions against defendants Sergio Mena and Samantha Garver, both of Big Bear, for the 2023 death of one-year-old Henry Wheatley-Brown.

Young Wheatley-Brown died as a result of being severely scalded and being denied timely medical care after his mother's live-in boyfriend left him in a bathtub with water believed to be above 130 degrees Fahrenheit (130°F) while he was reportedly smoking methamphetamine.

The death of Wheatley-Brown, considered in conjunction with earlier reports of his mother's abuse and neglect of his older siblings raised questions about the diligence and thoroughness of, and follow-through by, the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services.

The couple was arrested on October 1, 2023 after the Big Bear Fire Department responded to a home in the 700 block of Santa Barbara Avenue in Sugarloaf, where they found the 14-month-old baby "suffering severe burns to his body," according to a statement from the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department released at that time.

Garver, now 36, was Henry's mother. Mena, now 35, was Garver's boyfriend.

On September 30, 2023, while Garver was out of the home working for a vacation home company in the area near Big Bear Lake, Mena placed

Henry in a bathtub filled with what the district attorney's office described as "scalding water" and left him unattended to engage in drug use. Henry began screaming, and Mena returned to find the child severely See P 3

A Fish Story

A 30-pound channel catfish was caught at Hesperia Lake Park on Sunday, July 26, 2026.

According to Hesperia Recreation and Park District officials, the trophy fish was so heavy it broke the park's scale during the official weigh-in. The catch was made by angler Javier Antonio Fuentes, who officials said "brought this legend to the shoreline."

Fuentes made the catch while braving a brutal heat wave.

Two days previously, on July 24, the lake had been stocked with 1,000 pounds of catfish and

500 pounds of tilapia.

The whopper Fuentes landed, however, had been in the 7-acre lake far longer than two days. The time it would take a five pound catfish to grow to 30 pounds would typically require no fewer than 12 months and most likely more in the range of 18 months. The channel catfish and tilapia See P 3

A Bigger Fish Story

On July 28, the legendary Catzilla, a 50-pound catfish said to be lurking somewhere below the surface of Hesperia Lake for some time now, was caught, or so the story goes.

An angler, who has been described only by his first name, Justin, was credited with snagging the behemoth, which is believed to be the second-largest catfish that has ever haunted

ed California's 470 wet lakes and reservoirs.

Nearly a dozen nearby fisherman temporarily lost their focus on their own poles and lines as they watched in awe and virtual disbelief as Justin battled with the Leviathan in the late morning heat. It pulled away and he let the reel out. Then, as quickly, when the fish's resistance temporarily ebbed, he wound in more line than he had just let out. The contest between the fish thrashing as best as it could backward and Justin's now aching forearms intensified. Beneath the water, the cat's powerful body momentarily glistened as the sunlight penetrated the lake, but then seemed to disappear as the sun glinting off the water shone with a brightness that obscured the darker blue hue beneath it.

Justin, wet with sweat and the spray See P 5

As School Year Starts, Student Examinations Recommended

By Rhonda L. Randall

With the resumption of school next month, families are engaged in preparation for the upcoming school year that focus on school supplies, schedules and getting back into routines. Another important back-to-school step parents might consider taking before the first day of class is scheduling a medical examination for their child or children.

Because many pediatric and family practice schedules often fill quickly throughout the summer, now is an ideal time for parents to make appointments. These preventive visits help ensure children and adolescents are ready for the year ahead, not only academically, but physically, emotionally and developmentally.

These annual physicals help track a child's overall health and development, including growth and developmental milestones, immunizations and preventive screenings, vision and hearing checks, emotional and behavioral health.

Beyond these clinical measures, physicals also give parents a chance to complete school or sports forms and raise any concerns before the school year begins. More importantly, they create dedicated time for families and providers to discuss a child's overall well-being, connecting physical health with emotional wellness and any developmental concerns that may affect success in school and at home.

The broader view of a checkup may be especially important when it comes to mental health. A child's emotional well-being may be See P 5



## Hagman Was Designated To Temper Wapner's Take-No-Prisoners Crusade To Liberate Ontario Airport From LA, But Ended Up Joining With Him *from front page*

agents were seeking evidence and documentation pertaining to quid pro quos – bribes or kickbacks – provided to Wapner and Hagman by individuals, business entities, business owners and principals in businesses which had applications for project approval with the city, the county or the Ontario International Airport Authority, which were competing for contracts with the city or county or which were seeking franchises granted by the city, the county or the airport authority that ultimately were subject to approval by the Ontario City Council, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors or the Ontario Airport Authority Board of Commissioners.

In addition, federal agents were seeking instruments or documents relating to Wapner's and Hagman's overseas banking activity, most particularly involving financial institutions in the People's Republic of China, and their ability to access those accounts or transfer money, as well as account codes, or platform access and management tools for cryptocurrency exchanges.

Wapner and Hagman have been on the FBI's radar for nearly a decade, as dozens of their constituents have noted irregularities and improprieties in their operations, and reports of one or the other purchasing the silence of other officials have abounded for years. Those who have gone to both state and federal authorities with information or complaints have expressed dismay and frustration at the glacial pace of law enforcement and political regulatory agency investigations into that alleged wrongdoing.

Relatively early on, federal investigators took note of how Hagman moved, shortly after

he assumed the position of county supervisor, to hire Wapner as a member of his staff. This reflected a similar pattern evinced by Wapner in which he has used the authority vested in him as an elected official to hire individuals known or believed to be in possession of information that is potentially damaging to him on either a personal, legal or political level, as part of what appears to be an effort to keep himself in power.

Over the years, federal investigators accumulated what well-placed sources have told the *Sentinel* was sufficient information to justify arresting and charging both Wapner and Hagman with criminal acts relating to the misuse of their official governmental positions. The U.S. Attorney's Office held off on that action, it was said, as investigators were attempting to widen the investigative net and cinch up information relating to a number of others involved with them in the activity under investigation. According to those sources, because the activity Wapner and Hagman were engaged in was ongoing, delaying the filing of charges against either of them had no statute of limitations implication.

There are a number of parallels in the political careers of Alan Wapner and Curt Hagman. Hagman, a UCLA graduate, is nine years Wapner's junior. Wapner, a USC alumnus, was first elected to the Ontario City Council in 1994. Ten years later, in 2004, Hagman was first elected to the Chino Hills City Council. In 2008, Hagman was elevated by his council colleagues to the appointed position of mayor. It was in the capacity of Chino Hills mayor that Hagman campaigned for and won a position in the California Assembly that same year. He was subsequently re-elected to the Assembly in 2010 and 2012.

In 2011, Wapner embarked on an effort to wrest Ontario Airport from the grip of the City of Los Angeles.

In 1967, when the annual number of pas-

sengers passing through the airport's gates stood at 200,000, the cities of Ontario and Los Angeles entered into a joint powers agreement, whereby the larger metropolis was to use the expertise and personnel at its command by virtue of its ownership and operation of Los Angeles International Airport to run Ontario Airport, in so doing using its relationship with scores of national and international airlines to improve the smaller airport and induce more than just the handful of airlines then willing to fly into and out of Ontario to establish operations there. In 1985, after Los Angeles had succeeded in meeting all of the criteria laid out in the joint powers agreement, Ontario deeded the airport to Los Angeles, which continued with defraying operational costs at the airport and financed or arranged financing on continued modernization of the facility, including constructing what was the longest civilian runway in California, a state-of-the-art concourse and two ultra-modern terminals.

Ridership at Ontario Airport had peaked in 2007 at 7.2 million, but declined steeply as a consequence of the economic downturn precipitated by the subprime mortgage crisis that hit the nation, state and local region, resulting in what was referred to as "the Great Recession." Utilizing the drop-off in the number of passengers experienced by the airline industry in general as a pretext while arguing that Los Angeles officials were purposely mismanaging Ontario Airport to increase ridership at Los Angeles International, Wapner aggressively demanded that Los Angeles return Ontario Airport to Ontario. His tactics including a highly personal attack on Gina Marie Lindsey, the executive director at Los Angeles World Airports, the corporate entity Los Angeles used to oversee Los Angeles International Airport, Ontario Airport and Van Nuys Airport. While accusing Lindsey of running Ontario Airport into the ground, Wapner in 2012

convinced Ontario Mayor Paul Leon and his other council colleagues to create the Ontario International Airport Authority, which was intended to step into the role of operating and managing the airport once Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports were out of the picture.

Wapner succeeded in being designated as the president/chairman of the board of directors for the Ontario International Airport Authority, which had as two of its five other board members Wapner's council colleague and political ally, James Bowman, as well as the county's then-Fourth District supervisor, Gary Ovitt, who had previously been Ontario mayor. Wapner pushed the city toward filing suit against Los Angeles in an effort to recover the airport, and the city retained the law firm of Sheppard, Richter, Mullen, and Hampton to do so.

In pursuing that end, Wapner took a scorched-earth approach in which there appeared to be no regard for the impact the hostile tactics he was employing would have in the long run, nor what bridges were being burned with elected and other officials in Los Angeles, at least some of whom would move into powerful positions in state and federal government. Moreover, Wapner did not take into consideration that Los Angeles, which had control over gate position at Los Angeles International Airport and had strong ties and influence with the more than 90 airlines that fly into and out of that facility, was in a position to, on the positive side, offer airline executives with airlines who had no presence in Ontario inducements or incentives to schedule landings into or flights from there or, from a negative perspective, influence airlines already established in Ontario to discontinue their operations there.

A consensus was growing among local, county and regional officials that Wapner was being too aggressive and gratuitously offensive, such that his bull in a China shop approach was wreaking

### 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

more harm than the city or nearby communities stood to gain by returning the airport to local control. Wapner's determination to have Ontario, which simply lacked the gravitas and leverage of the megalopolis 37 miles to the west, intimidate Los Angeles into capitulation would not only not work, most thought, but create an institutional enmity where none had existed before and which would have no salutary outcome.

To Hagman, as the highest-ranking local elected state official with ties to the Inland Empire's business community and financial institutions, fell the assignment of attempting to serve as a moderating influence on Wapner. He was designated to approach the councilman and seek to convince him that at the very least he should tone down his vituperative rhetoric with regard to Los Angeles officials and dispense with the strategy of outright seizing the airport in favor of more amicable tack that would be less likely to antagonize some or all of those who yet had say not only in how the airport was being run but were in a position to determine how spiritedly Los Angeles should fight in maintaining its hold on Ontario Airport and the terms by which it was to be relinquished to the municipal jurisdiction in which it is located.

A small circle of those involved in government knew that Paul Leon, Ontario's mayor, had, as a child, lived in the same East Los Angeles neighborhood as then-Los Angeles Mayor An-

tonio Villaraigosa. Those people openly mused, among themselves, as to whether Leon would be able to work out a better deal by applying honey with his childhood chum than Wapner was trying achieve by dousing the situation with vinegar.

At least some federal investigators have come to recognize that it was the contact Hagman was making with Wapner in the 2012 and 2013 time-frame with the intent of getting the councilman to cool his jets and dispense with his solipsistic, indeed delusional, stance as David seeking to slay Goliath in favor of a more reasonable avenue of negotiation and compromise with Los Angeles that gave rise to the collusion between Wapner and Hagman that is at the heart of the matter now being investigated and which is the focus of the search warrants served today.

Indeed, if it was Hagman's intention to reason with Wapner and convince him that he was being overzealous in his demands that Los Angeles surrender control of the airport to Ontario and San Bernardino County, the outcome was virtually the opposite. Rather than Hagman convincing Wapner that he should alter his course, it was Wapner who persuaded Hagman to deviate from the path he was on and join him, and that Ontario seizing control of the airport was in their mutual benefit.

Under the term limits then in place for members of the California Legislature, Hagman was required to leave the

*Continued on Page 6*



**30-Pound Fish** *from front page*

stocked into Hesperia Lake come from Pacific Aquafarms in Niland, California. According to recent fish reports, the fish delivered by Pacific Aquafarms are typically in the 1.5 pound to 2.5 pound range, with some

larger specimens up to 3-to-4 pounds. It would thus seem the *Ictalurus punctatus* that Fuentes hooked and then managed to pull in, was likely swimming about Lake Hesperia for at least 21 months and had perhaps been there as long as two years.

The channel catfish, with the scientific moniker *Ictalurus punctatus* and known informally as the “channel cat,” is a species of catfish native to North America. It is North America’s most abundant catfish species. As such, it is also the most fished species

of catfish in the United States, with around 8 million anglers seeking them out every year. In their recent forays to Lake Hesperia, fisherman stay in the shade to avoid the sweltering conditions brought on the merciless sun. In days going forward

the temperature is expected to reach 113 degrees. The stocking of Hesperia Lake with fish from the hatchery at Pacific Aquafarms is part of the Hesperia Recreation and Park District’s ongoing program to maintain healthy catfish

populations in the lake, with multiple annual releases to support fishing opportunities.



**Child Met A Cruel End** *from front page*

burned. He notified Garver, who returned home later that evening. Despite Henry’s extensive and life-threatening injuries, according to the district attorney’s office, neither defendant sought medical care, instead attempting to treat the burns with over-the-counter ointment. The couple called 911 the following day, reporting that the child was having difficulty breathing, prosecutors said. Responding paramedics found Wheatley-Brown “without a pulse,

ice-cold to the touch, and severely dehydrated,” according to the district attorney’s office. The child died from his injuries, and the death was ruled a homicide. Investigators ultimately determined the boy had been the victim of “ongoing physical abuse,” prosecutors stated. “Henry had second- and third-degree burns, extensive bruising, petechiae in his eyes, and multiple healing fractures in both arms. Garver was aware of Henry’s injuries,” the district attorney’s office said. According to scienceinsights.org, exposure to

140°F water can cause a third-degree burn in an adult in as little as five seconds and a second-degree burn in about three seconds. 130°F can result in an adult suffering third-degree burns in roughly 15-to-30 seconds and second-degree burns in about ten seconds. 120°F water can result in adults sustaining third-degree burns in about five minutes and second-degree burns after ten minutes. 110°F water carries with it minimal scald risk for adults, requiring over an hour of continuous contact to reach that level of injury. Hot water transfers heat quickly to skin,

causing rapid protein denaturation and tissue destruction. The “zone of coagulation” forms immediately at high temperatures, destroying skin layers in seconds. Children under the age of five have thinner skin and a higher body surface area-to-mass ratio that makes them more susceptible to scalding than adults. In a child, a third-degree burn at 140°F can occur in three seconds, according to biologyinsights.com. Both Garver and Mena told child welfare investigators that Garver was not home when Henry suffered his fatal burns. It was Garver

who informed investigators that Mena was using methamphetamine at the time of the burns. Mena said he did not purposefully injure the child. Henry Wheatley-Brown, whose biological father was Thomas Rios, had turned one-year-old in August 2023. Garver did not summon paramedics with the Big Bear Fire Department to assist her son until more than 12 hours after the scalding occurred. Mena, in response to questions about burns on the child’s legs, said they had resulted from the toddler being placed in a hot bath. Garver said

the baby had been fine 40 minutes before paramedics arrived. But the firefighters found the child cold to the touch and unresponsive. He was taken to a hospital, where he was pronounced dead. “Through extensive investigation, it was discovered Wheatley Brown had additional injuries, indicating abuse,” the sheriff’s department said in a news release relating to the couple’s arrest. An investigation into the circumstances of the Santa Barbara Avenue domicile where Garver and Mena were living *Continued on Page 5*

**In His Last Moments, Kidnapper Killed His Captive** *from front page*

commotion and firing of the gun elicited the attention of neighbors, at least one of whom saw Aikebaer being bundled into the Altima’s trunk. At 10:14 p.m. Wednesday night, a call came into the sheriff’s dispatch center reporting that shots had been fired and providing a description of the Altima. En route to the call, a deputy and a sergeant,

each in separate vehicles, encountered the Altima, being driven by Zhengfeng Bo, both recklessly and at a high rate of speed. They immediately gave chase, as Bo attempted to elude them. Zhengfeng Bo pulled over in the midst of another residential neighborhood roughly a mile from Monteverde Drive, near Gemstone Court and Wandering Ridge Drive. A soundless security video from one of the houses proximate to where the two shoot-

ing deaths occurred obtained by the *Sentinel* shows Jianquan Bo, who was on the passenger side of the car closest to the curb across and the street from where the video camera is positioned, get out of the car, in apparent compliance with the commands that he keep his hands raised, and move closer toward the sheriff’s personnel, who were near their two cars positioned roughly 30 feet to 35 feet behind the Altima. Zhengfeng Bo remained in the car but,

after a short duration, emerged on the driver’s side, and allowed the door to close behind him as he walked toward the back of the car. He took three steps, reaching a point where he was parallel to the back wheel and then gestured with his right hand as if pointing or acknowledging something slightly to the left of where the officers were poised, and then turned around and walked back to the driver’s door and opened it. From the camera’s angle of view, he momentarily

appeared to be getting back into the car. Instead, he reached down into the car’s interior to pop the car’s trunk. After the lid of the trunk partially lifted, he again, in a remarkably nonchalant and calm manner considering the guns of at least two law enforcement officers were trained on him, walked back toward the rear of the car. As he transitioned from the back portion of the driver’s side of the car to behind it, he flipped the trunk top completely up and positioned him-

self behind the car, with his back to the officers, to gaze into the trunk’s interior. Aikebaer’s arm briefly came into view, and then Zhengfeng Bo discharged his gun into the trunk. Less than a second later, Zhengfeng was hit with the first of a volley of seven shots. In a portion of an audio recording of the moments leading up to the deadly confrontation and the shooting itself obtained by the *Sentinel* an officer using a bullhorn and another one shouting *Continued on Page 5*

**Catzilla Caught!?** *from front page*

of water flung from the line, reeled his prey in ever closer when the momentarily diminishing tension he encountered allowed him to do so. For a moment, when he stepped back and felt a sharp and sudden tug, he almost lost his balance, but then recovered. The angler’s muscles tightened, and, determined to overpower his quarry, he pulled and was rewarded with a peculiar sound

not unlike suction as the fish for the first time emerged from the water, followed immediately by a cacophonous thwack as the fish’s tail slapped the water, the sound echoing away and across the lake, followed by slower ripples of the water in the same direction. The faintest of smiles graced Justin’s face, signifying that he knew he was drawing very close to victory. The glimmer of outward happiness lasted only a second or so, as he knew the battle was not yet over, and he

could not afford to let anything distract him, particularly at this critical juncture of the contest between man and beast. At last, the fish was fully out of the water, no mean feat, considering its weight and that equipment between them was a flexible pole and 15-pound-to-20-pound monofilament line. For a brief second, Justin’s eyes and that of the catfish met, and the adversaries held each other’s gaze. Even at that point they were sizing each

other up. What did Justin see? The biggest freshwater fish he had ever caught or hoped to catch. What did the fish see? What was the fish looking to see? Some sign of weakness? Some indication that there would be a split-second of opportunity for self-survival? With perspiration streaking his brow, his fatiguing hands experiencing a hint of a tremble, Justin landed the prize. He posed for a photo with the still-living fish, a memento for posterity.

Justin then sought to heft the slippery creature into a basket. That’s when Catzilla moved to make his timed break for it, thrashing and twisting powerfully, unexpectedly and violently, propelling himself out of Justin’s grasp and into the shallow water of the lake and then away to depths, disappearing in a flash into the safety of the lake. Thus, this week, has the legend of Catzilla enlarged. There was no opportunity to put Catzilla on

a scale. According to the record books, the largest catfish ever landed in California was a 53.8-pounder that was reeled in from the San Joaquin River by Randall Gilgert Jr. in 2008. According to the International Game Fish Association, the world record for an all-tackle landing of a channel catfish, weighing 58 pounds, was caught at South Carolina’s Santee-Cooper Reservoir in 1964 by W.H. Whaley. – Mark Gutglueck



## Hagman Ruthlessly Blasted Anyone - Republican Or Democrat - Who Stood In His Way Of Becoming County Supervisor from page 2

Assembly at the end of his third term, which was to come to a close in December of 2014, a month after the November 2014 election. Logic dictated that Hagman, by that point a committed career politician, next move to the California State Senate. That was complicated by the consideration that Senate District 29, which encompassed Chino Hills where Hagman then resided, was at that point represented by Bob Huff, like Hagman a Republican. Huff had first been elected to the California State Senate in 2008, the same year Hagman had been elected to the Assembly. California state senators are elected to four-year terms, and under the term limit rules then in effect, state senators were restricted to two terms. Thus, Huff, who was reelected in 2012, was set to remain as the senator representing District 29 until December 2016. This meant that Hagman, as the heir apparent to Huff, would need to wait for two years after leaving the Assembly before stepping back into political office, this time as the state senator representing Chino Hills along with Diamond Bar, Walnut, Yorba Linda, Brea, La Habra, Placentia, Fullerton, Anaheim and Cypress. Hagman was ready to so, as the district was a safe one for a Republican, his experience in the Assembly prepared him to make a transition into California's upper legislative house, he had represented a large swath of the 29<sup>th</sup> Senate District as the assemblyman representing Assembly District 55 and he was positioned as an incumbent assemblyman in the 2012-to-2014 timeframe to raise a substantial amount of money for his future political endeavors, not to mention he could likely count on Huff's endorsement.

After meeting with Wapner several times, however, ostensibly as

part of the effort to broker a reasonable resolution to the dispute between Ontario and Los Angeles over Ontario Airport, Hagman came away with the idea that Ontario should charge forward with obtaining the airport, the sooner the better, and that he should himself get in on the action. Rather than progress up the political evolutionary chain to state senator in 2016, Hagman concluded, he should take a step backward to county supervisor in 2014.

Such a move was to take some maneuvering and gyrating. A major factor was that the incumbent Fourth District supervisor was Gary Ovitt, the former Ontario mayor. Ovitt was not only a Republican, but was eligible, under the county's term limit rule which had been enacted in 2006 and was applicable thereafter, to seek reelection in 2014 and again in 2018 before being termed out at the end of 2022. To run in 2014, Hagman would have to displace a member of his own party, a move not readily accepted within Republican circles.

A decade previously, the county's Republican leadership, which was later discredited and removed from all vestiges of political authority, had consented to the party siding with one Republican over another or set of Republicans over another set of Republicans during primaries. That practice had come to a halt, however, when Robert Rego had been chosen as the chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee in 2008. Rego's first priority was promoting the Republican Party as a whole rather than catering to the whims and personal ambition of individual politicians. This meant electing Republicans and keeping them in office was his priority. Not only had Rego, a certified public accountant who was extremely conscious of the importance of funding and fundraising in a political context, emphasized the importance of the local party building up a substantial amount of money

to carry out campaigns promoting Republican candidates and initiatives embraced by the GOP, he had insisted on discontinuing the immediate past practice of allowing San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee money being used against Republican candidates in primary elections by other Republican candidates.

Generally speaking, the strategy under Rego was that incumbent Republicans, who had by definition demonstrated their electability, were to be supported by the party apparatus. In primary elections where there was no Republican incumbent involved, the party was to steer clear of taking sides. The San Bernardino County Republican Party's official policy while Rego was at the helm was that in the primary elections held in March in presidential election years and June in gubernatorial election years, Republican candidates would vie against one another without the party becoming involved with endorsements or monetary contributions of any sort, such that, hopefully at least, the best Republican candidate would rise on his or her own merits to the top. The basic understanding was that where an incumbent with a demonstrated track record of winning was seeking reelection, loyal Republicans would stand down, not challenge the incumbent and for the good of the party jump in to help the incumbent perpetuate his or her incumbency. At that point, after the primary was concluded, going forward toward the November general election, the party's money and endorsements would be brought to bear in favor of the Republican candidate vying for whatever position was at stake, be it for the school district board, water district board, city council, mayor, county supervisor, Assembly member or California state senator.

For Hagman, his path forward was clear. The first order of business was that Rego would need to be deposed. Rego would not countenance a

non-incumbent Republican running against a proven incumbent Republican. That meant, Hagman knew, the party would not get behind him challenging Ovitt.

In 2013, while he was yet in the Assembly and functioning largely from Sacramento, Hagman, assisted by his chief of staff, Mike Spence, targeted Rego for removal as the chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. Hagman and Spence acted ruthlessly in dethroning Rego, who had done a masterful job during his tenure as chairman of transforming the central committee into an efficient fundraising machine that was dedicated to the GOP cause. Hagman and Spence used a carrot-and-stick approach. The stick consisted of threats to Rego himself and his supporters that they would be transformed into party irrelevancies if they attempted to keep Rego in the chairman's post, intimating that Hagman's ascendancy to the county chairmanship was supported by the state Republican Party and therefore inevitable. When that eventuality occurred, they said, Hagman would purge the county central committee's executive committee of Rego loyalists. This was matched with carrots, consisting of promises that if the committee members went along, those committee members who had been part of the Rego Administration's executive committee would keep their vaunted positions under Hagman. Rego himself was offered the position of treasurer if he gracefully acceded to being replaced as chairman by Hagman.

Ultimately, Rego deferred to Hagman and before 2013 was concluded, Hagman was central committee chairman.

Heading into 2014, Ovitt could feel the ground shifting below his feet. Gloria Negrete McLeod of Chino, a lifelong Democrat, had initiated her political career as a member of the Chaffey College Board of Trustees before she successfully vied for the

California Assembly in 2000, then ran, again successfully, for California State Senate in 2006 when she was termed out of the Assembly, before managing to be re-elected state senator in 2010. Two years later, Negrete McLeod leapt into the U.S. House of Representatives when then-New York Mayor Mike Bloomberg, at that time a Republican, endowed her, even though she was a Democrat, with more than \$5 million to challenge and defeat incumbent "Blue Dog" Democrat Congressman Joe Baca in 2012. After a single term in Washington, D.C., Negrete McLeod opted to leave Congress and, like Hagman was attempting to do, step backwards down the political evolutionary chain by running for Fourth District county supervisor.

While Ovitt confidently asserted he would be able to hold off Negrete McLeod's challenge, he simultaneously found himself undercut by the reality that Hagman had commandeered control of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. As central committee chairman, Hagman was in a position to cut off a significant portion of the funding that would have otherwise been available to Ovitt and to deny the incumbent the endorsement of the Republican Party as well, while claiming the endorsement for himself. Running for reelection as supervisor was suddenly a way more dicey situation than it had been six months previously, Ovitt realized. He pulled out of the race.

Despite the Democrats enjoying a significant voter registration advantage over Republicans in San Bernardino County's Fourth Supervisorial District, Hagman ultimately defeated Negrete McLeod in the November 2014 election.

Meanwhile, during the 2014 electoral season that ended with Hagman's assumption of the role of Fourth District county supervisor, elsewhere within the Fourth District an electoral drama played out during the

Ontario municipal races. Seeking reelection that year were Mayor Leon and councilmen Wapner and Bowman. Vying against Leon were Councilman Paul Avila and Rudy Favilla. Challenging Wapner and Bowman were Ruben Valencia, Yolanda Garcia and Reyna Machado.

As the campaign was heating up, a video was posted on the internet which carried with it the potential of derailing Wapner's reelection campaign and eradicating any prospect of the continuation of his career as an elected public official. That video was captured by a private residence security camera in place at a home within Wapner's neighborhood in the area of East Hazeltine and South Pleasant Avenue. It showed Wapner beating his then-16-year-old daughter after she had left their home in the midst of a heated argument.

Recognizing at once the impact the video would have, Wapner diverted attention from its contents through an effort to discredit those responsible for posting it. He accused Valencia, who had vied unsuccessfully for a position on the city council in 2012, and J. Steve Garcia, a member of the Ontario-Montclair School District Board who was running at that time for a board position with Chaffey Joint Union High School District, and the owners of the home with the security system that had captured the video as the culprits.

Indignantly, Wapner suggested that what had occurred was a private family matter and his method of dealing with his recalcitrant daughter was no one's business but his own. If the video was not removed from the internet along with all references to it, he vowed to take legal action, including suing for defamation, against all of the responsible parties.

Simultaneously, Wapner went on the attack against Valencia, asserting, spuriously it would turn out, that Valencia, who was then employed as a deputy with the Los

*Continued on Page 5*



**Child’s Death At Hands Of His Mother & Her Boyfriend**  
*from page 3*

and Garver’s history turned up issues that had been ignored and unaddressed, to Baby Wheatley-Brown’s ultimately fatal peril.

Garver had at least four and possibly five children. The first report about one of them being subjected to abuse had come into local authorities in 2009, when she



**Henry Wheatley-Brown**

Photo: Stephanie Duncan

was 19. Henry was the youngest of her children.

Over the years, family members and a babysitter had phoned the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department and Children and Family Services to report concerns about Garver’s children’s safety and visible injuries. One such report related to one of her other children having suffered severe burns in an incident in 2013, a decade before

**Kidnapping & Ensuing Chaos Ends In Killings**  
*from front page*

can be heard. Audible is an officer with a bullhorn saying, “Driver, put your hands up.” Then at a lower volume another officer can be heard yelling, “Get on your knees.” The officer with the bullhorn then says, “Back up. Back up.” The officer without the bullhorn can be hear yelling, “Get on your knees. Get

Henry’s death.

The San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services begged off when asked for comment regarding the matters involving Garver and her children.

The death of Henry did spark a more intense examination of the Garver household than had taken place previously. While it is not clear who interviewed Mena and Garver in the aftermath of Wheatley-

Brown’s death, both said Garver was not home at the time Henry suffered the injuries that led to the complications that killed him, consisting of second-degree burns from his shins down to his feet as well as “isolated” second-degree burns on his genitals consistent with having been “dipped in hot water,” according to

down. Get down. Get down.” Four seconds then elapse, at which point the officer without the bullhorn yells, “Hey. Halt. Hey. Halt.” As the last word is uttered, what sounds like two shots, fired rapidly together, apparently from Zhengfeng’s gun are heard. Roughly a half second later, what sounds like seven shots are then audible over span of 3.5 seconds.

According to the coroner’s office, when he was at his property on Monteverde Drive, Aikebaer sustained a gun-

Department of Children and Family Services report that was completed less than a month after the child’s death.

The report, which was dated October 25, 2023, indicated Garner demonstrated a lack of maternal sensitivity.

“The mother allowed the child to suffer for several hours before he eventually died,” it stated.

Jeany Zepeda, the director of the San Bernardino Department of Children and Family Services in 2023, acknowledged that the system had failed Wheatley-Brown and that her office had come to the conclusion that “abuse or neglect led to the child’s death.”

There were repeated safety and welfare issues relating to the children under Garver’s roof. In some cases, though not all, what appeared to be appropriate responses to the situation were made. In virtually all of those entailing referrals, citations and court appearances, however, Garver appears to have slipped around the punishment meted out to, or the conditions imposed on, her.

The report noted that investigators and medical personnel determined Henry had earlier injuries that had gone untreated and unreported, including a dislocated arm and marks and bruises on his face. “The mother failed to seek medical attention

shot to the torso before he was put into the trunk of the Altima. While in the trunk in the in the 2400 block of Wandering Ridge Drive, Aikebaer was yet alive when he he was shot at least once in the head, which proved fatal.

It was subsequently determined by San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department investigators that Zhengfeng Bo and Jianquan Bo lived together in Irvine and it was confirmed they were brothers. An investigator with the department said the team of detectives working on the case were at a loss as to the motive in abducting Aikebaer or the violence to

for previous injuries that are indicative of possible physical abuse that occurred,” according to the report.

The Department of Children and Family Services first took note of problems relating to Garver’s parenting in 2009 and further instances of neglect were noted at various points thereafter. The following year, a referral came into the department when a doctor reported that Garver had said sometimes, when one of

**Back-To-School**

**Physicals** *from front page*

closely linked to his or her physical health. According to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, approximately 1 in 5 children ages 3 to 17 in the U.S. has a diagnosable mental, emotional or behavioral disorder.

Young children may experience separation anxiety or behavioral outbursts. School-age children may struggle with focus, stress or social challenges. Teens may show changes in mood, sleep or engagement. Early conversations with a pediatrician can make a difference. A physical presents an opportunity for students to talk about how they’re feeling. These conversations may also help nor-

which he was subjected. They were unable to say whether Zhengfeng Bo’s intention all along had been to kill Aikebaer or whether that was a decision made by Zhengfeng Bo at the spur of the moment. They said Zhengfeng’s actions throughout the incident had been irrational and erratic.

Records indicate that Zhengfeng Bo and Shukur Aikebaer were entangled in a real estate transaction that went bad. Ostensibly, Bo and Aikebaer, who were linked through Bo’s company, Panshi Inc., were on the same side of a dispute with an outfit known as The Madison Collection LLC involving an apartment complex in Pasadena allegedly valued at \$20-million.

her children “wouldn’t stop crying,” she “felt like putting a pillow over” the child’s head.

Garner was reported to the department again in 2013. At that point, Garver had a four-year-old, a two-year-old and an 8-month-old baby. Garver made a posting in a Facebook group chat in which she inquired about the advisability of using duct tape to prevent a child from crying and whether doing so constituted abuse. In the same timeframe she

malize emotional health as an essential part of routine care.

In some cases, preventive care visits and behavioral health support programs are covered under a families’ health plan.

Dental & vision care is also important as part of the effort of keeping children ready to learn. Typical health plans may include annual eye exams that can detect changes in eyesight that may affect learning in the classroom. More than 600,000 children and teens in the U.S. suffer from some form of vision loss. Dental benefits may include routine cleanings and exams that help catch concerns before they become more

Panshi Inc, based in Irvine, filed articles of incorporation with the California Secretary of State’s Office on November 28, 2018. and is approximately eight years old, as recorded in documents filed with California Secretary of State. Panshi Inc was is listed as an officer of Madison Collection LLC.

Reportedly, both Bo brothers and Aikebaer are Uyghurs, that is members of a Muslim sect, and were originally from the Xinjiang region of China.

According to available documentation, Panshi Inc had not developed the property in question, consisting of apartment units, but held the major note and title to it. Shengfeng Bo was the president and chief executive officer of Panshi Inc, and Aikebaer served as its chief financial officer and corporate

made another Facebook posting in which she said her daughter had “blistered burns on her thighs” that came about when she was shopping and the child was under the care of a friend.

Garver posted on the Facebook page that she was afraid of Child and Family Service personnel, suggesting that was one of the reasons she was reluctant to bring her children to the hospital or a doctor for medical treatment.

*Continued on Page 17*

serious. Tooth decay, or cavities, is one of the most common chronic diseases among children and may contribute to missed days at school.

Scheduling a well-child visit is a simple but important step that gives families the opportunity to address concerns and support a child’s overall wellbeing throughout the year.

*Rhonda L. Randall, D.O., is the chief medical officer at UnitedHealthcare. Rhonda L. Randall, D.O., is the chief medical officer at UnitedHealthcare*

secretary.

At Zhengfeng’s direction and that of another investor, Aikebaer had released at least \$2.12 million to Madison Collection LLC, which took over operation of the property and served as its property manager. When Panshi Inc sought to reassert control over the property, Madison Collection refused to relinquish it and hostilities between the parties ensued. Meanwhile there were disputes between Panshi Inc and Madison Collection over payments due to vendors and service providers.

On February 17, 2026, Panshi LLC filed a commercial and trade contract lawsuit in Los Angeles County Superior Court against Madison Collection LLC. The case, in which Panshi Inc was represented by attorney Michael Chen, was being heard at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse by Judge Jerrold Abeles.

*-Mark Gutglueck*



## Though In 2014 He Was Caught On Video Beating His 15-Year-Old Daughter In Public, Wapner Sidestepped Being Criminally Charged, Threatened Those Who Brought The Matter Up With Legal Action And Cruised To Victory In That Year's Election *from page 4*

Angeles County Sheriff's Department at the department's City of Industry substation, was being assisted by the County of Los Angeles and its taxpayers in his Ontario City Council campaign. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and various personnel at the City of Industry substation, Wapner alleged, were using the substation premises and its equipment in assisting Valencia in his electioneering effort across the county line. What was more, Wapner said, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department higher-ups were allowing Valencia to campaign while in uniform.

Los Angeles County officials and commanders in the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, having at first been rocked back on their heels by Wapner's allegation, looked into the matter. Having satisfied themselves that no misuse of Los Angeles County equipment or facilities in support of Valencia's campaign had taken place, the county and the sheriff's department made a declaration to that effect. Valencia, sensing that Wapner was seeking to orchestrate events and use his position of power along with sheer intimidation to inhibit his ability to campaign for city council, thereafter sought and obtained a restraining order against Wapner.

At the September 2, 2014 Ontario City Council meeting, the council adjourned into a closed session, during which the panel's first order of business was to discuss how the city was going to respond to the restraining order that had been filed by Valencia, concerns that the city might be sued by the County of Los Angeles over his false accusations and to strategize with regard to how Ontario could overcome the adverse publicity the city was beginning to suffer because

of the tie-in between Wapner's beating of his daughter and his diversionary campaign tactics which had brought a law enforcement agency into the matter while the Ontario Police Department was, essentially, ignoring the criminal implication of Wapner's assault on his daughter.

During the September 2, 2014 closed session, the city council agreed, on a 3-to-2 vote with Wapner, Bowman and Councilwoman Debbie Dorst-Porada prevailing, to retain Jason Anderson, who from 2004 until 2008 had been a member of the Ontario City Council and who had just gone into private practice as an attorney after having served as a prosecutor with the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office from 1998 until earlier in 2014. Curiously, the council sought to disguise the retaining of Anderson by disbursing the funds out of the city's housing authority account. Anderson agreed to go to bat for the city and represent Wapner with regard to the restraining order filed against him, smooth out the contretemps with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and keep the damning video of Wapner under wraps.

As it would turn out, the political status quo in Ontario remained intact as a result of the November 2014 election, in which Leon was reelected as mayor and both Wapner and Bowman were retained as councilmen.

In December 2014, the month after the 2014 General Election, Hagman supplanted Ovitt as the representative of the Fourth District's 419,669 residents in San Bernardino, simultaneously moving into the position of airport commissioner at Ontario International Airport. Alpha type personalities both, it took some time for Wapner and Hagman to adjust to coexisting in the same

public forum. Ostensibly, Wapner, who was widely perceived as one of, if not, the most aggressive political figures in the county, occupied a less impressive, prestigious and powerful position as councilman than the supervisor's position Hagman had acceded to. Hagman, too, was known for his assertive, combative style. Yet, in the context of the forum they were now dealing with on a monthly basis, the Ontario International Airport Authority Board of Commissioners meetings, Wapner, as the board chairman, was the presiding officer. Hagman, as a board member, remained in his lane, and the two over the next several months established a working relationship in which neither threatened or overrode the other in a heavy-handed way.

In August 2015, a settlement in principle was reached between the cities of Ontario and Los Angeles regarding Ontario International Airport. After Ontario dropped Wapner's demand that Los Angeles deed the aerodrome back for no consideration and agreed a \$150 million purchase of the airport property, paying another \$60 million to take possession of the aviation-related assets technically belonging to Los Angeles World Airports that were in place at the airport and which were indispensable to its operations, as well as agreeing to take on the responsibility of servicing some \$60 million in bonded indebtedness Los Angeles had assumed over the years to finance airport improvements in Ontario, Los Angeles agreed to return ownership of the facility in its entirety and let Ontario take over management of the facility effective November 1, 2016.

That milestone having been achieved, the following month, without any fanfare, Hagman arranged to take on Wapner as a member of his supervisory staff. In an effort to minimize attention and scrutiny of the arrangement, Wapner's appointment as the 4<sup>th</sup> District's policy advisor was not put on the board of supervisors' September

15, 2015 agenda ahead of time but presented as a late "walk-on" item to the board's consent calendar. Wapner began work in the assignment, which had no set schedule nor requirement that he be present in county offices daily or any specified time, immediately. The position paid him an annual salary of \$48,326 plus benefits of \$1,859.

Once Wapner was installed as Hagman's policy advisor, the two embarked on an effort to court businesses and convince them to locate in the 4<sup>th</sup> District, as well as inviting investment in the area. Neither Wapner nor Hagman was restrictive in terms of where those infusions of capital were to come from, involving either domestic or foreign speculators and investors. Early in Wapner's tenure as 4<sup>th</sup> District policy advisor, the two traveled on multiple occasions outside the country together, in particular to the Far East, including both Taiwan and China, ostensibly to interest investors there in activity around the airport or regarding airport operations. A report at the time was that both established bank accounts in the People's Republic of China.

Simultaneously, with the pending exodus of the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Department of Airports, Los Angeles World Airports and Lindsey from Ontario, inquiries from entities testing whether the restrictions relating to the use and eventual sale of Ontario Airport property that had been in effect while Los Angeles had ownership and control of the facility would remain in place once Ontario was in the driver's seat began flooding in. Those interested in obtaining property on the airport grounds that Ontario might designate as "surplus" included development companies, logistics companies, real estate companies and speculators. The lion's share of those were domestic entities, with a few foreign companies or partnerships expressing interest. Of note, a few of the ostensibly American-based companies in actuality were funded

virtually entirely by foreign capital. A handful of those, consisting primarily of Chinese investors, had headquarters in California, primarily Los Angeles and Orange counties. A codeword for those – "Orange County interests" – came into vogue at Ontario City Hall, the airport authority's executive offices on the airport grounds and in Hagman's offices at the county. Understood was that Orange County interests were very interested in obtaining property at or near Ontario Airport, were willing to pay top dollar for it and outspend any competition if a bidding war for the property materialized, and that the Orange County interests were ready to show appreciation to anyone involved in the process, including airport authority staff and decision-makers or governmental officials, who facilitated them in achieving their goals.

Upon reaching the agreement with Los Angeles to reassume eventual ownership and management of the airport, the Ontario International Airport Authority Board of Commissioners initiated what turned out to be a five-month global search to find an airport management professional to oversee the airport. In January 2016, the board of commissioners approved the hiring of Kelly J. Fredericks to serve as Ontario International Airport's chief executive officer. Fredericks was at that time the president and chief executive officer of the Rhode Island Airport Corporation, which controlled and operated Rhode Island T. F. Green International Airport near Providence. Fredericks arrived in Ontario in March of 2016, and spent the next six months shadowing the Los Angeles World Airports staff in their daily operations running Ontario International in preparation of the November 1, 2016 ownership transition.

Even before that transition, Wapner began pressuring Fredericks to compile a list of what portions of the 1,741-acre airport property could be deemed "surplus," mean-

ing not crucial to airport operations at that time. The idea, Wapner made clear, was to prepare and then execute upon his intention, which he insisted was supported by the other members of the airport board of commissioners and the Ontario City Council, to sell the property to entities that would make use of it and thereby boost the local economy. He had, Wapner said, undertaken to return Ontario Airport to Ontario's control because the airport was most useful as an "economic engine" for the region, which he said Los Angeles officials had failed to take stock of. Ontario had already squandered the economic development potential at the airport during the 30 years Los Angeles had ownership of and complete control over it, Wapner said, and he asserted it was imperative that the transfer of non-essential land there be freed up for sale at once.

Fredericks, who was uncertain of what Wapner's true intention was, nonetheless had doubts about the legitimacy of his motivation. While there were pockets of land around the 1,741 acres that were indeed, at that moment, lying fallow and not being put to aeronautical use, aviation use, support use or any use whatsoever, the possibility existed that a time would come when the property might prove critical to airport operations. Selling the property in a rushed sale, Fredericks knew, would potentially preclude, at a later date, expansion of the airport and its operations. Undertaking to reacquire the property at some future point after it was in the hands of another entity utilizing it for some other purpose, would prove expensive, and more likely than not prohibitively expensive, Fredericks said. He pushed back, or attempted to push back. Fredericks did not understand, or came to understand too late, that Wapner does not gladly indulge those who defy him. He told Fredericks in no uncertain terms at that point that he needed

*Continued on Page 8*



## Wapner Pres-sured Thorpe To Sell Airport Land To His Political Benefactors At A Bargain Basement Price *from page 6*

to quit shilly-shallying around and carry out a survey of what airport land could be sold off. It wasn't a request, Wapner said. It was an order, he made clear, given by the president of the airport authority who had the backing of all four other members of the board.

Fredericks continued to drag his feet. Two months later, when Wapner recognized that Fredericks was not going to acquiesce to the sale, on July 5, 2017, he forced Fredericks to resign through a combination of threats and inducements. One of those inducements was agreeing to pay Fredericks the remaining \$1,494,375 of the \$1,992,500 in his five-year \$398,500 annual contract to have him leave.

Despite Wapner and the city having pursued the campaign to liberate the airport from the clutches of Los Angeles by claiming Los Angeles World Airports had been mismanaging the airport, when Ontario, San Bernardino County and the Ontario International Airport Authority assumed ownership of the facility, it poached numerous Los Angeles World Airports staff members, hiring them into key management posts at Ontario Airport. Having effectively sacked Fredericks, Wapner found himself in the position of having to turn to one of those, Mark Thorpe, who had been the director of air service development & marketing with Los Angeles World Airports from June 2003 to December 2011, to serve as the airport's interim executive director.

Thorpe had been the assistant vice president of air service development at Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport from 2012 to 2015, after which he had been recruited by Fredericks in August 2016, to serve as the Ontario International

Airport Authority's first chief development officer, in which capacity he spent his first ten weeks on the job working side-by-side with some of his former colleagues at Los Angeles World Airports while the clock wound down to Ontario's November 1, 2016 takeover of the airport. Following Fredericks' departure, Thorpe replaced him on what Wapner called "a temporary basis. Three months later, In October 2017, the board of directors dropped the qualifier "interim" from Thorpe's title, designating him as the airport's chief executive officer.

Just as he had with Fredericks, Wapner began to relentlessly bang on Thorpe to get him to identify and then prepare for sale a roster of surplus properties contained within the airport's 2.72-square mile grounds. By that point, Wapner's actual objective in pressing for having certain parts of the airport cataloged as surplus had become known.

Two entities, the Sares-Regis Group and Lee and Associates, had become interested in what was considered to be a prime piece of ground at the airport, a 198-acre property, referred to as "the boot" because of the unique outline of its boundaries. Situated on ground immediately east of the airport's runway just across Haven Avenue, south of Airport Drive and north of Jurupa Avenue, the property was perceived as ideal for industrial, logistics and commercial warehousing projects.

In 2015, Lee & Associates represented Sares Regis Group in the purchase of 150 acres of land extending nearly a mile along the north side of Interstate 10, between Archibald and Vineyard avenues in Ontario. Sares purchased the land with the intention of transforming it and adjacent property into the Meredith International Centre, a 243-acre campus with a 3-million-square-foot mega-warehouse and industrial distribution facility. Sares Regis and Lee & Associates had even more energetic designs on the boot. To-

gether, Lee & Associates and Sares Regis approached Wapner, offering to pay the airport authority \$101 for the 198 acres.

Wapner did not feel he was in a position to turn Sares Regis and Lee & Associates down. From April of 1998 through 2021, state campaign reporting documents show, Sares-Regis, including principals John Hagestad and Peter Rooney as well as its employees Larry Lukanish, Kenneth Coatsworth, Patrick Russell, Vincent Ciavarella and William Thormahlen, provided Wapner with at least \$123,444 in political donations. Similarly, between December of 1999 and December of 2021, Joe McKay, Mike Wolfe and Carol Plowman of Lee & Associates supplied Wapner with \$95,596.07 in campaign funding.

Throughout the closing months of 2017 and into the late winter and early spring of 2018, Wapner expressed confidence in Thorpe, who had succeeded, shortly after moving into the airport's chief executive officer position, in scoring two impressive coups – landing two new carriers, Frontier Airlines and China Airlines. "Mark is committed to transforming ONT [Ontario International Airport] into a magnet for economic development in the Inland Empire," Wapner said.

Yet, as he closely examined the course Wapner, Hagman and the rest of the board wanted the airport to take, Thorpe had come to the same conclusion that Fredericks before him had reached: Selling off the airport property would be a mistake. Once the land was developed and in the hands of private owners and companies, it would be virtually impossible to reclaim for airport use, based upon its value and the building that would take place on it.

For a time, Thorpe played along, toying with the prospect of having the authority sell off some of the acreage most distant from where aviation operations were taking place or where aeronautical activity was likely to

expand to. But those parcels were not what Lee & Associates and Sares Regis were expecting Wapner to make available to them. Before 2018 was halfway through, Wapner found himself repeating to Thorpe what he had gone over time and again with Fredericks a year prior to that, telling him to quit stalling and get on with it.

In the summer of 2017, in the immediate aftermath of Fredericks' sacking, Wapner arranged for the Ontario International Airport Authority to hire three consultants. The first of these was Greg Devereaux, who had been Ontario's city manager from 1997 until 2010, when he had left to become the chief executive officer of San Bernardino County, a post he held until 2017. The second was Chris Hughes, who had been Ontario's fire chief and was elevated to city manager following Devereaux's departure, a position he remained in until his retirement in 2013. The third was Steve Lambert, the one-time publisher and editor of the Inland Valley *Daily Bulletin*, the most widely circulating daily newspaper in Ontario and the west end of San Bernardino County who had gone on to found the 20/20 Network, a strategic communications firm specializing in what is described as public relations, media outreach and tailored advocacy. Devereaux, Hughes and Lambert were each paid \$10,000 less than a quarter of a million dollars per year for the services they were recruited to provide: \$20,000 per month. Less than six months later, Paul Haney, who had previously worked for American Airlines and the Lockheed Corporation and had been one of the deputy executive directors with Los Angeles World Airports from 2001 to 2008 while that entity had been overseeing Ontario Airport, was also enlisted by the Ontario International Airport Authority as a consultant on a \$20,000 monthly retainer, upon Wapner's recommendation.

While consultants are traditionally utilized to

provide expertise and advice with regard to technology, operations, business and marketing strategy, and utilize technical know-how in specific areas or under specialized circumstances to achieve goals or outcomes, Wapner had not retained Devereaux, Hughes, Lambert and Haney for them to offer him guidance with regard to how the airport should be run or assistance to the airport and airport authority staff with regard to operations but rather to assist him in bringing staff into compliance with his directions and objectives. What his go-round with Fredericks had demonstrated to him was that when his instructions to staff, from the executive director down, deviated with standard procedure or conventional rules, staff defaulted to doing things by the book and the way they are traditionally done. Fredericks' refusal to sell off the idle pieces of ground that real estate speculators and developers were interested in buying was a manifestation of that. What Wapner needed in order to be able to please his network of political backers and supporters were airport administrators and managers who would do his bidding at his command and without regard to the way things had been done historically. He had staked his political career on Ontario taking control of Ontario Airport, and had emerged victorious. He was now laying claim to the spoils that were his as a consequence of that victory, and it was not the place of Fredericks or Thorpe or anyone else to interfere with the exercise of his will. His intent was to utilize Devereaux, Hughes and Haney to ensure that the well-remunerated employees at the airport authority clearly understood what his objectives were and that they then executed the strategy formulated to achieve those objectives. It was Lambert's assignment to put the best face possible on that strategy and convince the public at large that not only was the airport in the competent hands of dedicated

public servants who had the best interest of the community at heart, but the best policies for efficient and beneficial operation of the airport were being implemented and were succeeding.

Despite the forces that were arrayed against him in 2018, Thorpe remained true to his belief that it would be an epic mistake to accede to Wapner's insistence that the 198-acre boot be sold to Lee & Associates/Sares Regis, a move he was certain would prove to be counter to the interests of the airport, its future, the City of Ontario and the whole of San Bernardino County and the Inland Empire.

In an effort to stymie Wapner, Hagman, Bowman, Devereaux, Hughes and Haney, all of whom were after him to move forward with the sale of the 198 acres, Thorpe cited a provision contained in the airline use agreements the airport had with its carriers requiring that non-aeronautical revenues to be split between the airport and the airlines. This would result in the airport having to surrender half the proceeds, or profit, from those land sales to the airlines, Thorpe asserted. This bought him some time, during which he began looking at the prospect of not selling the property, but rather leasing it. A 25-year lease would encumber the property and render it unusable for aviation purposes for a quarter century. That might preclude expansion of the airport, though not indefinitely. If such a lease could be effectuated and timed correctly, the airport and airport authority might have the best of both worlds, generating income off of the airport's dormant property, yet preserving the possibility of utilizing the property for airport expansion at some designated point decades hence. Furthermore, revenue derived from a lease arrangement would not be subject to the revenue sharing protocol contained in the airport's airline use agreements.

Ultimately, Thorpe was able to confound

*Continued on Page 8*



## Despite Wapner Engaging In Dozens Of Public Official Conflict Of Interest & Bribery Acts, The DA Didn't Touch Him

from page 7

Wapner, Hagman and Bowman when he was able to make a demonstrable showing that Wapner was seeking to shoehorn the airport, the airport authority and the City of Ontario into a disadvantageous financial deal through the acceptance of the offer on the table by Lee & Associates and Sares Regis without considering any other alternatives.

One of those alternatives was so starkly superior, from the standpoint of the city, the airport authority and the airport, that Wapner's and Hagman's insistence that Thorpe close the deal with Lee & Associates and Sares Regis was no longer operative. San Antonio, Texas-based USAA Real Estate Company and McDonald Property Group of Newport Beach, having formed a joint venture, began a dialogue with Thorpe in late 2020 regarding property at the airport that was non-essential to aviation purposes. Over the next several months, those discussions began to center on the boot, after which the concept of USAA Real Estate/McDonald Property gaining access to the property pursuant to a lease rather than an outright purchase was broached. The numbers being batted about in those discussions dwarfed the \$101 million Wapner had been insisting the airport authority had to accept for the 198 acres. Ultimately, when the deal fully shaped up, the airport authority found itself in a position to derive more than six times the revenue that was being offered by Sares Regis through Lee & Associates. Under the development and entitlement agreement that was worked out, USAA Real Estate Company and McDonald Property Group, functioning under the corporate guise of CanAm Ontario LLC, were

to lease the 198 acres for 55 years at an overall cost of \$625 million. The agreement specified that CanAm Ontario was to make a non-refundable \$10 million deposit with the airport authority, after which USAA Real Estate Company/McDonald Property Group, functioning jointly, were given time to obtain local jurisdictional entitlement and environmental approvals to construct buildings and improvements on the property. In the first five years, CanAm Ontario agreed to pay the airport authority \$25 million per year and in the second five years, \$30 million per year, such that at the end of the first ten years, the airport authority will have received \$275 million. Over the remaining 35 years of the lease, CanAm is to pay the authority an average of \$10 million per year, per the agreement.

Outmaneuvered, Wapner had no choice but to accept what Thorpe had structured. On December 23, 2021, Wapner joined with Hagman and Bowman and the other two members of the Ontario International Airport Authority Commission, former Riverside Mayor Ron Loveridge and former East West Bank president and CEO Julia Gouw in a unanimous vote to authorize the development and entitlement agreement with CanAm Ontario LLC.

Meanwhile, from the outset of Ontario's resumption of control over the airport, members of the Ontario community, including residents, a minority of Ontario city and airport authority/airport employees and business owners and operators in Ontario were confronted with elements or manifestations of the airport operation that appeared improper. Immediately apparent was the favoritism in the granting of franchises and concessions at and around the airport and the approval of contracts for the provision of goods and services to the airport itself.

Generally, governmental entities utilize competitive bid processes for the awarding of governmental contracts.

Under most, though not necessarily all, circumstances, the contract is awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. A responsive bid is one which the vendor follows all of the specifications in the submission and provides assurance the work or goods sought will be delivered. A responsible bidder is a contractor or vendor who has the proven financial resources and technical capacity to fully perform a public contract, and has previous experience in doing so. The decision-making body with a governmental entity or agency can make a determination that a bid was not responsive and reject it on that basis. The decision-makers can also reject a bid on the basis that the bidder does not have the resources, equipment, technical capability or personnel to perform the tasks at hand. The decision-making body can also bypass a lower bid in favor of a higher bid on the basis that the quality of work to be performed or quality of goods to be provided by the contractor or vendor with the higher bid would be superior to that offered by the lower bidder[s], and this qualitative difference justifies the higher expenditure. Competitive bid processes provide for an open and transparent examination of the governmental decision-making process.

In a substantial number of cases regarding contracts for goods and services at the airport paid for by the Ontario International Airport Authority, there was no competitive bid process. The overwhelming number of contractors and service providers and consultants involved in those no-bid contracts were donors of substantial amounts of money to Alan Wapner's campaign fund.

In addition, there were recurrent reports, backed by evidence and other indicators, that formalized kickback arrangements were in place in which the Ontario mayor and members of the city council were designated to be the recipients of graft/bribes to be pro-

vided by service providers at the airport. In this way, taxicab companies servicing the airport, tow companies servicing the airport, heating-ventilation-and-air-conditioning service providers maintaining the ventilation systems at the airport's terminals, the custodial crews cleaning the terminals, airport offices and their facilities, the groundskeeping contractors maintaining the landscape around the airport and the restaurant and shop owners with concession-operation permits within the terminals were obliged to make payments to a specific member of the council or the mayor, as designated by, presumably, Wapner, as the president of the airport authority board. Those payments, if cash, were supposed to be made silently and secretly or to take the form of an innocent-appearing transaction or in-kind provision of service.

Scattered and relatively infrequent reports regarding what appeared to be amiss at the airport drifted in during the first few years of Ontario's resumption of the aerodrome's ownership, and were generally made to what were deemed to be the most logical points of authority. When Mayor Paul Leon was approached about such matters, he would beg off, stating the airport was Wapner's bailiwick. To many, Leon's response struck them as insincere, as if he actually knew how bad the situation was and the degree to which he and the rest of Ontario officialdom were implicated in it and he either did not want to open any cans of worms or simply lacked the fortitude and character to face Wapner down. When confronted with issues relating to or questions about the airport, City Manager Scott Ochoa would defer to Thorpe or either of the two of his predecessors as city manager, Hughes and Devereaux, who were, he said, more directly involved with its management. The police department, under Police Chief Tom Hill, Chief Derek Williams and then Chief Michael Lorenz,

was no more accommodating of those who expressed concern with regard to issues at the airport. Citizens who approached the department with regard to the airport referenced or utilized such terms as "black hole" and "useless" and "unresponsive" in describing the attitude the police department took toward their complaints or allegations. Some expressed the view that members of the department had no stomach to take on Wapner.

Similarly, the district attorney's office was reluctant to engage in any critical examination of Wapner or his associates.

In 2016, 2017 and 2018, Mike Ramos was district attorney. Members of the department's public integrity unit would accept written complaints or listen politely to citizens' reports of what they had witnessed or observed, but made no realistic follow-up. In June 2018, Jason Anderson, who had been a member of the city council while he was a deputy district attorney from 2004 until 2008 and had taken on the representation of Wapner in the aftermath of his assault on his teenage daughter at the expense of Ontario's taxpayers as one of his first major cases when he went into private practice in 2014, was elected San Bernardino County District Attorney, and assumed the post in early January 2019. Anderson, who had moved to Upland subsequent to his time on the city council, nevertheless remained a member of the Ontario social and political establishment. An examination of campaign reporting documents that all elected officials in the state are required to complete twice yearly in non-election years and a minimum of six times during election years, known as California Form 460s, show a degree of commonality among the donors to Wapner and Anderson's respective political war chests. Accordingly, Anderson was reluctant to initiate an investigation, let alone action, against anyone in whose political career an investment had been made by someone who

had likewise invested in advancing him as a key public official.

While suspicion regarding Wapner existed and occasional accusations regarding him surfaced over the course of the first five years that Ontario Airport had been returned to Ontario and while he was the president of the airport authority, the public revelations relating to his efforts to force the sale of the 198 acres of prime airport property to his major campaign donors Sares Regis and Lee & Associates at a fraction of its actual value proved to be a watershed event that caught the attention of anyone tuned into governance in the Inland Empire. Thrown into stark relief was the pay-to-play ethos that gripped the leadership of the airport and that embodied Wapner's status as a public official. Exposed as well was the manner in which Hagman, Bowman, Loveridge and Gouw had gone along with him in their oversight of the airport and the airport authority. Only slightly less blameworthy, in the public perception, were Wapner's council colleagues and the mayor, who had stood by idly while he used the power they had conferred upon him by elevating him into the position of the only president/board chairman there had ever been of the airport authority to militate on behalf of his cronies, campaign donors and political supporters to the detriment of the city, its current residents and taxpayers and those who would live in Ontario in the future. Those residents were equally dismayed with the indolence of the city's top-ranking administrators and department heads, together with its police force, who were the highest paid municipal employees in the entire county, who were unwilling to rock the boat, lest Wapner, his council colleagues and the mayor use their authority to separate them from the city and their lucrative positions.

The revelation of what Wapner had done prompted some of the

*Continued on Page 15*



Public Notices

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVSB2506842

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

JEFFREY BOWENS, individually and as Vice President of SIX INVESTMENTS, LLC, AND SIX INVESTMENTS, LLC and DOES, 1 to 20, inclusive YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): KYLE COOPER and ALISHA COOPER

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below. You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación. Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulano que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede lla-

Public Notices

mar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratis de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desear el caso. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es): San Bernardino Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino Justice Center  
247 West Third Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210

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

ELIZABETH LEON GONZALEZ State Bar #3378430  
Milligan Beswick Levine & Knox, LLP  
447 Ford St Ste 201  
Redlands, CA 92374-6397  
Phone: 909-798-3300  
egonzalez@mbklaw.org  
DATE (Fecha): April 3, 2025  
Clerk (Secretario), by Mariah Mora, Deputy (Adjunto)  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R CIVSB2619481,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner SHALOME SHEKINAH RANDALL filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: SHALOME SHEKINAH RANDALL to ERNESTINE OLIVE NICHOLAS.

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: 09/01/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S33

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: 06/29/2026  
Priscilla Saldana, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court  
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July

Public Notices

10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R CIVSB2619488

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner LIHENG XU filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: LIHENG XU to GARRISON LIHENG XU.

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: 09/04/2026, 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: 07/06/2026  
Aryanna Sheeche, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court  
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260006311  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

C & R CRABBY INC 15200 RANCHERIAS RD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307: C & RCRABBY INC 15200 RANCHERIAS RD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307  
Business Mailing Address: 6808 SVL BX VICTORVILLE, CA 92395

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.

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ CARL EVERSOLE, CEO  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/06/2026

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 K1587

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 July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260005881  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

LEADING EDGE REALTY 1757 S EUCLID ONTARIO, CA 91762: ALL NATIONS REALTY ONTARIO 1757 S. EUCLID ONTARIO, CA 91762

Business Mailing Address: 1757 S EUCLID ONTARIO, CA 91762

The business is conducted by: A

Public Notices

CORPORATION registered with the State of California.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: June 1, 2010.

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ ALEXANDRO ESPINOZA, President

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/24/2026

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 K4616

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260005491  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

CANAS VASQUEZ SERVICES 237 S MUSCOTT ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410: REYNA A VASQUEZ DE CANAS  
Business Mailing Address: 237 S MUSCOTT ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ REYNA A VASQUEZ DE CANAS, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/10/2026

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 K6677

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 July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260006319  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

C R E M ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANING SERVICES 2527 S HOLMES PL ONTARIO, CA 91761: CONCEPCION REYES PEREZ

Business Mailing Address: 2527 S HOLMES PL ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ CONCEPCION REYES PEREZ, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/06/2026

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 K7325

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or com-

Public Notices

mon law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260006357  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

COASTAL HAVEN BIRTH 311 W H STREET ONTARIO, CA 91762: CHRISTINA L KERBY  
Business Mailing Address: 311 W H STREET ONTARIO, CA 91762

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ CHRISTINA L KERBY

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/07/2026

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 July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN20260005935  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

OASIS NOTARY & DOCUMENT SERVICES 1162 E 19TH ST, UNIT 1329 UPLAND, CA 91784: ALEXANDER LEV-DASILVA

Business Mailing Address: 1162 E 19TH ST, UNIT 1329 UPLAND, CA 91784

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ ALEXANDER LEV-DASILVA, Manager

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/25/2026

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 K4616

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 10, 17, 24 & 31, 2026.

FBN 20260005475

The following person is doing business as: DELICIAS PERUANAS DE ISABEL 8755 CELEBRATION ST CHINO CA 91708: MAILING ADDRESS 8755 CELEBRATION ST CHINO CA 91708: COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ISABEL ROJAS

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
s/ ISABEL ROJAS, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/10/2026  
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Ber-

Public Notices

nardino 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 06/19/2026, 06/26/2026, 07/03/2026, 07/10/2026 CN: BB242601MT

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2620226

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

ROBYN JODI PORTER to ROBYN JODI ABRAMS  
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: AUGUST 24, 2026  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Department: S24  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Aryanna Sheeche, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: July 10, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2620549

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner DANIEL JAMES MILES filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

DANIEL JAMES MILES to DANIEL JAMES WAGNER  
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: September 3, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S28  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino District-Civil Division

The address of the court is Superior Court of California,

Public Notices

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Adilene Gutierrez, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: July 15, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2620687

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner KENDALL DARIAN RAND filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

KENDALL DARIAN RAND to KENDALL DARIAN TILLMAN  
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: SEPTEMBER 4, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S35

Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Erika Hernandez, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: July 10, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN20260005784  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

JOVERA PROCLEANING SOLUTIONS 11791 LARINO DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701: MARIA S LESMANA

Business Mailing Address: 11791 LARINO DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: June 22, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ MARIA S LESMANA, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/22/2026

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



Public Notices

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 July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN20260006625  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
NORTH STAR SERVICES  
4020 NEW HAVEN DR ONTARIO, CA 91761: ASHLEY N EVANS  
Business Mailing Address:  
4020 NEW HAVEN DR ONTARIO, CA 91761  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JULY 15, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ ASHLY N EVANS, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/15/2026

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 K7325

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN20260005388  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
KARVANLY 1101 S MILLIKEN AVE STE E #115 ONTARIO, CA 91761: IGNACIO TORRES GONZALEZ  
Business Mailing Address:  
1101 S MILLIKEN AVE STE E #115 ONTARIO, CA 91761  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUNE 8, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ IGNACIO TORRES GONZALEZ, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/08/2026

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 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 July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN20260006686  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
COMFORT INN & SUITES  
3333 SHELBY ST ONTARIO, CA 91764: SHELBY HOSPITALITY, LLC  
640 W LAMBERT RD BREA, CA 92821  
Business Mailing Address:  
640 W LAMBERT RD BREA, CA

Public Notices

92821  
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 1, 2020.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ NISH KHAROD, Managing Member  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/17/2026

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 K4616

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN20260005832  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

MAKING MONEY WITH PAPER 11660 CHURCH STREET, STE. 124F RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: ARTHUR L BONNER, JR  
Business Mailing Address:  
PO BOX 665 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91729

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ ARTHUR L BONNER, JR, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/23/2026

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 K7211

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 July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

FBN 20260002185  
The following person is doing business as: E & G LANDSCAPING SERVICES. 1876 GOULD STREET LOMA LINDA, CA 92354: MAILING ADDRESS 1876 GOULD STREET LOMA LINDA, CA 92354: COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EVERARDO MANZO SANCHEZ  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 13, 2025  
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
s/ EVERARDO MANZO SANCHEZ, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MARCH 16, 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

Public Notices

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 03/27/2026, 04/03/2026, 04/10/2026, 04/17/2026  
CN-BB13202604MT CORRECTION DATES CORRECTION DATES  
05/01/2026, 05/08/2026, 05/15/2026, 05/22/2026 CORRECTION DATES  
06/19/2026, 06/26/2026, 07/03/2026, 07/10/2026

TS NO. 2026-1167 APN NO. 0201-741-53-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE UNDER A NOTICE OF A DELINQUENT ASSESSMENT AND CLAIM OF LIEN

YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A NOTICE OF DELINQUENT ASSESSMENT DATED 11/18/2025. UNLESS YOU TAKE ACTION TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY, IT MAY BE SOLD AT A PUBLIC SALE. IF YOU NEED AN EXPLANATION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER.

Notice is hereby given that on 8/17/2026 at 1 :00 PM, S.B.S. Lien Services As the duly appointed Trustee under and pursuant to Notice of Delinquent Assessment, recorded on 12/4/2025 as Document No. 2025-0297870 Book Page of Official Records in the Office of the Recorder of San Bernardino County, California. The original owner: CHU-JAN CHENG The purported current owner: CHU-JAN CHENG WILL SELL AT PUBLIC AUCTION TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER payable at time of sale in lawful money of the United States, by a cashier's check drawn by a State or national bank, a check drawn by a state of federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, savings association, or savings bank specified in section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state.: NEAR THE FRONT STEPS LEADING UP TO THE CITY OF CHINO CIVIC CENTER, 13220 CENTRAL AVENUE, CHINO, CALIFORNIA 91710 All right, title and interest under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment in the property situated in said County, as more fully described on the above referenced assessment lien. The street address and other common designation, if any of the real property described above is purported to be: 10460 ALTA LOMA DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91737 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address and other common designation, if any, shown herein. Said sale will be made, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum due under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment, with interest thereon, as provided in said notice, advances, if any, estimated fees, charges, and expenses of the Trustee, to-wit: \$15,905.02 accrued interest and additional advances, if any, will increase this figure prior to sale. The claimant, THE ALTA LOMA GARDENS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment heretofore executed and delivered to the undersigned a written Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale, and a written Notice of Default and Election to Sell. The undersigned caused said Notice of Default and Election to Sell to be recorded in the county where the real property is located and more than three months have elapsed since such recordation. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks

Public Notices

involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call FOR SALES INFORMATION, PLEASE CALL (855) 986-9342 or visit this internet web-site www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case 2026-1167. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the internet web-site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. NOTICE TO TENANT: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction if conducted after January 1, 2021, pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call FOR SALES INFORMATION, PLEASE CALL (855) 986-9342, or visit this internet website www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case 2026-1167 to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid, by remitting the funds and affidavit described in Section 2924m(c) of the Civil Code, so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. THE PROPERTY IS BEING SOLD SUBJECT TO THE NINETY DAY RIGHT OF REDEMPTION CONTAINED IN CIVIL CODE SECTION 5715(b).

Date: 7/14/2026 S.B.S. Lien Services 31194 La Baya Drive, Suite 106 Westlake Village, California 91362 Jennifer Kenlck, Executive Vice President Cucamonga on: 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026,

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2609610,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: ,Lori Christine Beard, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Lori Christine Beard to Lori Christine Chronis, 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: 08/31/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: Civil  
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 ? Upland in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.  
Dated: 04/14/2026  
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph Ortiz

Published in the SBCS Upland on 7/24/2026, 7/31/2026, 8/7/2026, 8/14/2026

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVRS2602139

NOTICE TO ANIL ANIL aka ANIL KUMAR, JEEVAN DASS and DOES 1 to 10

(AVISO DEMANDA-DO):

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

SAMANTHA MARQUEZ and ADDISON SAENZ

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

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the Cali-

Public Notices

fornia Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su version. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CAL- ENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entreeque una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulano que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corta que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corta le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conace a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un un abogado, es posible que cumpia con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratu de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendoso en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a recellar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de vaoir recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es):

San Bernardino Superior Court

8303 Haven Ave., Rancho Cucamonga California 91730 Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse  
The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Robert A. Zermeno  
500 N. State College Bl., Ste. 1100  
Orange CA 92868  
Telephone: 855-952-9477  
DATE (Fecha): 03/05/2026  
Clerk (Secretario), by Sabrina Jamison, Deputy  
Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on: 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB2621051

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner SIH WIDI ROMADHONA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

SIH WIDI ROMADHONA to DONNA SIH-

Public Notices

WIDI ROMADHONA 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: AUGUST 31, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S28  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court. Raymond Rojas, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: July 20, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 261048

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner RUBI ESMERALDA CHAIDEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

MIGUEL ANGEL GONZALEZ to MIGUEL ANGEL CHAIDEZ

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: AUGUST 31, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S28  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court. Raymond Rojas, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: July 20, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF



Public Notices

NAME CASE NUMBER  
CIVSB2620687  
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner KENDALL DARIAN RAND filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

KENDALL DARIAN RAND to KENDALL DARIAN TILLMAN 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: SEPTEMBER 4, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S35  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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.

Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Erika Hernandez, Deputy Clerk of the Court  
Dated: July 10, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER  
CIVSB2621414  
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JOSEMIGUEL GONZALEZ GAMINO filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JOSEMIGUEL GONZALEZ GAMINO to JOSEMIGUEL GAMINO 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: SEPTEMBER 11, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: S23  
7th Floor  
Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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

Public Notices

hearing of the petition.  
Joseph T. Ortiz  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Janai Piedra, Deputy Clerk of the Court  
Dated: July 10, 2026  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 17, 24 & 31 and August 7, 2026.

Once trust collapses, power decides the outcome.

FBN20260006379  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
THE BAGEL LAB 4863 S MONARCH PL ONTARIO, CA 91762: FOODIEWORKS LLC 4863 S MONARCH PL ONTARIO, CA 91762  
Business Mailing Address: 4863 S MONARCH PL ONTARIO, CA 91762  
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ MARIANO CHANG, CEO  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/08/2026

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 I4100

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 July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260006137  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
KAR COMPANY 17334 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335: KUNAL VERMA  
Business Mailing Address: 17334 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 1, 2022.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ KUNAL VERMA, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/30/2026

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 K7211  
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 July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260006527  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
VANGUARD PARTITION SPECIALTIES 9431 HAVEN AVE SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: JUAN E LOPEZ SR  
Business Mailing Address: 9431 HAVEN AVE SUITE 100 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious

Public Notices

business name or names listed above on: JUNE 15, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ JUAN E LOPEZ SR, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/13/2026

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 K4616

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260006387  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
CALIFORNIA ADU PROFESSIONAL 7912 CYPRESS AVE FONTANA, CA 92336: RENE SILVA-GONZALEZ  
Business Mailing Address: 7912 CYPRESS AVE FONTANA, CA 92336: RENE SILVA-GONZALEZ  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JULY 8, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ RENE SILVA-GONZALEZ, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/08/2026

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 J3256  
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260004636  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
MY HEART WERXS 1752 E. LUGONIA AVE. 117 #228 REDLANDS, CA 92374: CHARLEY J DUNCAN  
Business Mailing Address: 1752 E. LUGONIA AVE. 117 #228 REDLANDS, CA 92374  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name listed above on: May 13, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ CHARLEY J DUNCAN, Owner  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/18/2026

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 K3379

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 June 26 and July 3,

Public Notices

10 & 17, 2026  
FBN 20260005958  
The following person is doing business as: WRIGHT MOUNTAIN METAL WORKS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371:[ MAILING ADDRESS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371]: COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TIMOTHY M MACDONALD  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOV 03, 2009  
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
s/ TIMOTHY M MACDONALD, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/25/2026  
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 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 07/03/2026, 07/10/2026, 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026 CNBB27202601MT

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

Estate of Patricia Ann Duchay Case NO. PROVA2600518

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Estate of Patricia Ann Duchay A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Cherie D. Evans in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that 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., Cherie D. Evans be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. F1 at 09:00 AM on 08/19/2026 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California,

County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana Division

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you

Public Notices

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.

Diane E. Robbins:  
201 West F Street Ontario CA 91762  
Telephone No: (909) 391-9000  
Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on: 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

HENRY MARQUES JR Case NO. PROVA2600542

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that 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., Ricky Marques 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. F2 at 09:00 AM on 08/31/2026 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana

Public Notices

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

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

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

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

Soon O Kim:  
12600 Brookhurst St #102 Garden Grove CA 92840  
Telephone No: 323-810-6633  
Published in the SBCS Rancho Cucamonga on: 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026

FBN20260006208  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
TRUSTWORTHY TRANSPORTATION SERVICES 1748 W SUMMIT AVE RIALTO, CA 92377: CLAUDE O NUGENT

Business Mailing Address: 1748 W SUMMIT AVE RIALTO, CA 92377  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name listed above on: JUNE 1, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ CLAUDE O NUGENT, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/30/2026

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 July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260005290  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
CONVERSATIONS WITH THEA, LLC 13062 LOIRE VALLEY DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739: CONVERSATIONS WITH THEA, LLC 13062 LOIRE VALLEY DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739  
Business Mailing Address: 13062 LOIRE VALLEY DRIVE

Public Notices

RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number B20260230557.

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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ LA-THEA SONYA DAVIS, Managing Member

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/04/2026

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 K7211

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 June 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2026. Corrected on July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260005652  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
CH-BRIDGE FUTURE FUND 9229 UTICA AVE STE 140 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: EXPRESS WORKFORCE FOUNDATION 9229 UTICA AVE, SUITE 140 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730  
Business Mailing Address: 9229 UTICA AVE STE 140 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 name listed above on: MAY 10, 2020.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ THERESA JONES ZAROUR, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/15/2026

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 July 24 & 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

FBN20260006907  
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as  
RIZO TECH REFRIGERATION 6327 OPAL ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701: SALVADOR RIZO  
Business Mailing Address: 6327 OPAL ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: January 1, 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 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
/s/ SALVADOR RIZO, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/24/2026















## Wapner Has Proven To Be The Most Prolific Fundraiser Among Local SBC Politicians In County History *from page 8*

minute number of people who had already sought to push the authorities into taking action but who had come up short in doing so to redouble their efforts. A slightly larger subset of the local population, ones who had also been disturbed by what they had seen but had not been moved to action previously, were motivated to speak out and register their disapproval and outrage. As before, neither the police nor the mayor nor the city council nor city officials were willing to challenge Wapner or hold him to account. Wapner's attempt to advance the fortunes of a set of his donors who had given him \$218,000 – the corporate officers of Lee & Associates and Sares Regis – and in essence provide them with a gift of public funds valued in excess of \$300 million had roused dozens of Ontario residents to take a deeper and harder look at Wapner and the way in which he had conducted himself as an elected public official over the course of his quarter of a century in office. Few were pleased with what they discovered. That examination demonstrating that Wapner's first loyalty was not to the voters who had put him into office but rather to those with business and economic interests who were highly dependent upon action by the city council and who were willing to outright pay money to Wapner to get into or remain in his good grace. Those who had business with the city, from those who were seeking franchises to those who were competing to get municipal contracts for the provision of goods or services to those who were seeking permits doled out at City Hall to landowners, speculators and developers seeking entitlements to build or to obtain approval of projects, were obliged to make donations to his campaign fund. Whereas with the lion's share of local politicians in San Bernardino

County donations generally top out at a thousand dollars and run-of-the-mill donors average a show of generosity toward the candidates they support of \$500 or less, among the legion of Wapner's donors, an offering of \$1,000 is barely chump change. He routinely collects donations \$2,000, \$5,000, \$10,000 and on occasion \$20,000 and was once provided with \$30,000 from a single donor in one go.

In the 32 years since he first ran for city council in 1994, Wapner has taken in at least \$3,875,936 in campaign donations, not counting money he raised for his unsuccessful 2004 run for the California Assembly, making him the most prolific fundraiser among elected municipal officeholders in San Bernardino County history. In achieving that distinction, Wapner has continuously skirted the law, which prohibits an officeholder from promising any specific action in exchange for the donation being provided. Wapner decades ago perfected asking for money in support of his candidacy without making any explicit commitment, yet doing so in a way that suggested to the individual being approached that it would be best for the potential donor and his business interest[s] if the request were not turned down. That Ontario had descended into an undeniable pay-to-play environment was evinced by a comparison of those entities which have Ontario city contracts, hold franchises granted by the City of Ontario through a vote of the city council and those developers, builders or contractors on projects built in the city going back three decades to the roster of donors to Wapner's political campaigns in the same timeframe, which demonstrates that there is virtually no one concluding business successfully at Ontario City Hall who does not pay literal financial tribute to Wapner.

A law school graduate, Wapner's approach in this regard pivoted on his interpretation of a critical element of the California Political Reform Act of

1974, embodied in California Government Code § 84308. As originally written, Government Code § 84308 prohibited appointed officials in California from accepting \$250 or more from a donor and then voting on any matter impacting that donor financially or otherwise. While California Government Code § 84308 was applicable to votes or decisions made or action taken by any appointed officials, such as members of a planning commission or civilian appointees to a governmental committee/subcommittee who had run for political office and received money from campaign donors and to elected officials when they were voting as a member of a joint powers authority board of directors or a member of an adjunct committee or commission to which they were appointed, it did not apply to votes made by elected officials when they were acting in their elected capacity, such as a member of the city council or county board of supervisors. In 2022, pursuant to Senate Bill 1429, the California Legislature altered the form of California Government Code § 84308, making it applicable to both appointed and elected officials while upping the donation threshold from \$250 to \$500 for one year prior to, and one year after, receiving the money from an entity impacted by the vote. From the time of his election in 1994 until Senate Bill 1429 went into effect on January 1, 2023, Wapner, as all elected municipal, county and local agency officials in the state, functioned under the original language of Government Code § 84308, which Wapner interpreted along with most other politicians and officials in the state as allowing him to take money from donors and vote with regard to project proposals or contract applications they had with the city. As the vast majority of votes that Wapner made during that timeframe, at least for the first 18 years following his 1994 election to the city council were ones made in his capacity as an elected city council

member, these did not represent any legal issue.

What was more problematic for Wapner was his function in those posts that had been conferred upon him as a secondary consequence of his being a member of the city council. Mayors and council members with nearly all of California's 482 cities and incorporated towns as well as members of the state's 58 boards of supervisors participate in adjunct governmental capacities as representatives of their town, city or county on panels or boards that oversee joint powers authorities in which multiple cities and agencies and the counties in which they are located take on issues of mutual concern or regional boards that oversee the management of operations that span multiple cities or even counties. In San Bernardino County and Southern California, such adjunct governmental roles that Wapner participated in included the Southern California Association of Governments, a regional planning agency that involved the cities of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties; San Bernardino County's transportation agency involving all 22 of the county's cities, its two incorporated towns and the county itself, which was originally referred to as San Bernardino Associated Governments or the acronym SANBAG and then was rechristened the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority or SBCTA; Omnitrans, the agency devoted to overseeing the San Bernardino Valley's public transportation system; the Southern California Regional Rail Authority; the San Bernardino County Council of Governments and the Metro Foothill Gold Line Extension Construction Authority. All of those entities predated the creation of the Ontario International Airport Authority. Several of them involved contractors or service providers or vendors or development companies which at one time or another had made political contributions to Wapner.

Despite that, there was little in the way of scrutiny with regard to the specific issue involved in California Government Code § 84308 – i.e., a board member of an adjunct governmental entity voting on a matter involving a donor – and all such matters flew under the applicable regulatory and prosecutorial radar.

The way in which such regulations were ignored with regard to these regional governmental entities provided a larger context within which there would be an avoidance of scrutiny within Wapner's primary jurisdiction of operation – Ontario. The pay-to-play ethos was so engrained in him and those around him that it was not accurate to say officials were ignoring it. In actuality, it was such an intrinsic element of how Wapner and those around him functioned that they did not even know it was there.

There were a few exceptions that proved the rule. One of those exceptions would have an extraordinary, even paradoxical, indeed absurd conclusion, one that illustrates how thoroughly the pay-to-play principle had come to inhabit the Ontario International Airport Authority. In 2018, the firm that served as the general counsel to the airport authority – Gatzke Dillon & Ballance – stated in a memo that members of the airport board who received donations from any entity of \$250 or more should not, pursuant to Government Code § 84308, vote on any matter impacting that donor. The memo was further memorialized in an informational item that was put on the agenda for the airport commission's then-upcoming meeting, one that might simply be accepted or subject to a brief discussion. Wapner, however, in reviewing the meeting agenda after it had been tentatively drafted and just before it was finalized and posted, took stock of the memo. He instructed the airport authority staff to remove the item from the agenda and that the memo not be distributed to the board. This illustrates that Wap-

ner, at least as early as 2018, if not prior to that, recognized that he was in violation of the law when he voted, as a member of the airport commission, to approve contracts or other arrangements with companies that had donated money to his campaign fund or the owners of and principals in those companies that had backed him with money to run his campaigns. A footnote to this is that on March 1, 2022, Gatzke Dillon & Ballance donated \$5,000 to Wapner's reelection campaign. On December 31, 2025, Gatzke Dillon & Ballance provided Wapner with another \$5,000. This was a testament that Wapner ruled the roost, and that what was taking place at Ontario International Airport was a game that was being played by his rules, rather than society's. The law firm that was in place to make sure that Wapner and the others on the board played by society's rules dispensed with those rules and social convention as soon as it was understood by all involved that if it abided those rules, it would very soon no longer be the law firm employed to advise and represent the airport authority.

Though city officials, county officials, prosecutorial authorities and regulatory authorities were not focused upon whether the rules were being adhered to or enforcing the rules once it was recognized they were being disobeyed, as is often the case, it was outsiders who took the lead in trying to redress the situation. It was soon recognized that no one at the city, neither Leon and the remainder of the council nor City Manager Ochoa nor the police chief was going to stand up to Wapner, Hagman, Bowman, Loveridge and Gouw. The next move was to go to the district attorney's office. It was soon recognized that Anderson had not handed out get-out-of-jail-free cards to the airport authority board members but rather never-get-arrested-or-prosecuted cards.

Anderson's stance  
*Continued on Page 16*



## FBI Got Little Traction In Ontario Airport Probe At First from page 8

was baffling. There were approaching two dozen examples of Wapner having violated Government Code § 84308 alone. In the cases of Hagman and Bowman, they had not violated Government Code § 84308 as frequently as Wapner, but had violated it nonetheless, unequivocally, and those violations had been documented with the provision of documents originating with the treasurers to their respective political campaigns which had been filed and validated, in the case of Wapner and Bowman, by the Ontario City Clerk's Office and in Hagman's case, the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voter's Office. The documentation, which illustrated an open-and-shut case against all three, softened no soap with the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office, which refused to budge. Without an explanation or providing a reason, the prosecutor's office took no action against Wapner, Hagman or Bowman.

After that avenue was exhausted by several Ontario residents and at least one city employee/former city employee, most working independently of one another, several persisted, going to what some, at least, calculated was their next best option, that being federal authorities.

The U.S. Attorney's Office and the FBI, truly, did not know what to make of the handful of reports floating in. Agents consulted the files relating to the airport and the airport authority going back to the mid-2010s, which offered only a single matter of substance, pertaining to an environmental issue relating to the migration of TCE, trichloroethylene, a solvent used in aviation contexts, which had permeated through the airport's tarmac and seeped into the water table beneath it, manifesting in a toxic plume migrating into the Chino Water Basin. That matter had been handed off to

the Environmental Protection Agency for some order of resolution. There had been some civil liability potential on the part of the manufacturer of the TCE, the aviation maintenance companies that used it and the airport itself, but unless some evidence of willful or indifferent negligence emerged, there was no realistic criminal case, and for that reason the EPA was handling the matter. A standard otherwise would have led to the nation's prisons being full to bursting with the leadership and management of every public and private airport in the country. There was indication, as well, that Wapner and Hagman had made at some points frequent but overall irregular flights to the Far East, which was not unheard of, particularly given their status, in Wapner's case, as a city councilman and the leader of the airport authority, and, in Hagman's, the chairman of the county board of supervisors and a board member of the airport authority. The airport authority at that point was courting airlines from around the globe, which made travel on the part of the airport authority's two highest-ranking officials both logical and justifiable. The complaints that had been lodged had also made reference to their prodigious political fundraising on their own behalves, which was certainly accurate. Still, politicians are raising money for their campaigns constantly, and given the success both Wapner and Hagman had experienced over an extended period, their fundraising efforts were in keeping with their station as public officials. In the context of city and county politicians, the amount of money deposited into their campaign accounts surpassed that of their rivals by multiple factors. In comparison to politicians involved in federal politics, such as Congress members, the money collected by Wapner and Hagman was not out of the ordinary. In comparison to the other matters being considered by the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Central Dis-

trict of California and the local FBI, the ill-defined issues at the basis of the complaints centering on the circumstance at Ontario International Airport were assigned a relatively low priority, with FBI agents devoting little more time to the matter than reading over the incoming complaints.

For months on end, and then for well over a year, the initial FBI investigation, touched off by no more than a half dozen citizen complaints, gained no traction.

It was, in retrospect and in terms of monetary scale, a seemingly insignificant event that triggered the more intensive scrutiny of Wapner and Hagman by the FBI that now looms so large in the public's attention.

In the midst of the 2022 election season, on August 1 of that year, Alan Wong, the station manager with China Airlines at Ontario International Airport, made a \$500 donation to Wapner's reelection campaign. The money Wong tossed in appears to have been offered up during a fundraising event held that day, as simultaneously on that same date, Wapner received \$500 each from six other donors, \$250 each from 11 donors, \$200 from a single donor, \$1,000 each from six donors, \$2,500 each from four donors, \$5,000 each from three donors and \$10,000 from a single donor. In the week, i.e., seven days, before August 1, 2022, Wapner had received two donations, one of \$2,500 and another of \$15,000. In the week after August 1, 2022, Wapner received one donation of \$500, two donations of \$1,000 each, one donation of \$2,500, two donations of \$3,000 each and three donations of \$5,000 each. Thus, on balance, at least from the common man's perspective, the \$500 from Wong was not terribly impressive or significant and didn't stand out. More than any of the others, however, it caught the attention, the full attention, of the FBI.

Under federal law, an American politician cannot legally accept campaign contributions from a foreign national — any-

one who is not a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident — in connection with any federal, state, or local election.

The Federal Election Campaign Act and related regulations prohibit candidates, political committees, and parties from soliciting, accepting, or receiving contributions from foreign individuals or entities for any U.S. election.

The FBI agents assigned to looking into the goings-on at Ontario International Airport did not immediately discover Wong's donation to Wapner. But when they did, several months after the fact, it had a resounding impact. It appeared that Wapner, who had been accepting money hand over fist to propel his political career for a generation without any detriment, and indeed, on the contrary, to great benefit, had at long last outsmarted himself by breaking the law, not state law which a friendly district attorney who had once been his lawyer was not going to enforce against him but federal law, a felony, in fact. It was as if, for a microsecond, the universe had stopped.

After that microsecond pause, all of existence picked up again. Things had changed. From that point forward, the FBI agents assigned to the case were no longer just going through the motions. They were no longer half-listening or one third-listening or one quarter-listening to what the residents of Ontario had been telling them. They were from then on considering the full implication of what they were being told. They went back to canvass once more the ground they had already covered, but this time considering what lay before them as embodying something, or maybe some things, which they had previously missed.

They kept their eyes peeled. It wasn't any great challenge to move to what was for many the most logical jumping off place: the episode involving Lee & Associates' and Sares Regis's designs on the 198 acres due east from the airport runway. All the elements of graft

were there.

Hagestad, Rooney, Lukanish, Coatsworth, Russell, Ciavarella, Thor-mahlen, McKay, Wolfe and Plowman provided Wapner with \$219,040.07 for his political war chest and Wapner, with the support of Hagman, Bowman, Loveridge and Gouw, were on a trajectory to sell property worth somewhere in the neighborhood of \$450 million to \$475 million to Lee & Associates and Sares Regis for \$101 million. It was a classic quid pro, a bribe to a public official to compromise his duty to those he represented as part of the democratic process to the detriment of the public at large to benefit those who are paying him off. That is what would have occurred, had Thorpe not resolved to resist Wapner and if the USAA Real Estate Company and McDonald Property Group had not coalesced into the CanAm Ontario partnership to lease the 198 acres over the course of 55 years for \$625 million. An examination of what Wapner had tried to pull off with Lee & Associates and Sares Regis allowed the FBI to draw back the curtain to expose the actual pageant ongoing in Ontario: Wapner masquerading as the savior of Ontario so he could liberate the airport from the foul clutches of Los Angeles when in actuality his intention all along had been to loot the place seven ways from Sunday, doing so in the guise of of a pillar of the community, one whom the other pillars held in high esteem as an honorable and dedicated public official, someone who was too respectable to be distrusted, whose word was given automatic credence and whose critics were systematically disregarded.

All that was fading away like the mirage it was.

Everything about the operation at Ontario International Airport was subject to scrutiny.

A giveaway that something was amiss was that Thorpe was not recognized for what he had accomplished with the CanAm Ontario lease but, like Fredericks before

him, forced out, replaced with the Atif Elkadi. That promotion did not stand up to scrutiny. Elkadi had been hired in 2017, as the senior director of marketing largely at the direction of Wapner. Elkadi's qualifications for the post, those questioned said, consisted primarily of Elkadi being, like Wapner, a USC graduate who was fiercely loyal to Wapner. The following year, Elkadi was promoted to the position of the airport's chief commercial officer/deputy executive director to manage strategic communications, public relations, and branding at a salary of \$275,307 with benefits and perquisites of \$97,614 for a total annual compensation of \$373,921. Elkadi had originally been brought in as director of marketing despite the airport authority having simultaneously retained Steve Lambert as a consultant being paid \$240,000 yearly to "oversee public affairs, strategic communications, creative marketing services, media relations, branding, crisis management and policy advocacy." In March of 2022, Elkadi was put in charge of the airport without having any substantive experience relating to the aviation-related elements of running an airport.

The FBI's examination extended to the airport board's tendency toward expensive redundancy in the airport's secondary and tertiary areas of function such as public affairs, media relations, marketing and branding, while important posts relating to critical elements of the airport's operations were staffed with inexperienced individuals whose primary value to the board was their willingness to execute the strategies that were being dictated to them by Wapner and, to a lesser extent, Hagman. A recurrent pattern was noted in which contracts, primarily no-bid contracts, were prepared by airport staff for ratification in a straight up-or-down vote of the airport commission, and the remarkable degree to which the providers of those contract-

*Continued on Page 17*



Sentences In Child’s Death *from page 5*

Based, apparently, on that post and its reference to burns on Garver’s daughter, the San Bernardino County Department of Children and Family Services carried out a child welfare check. When the presence of blisters was confirmed, Garver said they had come about when the baby somehow wedged herself between

a wall and a heater. Further inspection of the home found very unsanitary conditions at the home, including fecal matter smeared in the children’s bedroom and a cockroach infestation. The child was hospitalized and Garver was cited for felony child neglect, felony willful cruelty resulting in injury and leading potentially to death. After a go-round in court, those charges

were dismissed, pursuant to Garver’s plea to misdemeanor cruelty to a child. She was given a 100-day sentence to be served in county jail, with the court giving her until July 2013 to make arrangements for the care of her children so she could begin serving her sentence. She did not report to jail that July and was listed as a fugitive from justice. No concerted effort to bring her into custody was

made, however. Despite Garver not having served her sentence, when the sheriff’s department and Children and Family Services Department personnel were called to her home on multiple occasions in the following years, she was not arrested and it is not clear what measures were taken to ensure her children’s safety. After Henry’s birth, a report about Garver’s poor parenting skills

was again made to the Department of Children and Family Services, apparently by Sierra Rivers, Henry’s grandmother. Children and Family Services sent an investigator to Garver’s premises on August 19, 2022. The investigator lodged a report that paradoxically made a finding that while the children were “safe” and “No safety threats are present,” they were at “high risk” of abuse and neglect.

Garver was convicted and sentenced to 14 years in state prison for voluntary manslaughter and child abuse causing great bodily injury. Mena pled guilty to second-degree murder and child abuse causing great bodily injury. He received a prison term of 21 years to life. The case was prosecuted by the district attorney’s Family Violence Unit. -Mark Gutglueck

Government Code § 84308 Violations Repeatedly Surfaced During The Investigation *from page 8*

ed-for goods or services were donors, and usually substantial donors, to Wapner’s campaign fund.

A grand picture of graft at the airport was emerging. Within that mosaic of pay-to-play politics whereby the likes of Wapner and Hagman and even Bowman were shaking down those making money at the airport for campaign contributions, on that same huge canvas were smaller scenes of simultaneously ongoing grifts in which, from time-to-time, Wapner or Hagman were themselves being shaken down, or so it seemed, by those who were in a position to force their advantage.

In the summer of 2017, Devereaux, Hughes and Lambert were given \$240,000-per year consultancies. A little less than five months later, Haney was given a consultancy on exactly the same terms. Like clockwork ever since, each month the airport authority commissioners/board of directors approves \$20,000 payments to each of those four on an automatic basis. Those payments, twelve times a year, have continued every year – through-out 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025 and the first seven months of 2026, right up to the present. None of the consultants has ever been required to provide a description/inventory of the services rendered in exchange for those payments. Inquiries submit-

ted to the airport authority in an effort to obtain such inventories submitted in conjunction with the invoices submitted by Devereaux, Hughes, Lambert and Haney were met by the airport authority’s response that no such documentation in response to that request were available in the agency’s files.

During his tenure as Ontario city manager and chief executive officer with San Bernardino County, Devereaux never tolerated a situation in which a consultant to either of those government agencies or any of their departments was paid without there being a strict accounting of what services were provided and the amount of time in hours and fractions thereof were devoted to the relevant tasks involved.

Under normal circumstances, consulting contracts run for a set period and are discontinued. Of note, there is no sunset built into the consulting contracts Devereaux and his company, Worthington Partners, LLC, Hughes and his company, Woodlawn Consulting, LLC, Lambert and his company, the 20/20 Network, and Haney and his company, Paul A Haney & Associates LLC have with the airport authority. Both Devereaux, who was Ontario city manager for approaching 13 years while Wapner was a member of the city council, and Hughes, who was Ontario city manager for three years while Wapner was on the city council in the immediate aftermath of Devereaux’s departure, in the words of Steve Rogers, who was formerly employed as a

civil engineer in Ontario’s public works department, “know where Alan Wapner buried maybe not all but some of the bodies.” Lambert’s presence at the airport as a consultant over the years, given that strategic communications, public relations, and branding, as it were, were handled by Elkadi during the first four years of his consulting contract and by Elkadi’s successors as deputy executive director in the years since, appears to be based on his ability, as the one-time publisher and editor of the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, to keep information unflattering, embarrassing or downright damaging to the airport, the airport authority, the airport authority’s board of directors and both Wapner and Hagman, in particular, out of the press. The exact nature of Haney’s function as a consultant to the airport authority is equally baffling. While his previous experience as an executive with American Airlines and the Lockheed Corporation along with his function as one of the deputy executive directors with Los Angeles World Airports would appear to justify having him in place to provide the board and the airport administration with advice, that is not how Haney is being utilized at the airport, as he has no ostensible involvement whatsoever in those aspects of the airport’s operation about which he has the greatest expertise. Staff members at the airport, when pressed to do so in 2024, could not cite a single accomplishment that might have been attributed to him, despite what was then

his more than six-and-one-half year association with the facility. Though virtually everyone knew who he was, referring to him variously as Wapner’s “friend...” or “associate...” or “travel companion...” no one seemed to know what he did, and is was commonly said that he was present at the airport on only the rarest of occasions. It was Haney’s accompaniment of Wapner on his flights out of the country and the assistance he was rendering the airport commission president in his activity in those contexts that some suggested represented Haney’s true value to the collection of politicians, their backers and the select set of administrators that had been handpicked by Wapner to run the airport.

In this way, the FBI agents assigned to the matter at Ontario International Airport found themselves inexorably driven to the same conclusion that a handful of Ontario residents had reached: Devereaux, Hughes, Lambert and Haney were, in not so many words but still essentially, blackmailing Wapner. They had too much damning information about him and the way he had been conducting business, both at the airport and at the city, for him to terminate their consultancies with the airport authority.

Another aspect of the consulting contracts had relevance to the issues being explored by federal authorities. While Hughes had for the most part steered clear of participating as a donor to political campaigns, at least local ones, altogether, that was not the case

with Devereaux, Lambert and Haney.

In 2022, Devereaux donated \$2,500 to Hagman’s supervisorial reelection campaign.

In 2022, Lambert donated \$1,000 to Wapner’s political war chest. In 2023, Lambert contributed another \$1,000 to Wapner’s electioneering fund.

Over the years, Haney had demonstrated himself to be the most generous of the four consultants in his support of the airport authority’s board members’ reelection efforts.

Haney has been an associate with the firm of Englander Knabe & Allen since he left Los Angeles World Airports in 2008. Englander, Knabe & Allen did consulting work for the City of Ontario and subsequently the Ontario International Airport Authority as part of Ontario’s effort to reassume ownership of Ontario Airport from Los Angeles. Englander, Knabe & Allen contributed \$1,000 to Wapner’s electioneering fund on February 23, 2012; another \$1,000 on April 1, 2013; another \$1,000 on June 12, 2014; and another \$1,000 on February 24, 2015. In addition, Englander Knabe & Allen contributed \$1,000 to Jim Bowman’s campaign fund on November 28, 2013. Paul Harvey contributed \$1,000 to Wapner on June 18, 2014; another \$1,000 on February 15, 2016; another \$1,000 on January 27, 2017; another \$1,000 on March 5, 2018; another \$1,000 on February 7, 2020; another \$1,000 on January 25, 2021; another \$1,000 on March 1, 2022; and \$2,000 on December

19, 2022. Susan Haney, Paul Haney’s wife, gave Wapner \$1,000 on July 18, 2022. Paul Haney also provided \$1,000 to Bowman on March 30, 2018.

As a consequence of the money flowing from Haney, Devereaux and Lambert to Wapner, Hagman and Bowman, accusations of graft have been vectored at the three members of the airport commission, extending to assertions that the three consultants were kicking back to the three airport commissioners in the form of political contributions. It is in this context that Government Code 84308 has relevance. Of some import is that when Wapner in 2017 insisted upon Haney being given a consulting contract with the airport authority, when the vote to do so was made in December 2017, Wapner recused himself from the original approval of that contract. Bowman, however, did not. In the monthly votes made thereafter by the airport authority board to approve the \$20,000 installments to Haney on the consulting contract, Wapner has participated, as have Hagman and Bowman.

Given Haney’s donations to Wapner and Bowman, both Wapner and Bowman were prohibited, under Government Code 84308, from approving payments to Haney. Lambert’s donations to Wapner on August 1, 2022 and June 8, 2023 should have prohibited Wapner from voting to approve payments to Lambert and the 20/20 Network thereafter. Devereaux’s donations to Hagman during the 2022

*Continued on Page 18*



## California Government Code § 84308 Has Parallels In Federal Law from page 17

election season should have prohibited him from voting to approve the consulting contract payments to Devereaux and Worthington Partners thereafter.

California Government Code 84308 is a state rather than federal statute. It is relevant, nonetheless, to the FBI's investigation into Ontario International Airport and the Ontario International Airport Authority because the activity it touches on is likewise prohibited under federal law.

The quid pro quo element inherent in California Government Code 84308, which is intended to prevent a government official from taking money from an individual with a financial interest in a decision that official is to make in his official capacity, has a parallel in federal law. A federal prosecution of a New York state senator earlier this decade illustrates this principle, and a court decision that gave prosecutors a green light to proceed against that state senator appears to be the guiding standard which was used by the FBI in pursuing the investigation into Wapner's and Hagman's activities.

The United States v. Benjamin, federal bribery and corruption case involved Brian Benjamin, who was a New York state senator from 2017 until 2021, and later lieutenant governor, who was indicted in 2022 on multiple federal bribery and corruption charges. According to the indictment, Benjamin allegedly agreed to allocate \$50,000 in state funds to a nonprofit controlled by real estate developer, Gerald Migdol, in his district. In exchange, according to the indictment, Migdol provided donations to Benjamin's political campaigns. Benjamin, in accepting those donations, attempted to conceal the arrangement by falsifying his campaign contribution forms to misrepresent from where the dona-

tion originated and then provided false information during a background check when nominated for lieutenant governor. The government alleged Benjamin used his official authority to secure the grant in return for political donations, constituting federal funds bribery, honest services wire fraud, and related offenses. The charges against Benjamin contained in the April 2022 indictment included conspiracy to commit bribery and honest services wire fraud (18 U.S.C. § 371); soliciting bribes (18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B)); honest services wire fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1346); and two counts of falsifying records (18 U.S.C. § 1519).

Before trial, Benjamin moved to dismiss the bribery charges, arguing the indictment failed to allege an explicit quid pro quo – a direct exchange between the official and the donor discussing the trade of action for money – as is required under federal bribery law. The Court for the Southern District of New York dismissed counts One, Two, and Three – the bribery, conspiracy, and related wire fraud charges – on that ground. The U.S. Attorney's Office appealed that ruling to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which reversed the lower court, holding that an explicit quid pro quo does not need to be stated in words and that it can be inferred from the official's and donor's statements with regard to the ultimate action taken and the actions. The court found the indictment sufficiently alleged that Benjamin obtained campaign contributions in exchange for using his official authority to secure a state grant, thus satisfying the quid pro quo requirement.

The standard set in the Benjamin case, while operative in the Second Circuit, meaning the District of Connecticut, the Eastern District of New York, the Northern District of New York, the Southern District of New York, the Western District of New York and the District of Vermont, would not necessarily be applicable outside the Second Cir-

cuit, including the Ninth Circuit, which includes California. However, Benjamin's defense team sought to have the U.S. Supreme Court take the matter up, which resulted in the Supreme Court denying certiorari, or review, of the case, letting the Second Circuit's ruling stand. This is taken as an indication that the standard of interpreting an elected official's action in favor of a donor constituting a bribe even if an explicit quid pro quo was not expressed is in effect throughout the rest of the country, including the Central District of California.

With that standard in mind, the FBI delved further into the matter relating to Ontario Airport and the Ontario International Airport Authority, unearthing further indications that, like Brian Benjamin on the other side of the continent, Alan Wapner and Curt Hagman, had involved themselves in what the U.S. Attorney's Office characterized as bribery, conspiracy, and fraud.

It appears that at some point within the last two to three years, Wapner, Hagman, Devereaux and Haney became acutely conscious of the prohibitions in California Government Code 84308 which prevent Wapner, Hagman and Bowman from accepting political contributions from Devereaux and Haney and then voting to approve payments to them through the Ontario International Airport Authority. There ensued an effort to launder those contributions or in some fashion prevent the source of that money from being identified. To do that, Wapner and Hagman employed Robert Rego, whom Hagman had deposed as San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee Chairman in 2013, but with whom he had remained on amicable terms.

Rego at present is the treasurer of the California Parents Association, a political action committee which is run out of Rego's financial services company's office in Suite 207 at 22365 Barton Road in Grand

Terrace. Available documentation shows that on January 14, 2025, Paul Haney gave the California Parents Association \$1,000 and that on February 21, 2025 Paul Haney followed that up with a donation of \$1,250 to the California Parents Association. On November 13, 2025, Paul A Haney & Associates gave the California Parents Association \$2,000, and on February 10, 2026, Paul Haney gave the California Parents Association another \$2,000. On February 21, 2025, Haney's wife, Susan Haney, gave the California Parents Association PAC \$1,250.

On May 4, 2026, Devereaux provided \$10,000 to the California Parents Association.

Documentation shows that on June 30, 2025, the California Parents Association conveyed \$9,000 to the Wapner for Council District 3 2026 campaign fund. The following day, on July 1, 2025, the California Parents Association PAC provided the Wapner for Council District 3 2026 campaign fund with another \$2,050. Two weeks later, on July 15, 2025, the California Parents Association provided Wapner's reelection fund with \$5,000. One month and one day after that, on August 16, 2025, the California Parents Association conferred another \$20,000 on the Wapner for Council District 3 2026 campaign fund. On December 23, 2025, the California Parents Association PAC gave Wapner \$30,000, conveying it not to his council reelection fund but rather to his Alan Wapner for Mayor account. On June 30, 2026, the California Parents Association PAC provided the Alan Wapner for Mayor campaign fund with \$8,500.

On November 11, 2025 the California Parents Association PAC gave Hagman's supervisorial reelection campaign \$1,000. On April 23, 2026, the California Parents Association provided Hagman's campaign with \$1,000.

The utilization of the California Parents Association to hide Devereaux and the Haney's as the source of the \$17,500 of

the \$76,550 provided to the Wapner and Hagman campaigns during the 2026 election cycle constituted a conspiracy, fraud and the falsification of campaign reporting documents, as well as bribery, according to the FBI's theory of the criminal acts relating to the Ontario International Airport Authority Board of Commissioners' votes to approve payment to Devereaux and Haney over the last 18 months, crimes virtually indistinguishable from what Benjamin was charged with in New York in 2022.

The focus on quid pro quos involving Wapner and Haney reflected in donations to their respective political funds and the circumstance involving Alan Wong's August 2022 donation to Wapner led the FBI to scrutinize in depth donations made to Wapner and Hagman across the board going back for four years. In the course of that examination, as investigators paged through Hagman's California Form 460s, a slew of donations stood out as having potentially come from foreign citizens.

Among these were \$1,000 each from Yin Tai Designs LLC, Zhiming Zou, James Xu, Wei Tao Sheng, Jerry Qui Tangshan, Weiyan Hu, Haiping Chen, Yaping Wang and Zhen Zhong Cao. In addition, Zhi Ping Wen of Heng Tong Investments provided Hagman with \$2,000. Investigators' attention was seized, as well, by three donations made to Hagman on the same day, March 8, 2022, by Tangshan Qui for \$3,000, Yin Qian for \$2,550 and Li Wang for \$4,900. Less than a month later, Hagman on a single day, March 31, 2022, received three donations totaling more money than that from questionable sources. One of those was for \$4,900 and came from Chen Feng, the CEO of Sun Yin USA Inc. That was accompanied by \$4,500 from Li Ming Dai, another Sun Yin USA employee. The same day, March 31, 2022, Feng Xu endowed Hagman's campaign with \$4,900.

Investigators would

further note that on September 17, 2012, James Su, the president of EDI Media, Inc., donated \$1,000 to Hagman's supervisorial reelection campaign and that on April 11, 2022, Hagman received \$1,000 from Bun Chan, who was described in the California 460 document reporting the donation as a media worker with the "EDI Group." More than three years and two months later, on July 30, 2025, Sammi Su, identified as an "events manager" with EDI Media, Inc., provided Hagman with \$1,000. Earlier this year, on March 19, 2026, James Su, characterized in the Form 460 filed by Hagman's campaign treasurer Lysa Ray on April 23, 2026 as the "owner" of EDI Media, gave Hagman \$2,500.

James Su, born in Shanghai in 1970, has lived in the United States for more than 30 years, but has maintained ties to the People's Republic of China. He is the California-based manager of the West Coast arm of Guoguang Century Media, which consists of 34 radio stations in 14 countries. Guoguang Century Media is backed and funded by China Radio International, the state-owned international radio broadcasting network of the People's Republic of China. Guoguang Century Media is dedicated to producing content aligned with Beijing's interests, both domestically and internationally. In 1993, using funding provided to him by the Chinese government through Guoguang Century Media, Su founded EDI Media, Inc., which is now affiliated with G&E Studio Inc. and CiTi News, a company of which Su is the president that includes multiple TV stations, radio stations, magazines, and newspapers. In 2005, Su, as chairman, founded the Chinese America Film Festival, which is intended to enhance cultural exchange between the U.S. and China. In 2011, during the Beijing Film Festival, the Chinese Cultural Ministry conferred on Su the title of Outstanding Oversea

*Continued on Page 19*



## Hagman Was “Playing Footsie” With Chinese Government Agents, The FBI Learned from page 18

Promotion Executor of Chinese Film.

Utilizing money provided to him by the Chinese government, Su, who resides in West Covina where the EDI Media offices are located, has become a prolific donor to humanitarian and philanthropic causes in Southern California, as well as to local, state and federal politicians.

In November 2015, the Federal Communications Commission began an investigation into EDI Media, G&E Studio Inc. and CiTi News, based on indications that EDI Media and CiTi News programming, which consisted of content produced at G&E Studio as well as material originating with China Radio International, were being financed and controlled by the Chinese government. As a consequence of the FCC investigation, those associated with and employed by EDI Media and its related corporate entities were obliged to register as agents of a foreign government.

It was at that point that the case turned what was perhaps its most significant corner. For a contingent of the federal agents working the case, Wapner’s and Hagman’s readiness to accept campaign donations and, in their official capacity, do the bidding of whoever gave them the money could no longer be dismissed as petty corruption when those agents came face to face with the consideration that a fair share of the money coming to Hagman and Wapner originated with overseas sources, including money apparently put up by governments inimical to the United States.

Something that had occurred in late 2023, which had triggered no alarm at the time, now seemed far more significant. That year, the Ontario International Airport Authority, in conjunction with the Department of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, initiated operations

at Ontario Airport’s Global Entry Enrollment Center, which involved so-called “dedicated expedited clearance lanes” that greatly facilitated and sped up the arrival and customs process for those flying directly into Ontario from a foreign location, in particular fliers who traveled frequently. The system involved an automated “Simplified Arrival” facial biometrics system to speed up primary document checks for arriving international passengers as well as allowing fast-tracked in-person interviews with customs officials for pre-approved Global Entry applicants.

The championing of the Ontario International Airport Global Entry Enrollment Center by Wapner and Hagman was represented by Lambert as a wise move that would contribute to greater future ridership into Ontario. At the same time, there was little in the way of difficulty with delays of international passengers at Ontario. Those passengers disembarked and moved exclusively through the airport’s historic terminal, while domestic travelers made use of its two more recently built and much more heavily-crowded terminals. In 2025, of the 7,116,735 passengers at Ontario International, just under 8 percent, 566,923, i.e., 7.96 percent, were arriving from or departing to foreign destinations. In this way, processing of passengers in the international terminal was more expeditious than in the two domestic terminals.

There is no legal cap on the amount of money an individual can take out of the United States in U.S. or foreign currency, coins, traveler’s checks, money orders, or other monetary instruments. However, federal law requires that a traveler must declare any amount over \$10,000 in U.S. dollars or the foreign equivalent upon entering or leaving the United States.

If foreign bank accounts were being used as repository for bribes or other illicit money obtained by either Wapner or Hagman or both, a dif-

ficulty would ensue for them in trying to access those funds. Wire transfers from a foreign bank to a domestic bank, like wire transfers anywhere, could be tracked, generally, through electronic processes, and would be subject to disclosure in the event a warrant for those records was obtained. In that context, the otherwise benign-appearing Global Entry Enrollment Center at Ontario International Airport took on a dimension that fueled the investigation.

Previously, suggestions afloat that both Wapner and Hagman, but particularly Hagman, were, in the words of one individual close to the situation, “playing footsie” with wealthy Chinese business interests and government officials from both Mainland China and Taiwan had been curtly dismissed or disregarded by the FBI. Earlier this year, however, multiple factors converging at once – rock solid evidence both were on the take, their acceptance of foreign money, their foreign travel, the airport authority’s push to establish the Ontario Global Entry Enrollment Center at the airport, the sudden proliferation of laundering mechanisms in their orbit to hide where they were getting their money – took the FBI’s investigation to an even higher level of intensity.

Mary Jane Olhasso, served as Ontario’s economic development director in the 1990s and 2000s and later went to work as the top administrator of the County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency before being promoted to the post of the county’s assistant executive officer of finance and administration. In the late 1990s and early-to-mid-2000s, she accompanied members of the Ontario City Council, including Wapner, on trade missions to the People’s Republic of China.

The Chinese government representatives who came into close contact with American dignitaries were anxious to bypass unelected staff members who were a part of the U.S. delegation such as herself

in favor of having direct contact with elected officials, Olhasso told the *Sentinel*. Their Chinese hosts proved very effective at isolating American politicians from the others accompanying them on the trade missions, she said. Wapner, she recalled, recognized very early on that the People’s Republic of China government functionaries and the representatives of the Chinese industries and commercial concerns put a premium on speaking with him directly and without other Americans present. Wapner, she said, accommodated the Chinese in this approach.

Wapner’s and Hagman’s travels to the People’s Republic of China in years gone by had not gone unremarked by federal officials, but had caused no great stir, even though there were reports extant in San Bernardino County that both had established accounts in banking institutions on the mainland.

In January 2026, based either on the FBI’s tracking of the reports circulating in Ontario and San Bernardino County relating to Wapner and Hagman opening foreign bank accounts and/or other information that had been developed, there was concern that the “Simplified Arrival” at Ontario International Airport was a device virtually tailor-made for Wapner and Hagman to bring money into the country in a way that would be undetected.

Simultaneous with the raids on Wapner’s and Hagman’s homes and offices on July 28, the FBI and liaison personnel with other federal agencies served search warrants at James Su’s residence in West Covina and at the West Covina office of EDI Media.

Within hours of that raid, Su’s Attorney, Andrew Cowan, issued a public statement that Su was an American citizen and was cooperating fully with federal agents. Cowan pointed out that Su’s philanthropic activity was carried out for altruistic reasons, his donations to candidates of his choosing, which included local, state and

federal officeholders, most notably Congresswoman Judy Chu, were exercises of his First Amendment Constitutional rights and that he had openly engaged in making those donations, doing nothing to hide or disguise them. Cowan acknowledged that Su had made contributions to Hagman going back almost five years ago, which he said were similar to other donations Su had made to local officeholders in a spirit of civic pride and in keeping with Su’s belief that those doing an admirable job in their elected capacities merit the support of those who are in a position to provide it.

Former FBI Director Christopher Wray, under whose ultimate leadership the FBI stepped up the investigation of Wapner and Hagman, said agents of the People’s Republic of China frequently disguise the effort to influence American politics by seeking “to cultivate talent early, often state and local officials, to ensure that politicians at all levels of government will be ready to take a call and advocate on behalf of Beijing’s agenda. When we tally up what we see in our investigations – over 2,000 of which are focused on the Chinese government trying to steal our information or technology – there is just no country that presents a broader threat to our ideas, our innovation, and our economic security than China.” Wray said the Chinese Communist Party has set about purchasing American leaders’ loyalty with the application of money, or in the alternative, through intimidation or blackmail, “to undermine our democratic process by influencing our elected officials.” In this regard, Wray said, the Chinese Communist Party takes a long term approach, patiently seeking to recruit local politicians to secure their assistance when they perhaps move into higher levels of power, perhaps at the state or federal level.

In seeking to combat the Chinese government’s influence, the FBI, other federal agen-

cies and the U.S. Justice Department employ a strategy of being equally or more patient, building an extensive profile of the foreign government’s operatives, most of whom are Chinese themselves but are occasionally American citizens, native or naturalized, and assembling an airtight case against the politicians by being able to demonstrate what action they took in their official capacity to please and/or advance the interests of their foreign benefactors.

In the instant case involving Wapner and Hagman, despite the consideration that action in the form of search raids was delayed at least eight years since the first complaints regarding what was ongoing at the airport authority drifting in, there is a sense that the FBI’s timetable was hurried along as the consequence of some factors, both anticipated and unforeseen.

While not a law, per se, the FBI abides by what is referred to as the “60-Day Rule” imposed as part of the U.S. Department of Justice’s “unwritten” policy and internal guidelines. Under that policy, federal law enforcement – including the U.S. Attorney’s Office and the FBI – refrain from taking certain actions within 60 days of an election. The intent is to preserve the appearance of political neutrality and avoid influencing the outcome of an election. Thus, with the November 3, 2026 looming election, in which Wapner is seeking to move up from his position on the city council to that of mayor, federal authorities, meaning not just the prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney’s Office but the host of investigative agencies being brought to bear in this matter, the FBI among them, would have only until September 4 to act, or otherwise have to stand down in terms of any overt action that might come to the attention of the public and influence the election outcome. Furthermore, Hagman’s son, Jonathan, has jumped into Ontario’s District 3 city council race, garnering

*Continued on Page 20*



## With The Clock Winding Down, Wapner Running For Mayor & Records About To Be Destroyed, The FBI Leapt Into The Breach *from page 19*

his father's and Wapner's endorsement in doing so, along with \$10,500 transferred into his campaign fund from his father's political war chest. Young Hagman filed a California Form 501 and California Form 410 with the Ontario City Clerk's Office in conjunction with his application for candidacy. City Clerk Sheila Mautz and Assistant City Clerk Claudia Isbell withheld Hagman's Form 501 and Form 410 from public scrutiny. Amidst reports that his father and Wapner were transferring tens of thousands of dollars into his campaign war chest, Jonathan Hagman then neglected to file with the city clerk's office his California Form 460, which would have identified the origin[s] of the wellspring of money being used to fund his campaign.

Reports were emanating from the airport authority headquarters and Ontario City Hall that as a consequence of Wapner's go-for-broke gamble in running for mayor this year, he and his support network were also making preparations for the potential that he would not prevail against the incumbent, Leon. From the time Leon was elected mayor in a special election in 2005, both he and Wapner found themselves locked into the same election cycle, such that Leon was running for reelection as mayor and Wapner was running for reelection as city councilman in 2006, 2010, 2014, 2018 and 2022. In each of those years, Wapner had the opportunity, which he consistently bypassed, of running for mayor. If he had run for mayor any of those times and failed to grasp the brass ring, he would have been bounced off the city council, since he could not run for both positions at the same time. In losing his council seat, Wapner would also have needed to surrender not

only his position as the president of the airport commission but his place on the airport authority board altogether. Accordingly, he had never stepped up to run against Leon, instead having to content himself with remaining on the city council. This year, it is different. He resolved last year to run against Leon, staking his political future on the belief that the \$652,248.08 in political donations he managed to collect in all of 2025 and the first six months of this year provides him with sufficient funding to overcome Leon. In the same 18 months from January 2025 until June 2026, inclusive, Leon took in \$96,449 in political contributions. In this way, Wapner has recently chalked up a 676 percent fundraising advantage over the mayor, meaning, essentially, he will be able to spend \$6.76 on campaigning – translating into purchasing billboard space, window signs, yard signs, television spots, radio ads, newspaper advertisements, brochures, handbills, mailers, postage, surveys and phone banks – for every \$1 Leon spends.

In the face of Wapner's superior financial positioning, Leon has the advantage of incumbency and a Spanish surname in a city in which 72 percent of the residents are Latino.

The outcome of the race is thus in doubt, and Wapner had plans in place to have the airport authority staff, acting on the orders of the airport's general manager and executive director, Atif Elkadi, purge documentation contained in the files at the airport authority's headquarters at 1923 East Avion Street that implicates him or would otherwise demonstrate the extent of the pay-to-play culture that engulfed airport operations since the airport authority under Wapner's domination took over operations of the airport in 2016. FBI agents had already heard from Ontario residents who complained that in response to requests for documents and records, including ones made pursuant to California's

Public Records Act, the authority and its general counsel – Gatzke Dillon & Ballance – denied access to most of that information and those materials, citing questionable exceptions to the Public Records Act.

Additionally, the *Sentinel* is informed, Natalie Gonzaga, who was employed by the Ontario International Authority from 2019 and throughout 2020 and 2021, conveyed to the FBI that individuals within the airport authority hierarchy were mishandling, misrouting and withholding documents and other materials or otherwise engaging in improper records management. After being hired into a clerical position as a document management specialist, Gonzaga acceded to the position of board clerk, that is, the executive secretary to the airport authority board. In 2020 and again in 2021, Gonzaga, it was related to the *Sentinel*, found herself in the doghouse after she produced documents and records requested by members of the public through the California Public Records Act. Wapner, on at least two occasions confronted Gonzaga, berating her for having complied with the requests, which Wapner felt provided ammunition to his political enemies. He told her that she needed do better in finding some technical reason, pretext or excuse to not make the documents available.

In early 2022, Gonzaga resigned from her position with the Ontario International Airport Authority, which provided her with \$120,614.15 in total yearly compensation, for a position as an assistant city clerk with the City of Chino that offered \$83,847.95 in total annual compensation.

In 2024, a team of five federal auditors who were going over the books at Ontario International Airport detected anomalies and holes in the airport's record keeping, which was interpreted as a sign that some data had been selectively or purposefully altered, erased or moved/recorded elsewhere.

With the clock wind-

ing down to a point of no return where crucial information about operations at the airport might be lost forever, a decision to secure search warrants for Wapner's, Hagman's and Su's domiciles, located, respectively, in the 2700 block of Monterey Place in Ontario, the 3000 block of Biscayne Street in Chino, and on Mount Tricia Avenue in West Covina, was made. In addition, search warrants were simultaneously served at Hagman's Chino Hills Fourth District supervisorial office located in the Chino Hills municipal government complex, the EDI corporate office in the west 1700 block of San Bernardino Avenue in West Covina; the Rancho Cucamonga home and Ontario office of Frank Lizarraga, Wapner's personal attorney; the business offices of Andrea "Andy" Sehremelis at 8522 Kimball Avenue; and at a mansion in the 600 block of North Canon Drive of Beverly Hills. In addition, the FBI submitted subpoenas to the offices of the Ontario city clerk and the airport authority's executive suite and administrative offices on Avion Drive at the airport.

Lizarraga is closely identified with the City of Ontario, having had three offices in the city. He was a member of the Ontario Planning Commission for 13 years. He was Bowman's legal representative and has done legal work for Wapner's wife and for Ontario Councilwoman Daisy Macias. He was the former general counsel to the Southern California Association of Governments, representing six counties. He is respected as a "fixer," an attorney who, in the most benign definition of the term, while representing one side in a legal matter, is able to obtain, by skillful negotiation and respectful give-and-take, resolution short of trial and avoid what otherwise would prove to be an exhaustingly vituperative and quite likely, mutually destructive, legal Armageddon. Though he seeks settlement prior to trial whenever possible, he is capable of aggres-

sive courtroom litigation when accommodation cannot be achieved. Lizarraga represented the *Sentinel*, successfully, in a libel action brought against it.

Lizarraga is also a fixer in the sense of the term that is viewed with greater disdain by the public in general. In that role, as the representative of the politically powerful, he has successfully intervened in a multitude of circumstances where a public official or public personage has worked himself into an intractable bind in which his goose appears to have already been cooked such that he is about to get what a majority of the community figures to be his just dessert, only to have Lizarraga by some artful design save his bacon.

Beyond his status as an attorney, Lizarraga has pursued business opportunities and development projects unrelated, in the main, to practicing law. He is in partnership with Phylis Shih, who has been active in real estate development throughout California but primarily in Southern California in conjunction with at least 18 companies, including IO Logistics and Exdev, of which she is the managing director, 16 holding companies and 104 properties. Her real estate activities include a mix of industrial, office, commercial, and residential properties. With Lizarraga, she is the co-owner of the Prado Golf Course, which is located on leased San Bernardino County land, and the two have joint ventured on at least one industrial project in South Ontario. Shih has tremendous entre with Shanghai Commercial Bank LTD.

That the FBI was certain enough of its case to be willing to obtain and serve a search warrant targeting an attorney, let alone an attorney of Lizarraga's reach and stature is an indication, individuals involved in the Ontario business community said, of the strength of the evidence in its possession.

Sehremelis is the president and CEO of Parkcrest Development, the president of AGS Fuel-

ing and Automotive, the president and CEO of Archibald's Drive-Thru, and has been active in development, construction and business operations in Ontario and the Chino Valley. He is one of the major political donors to Wapner, Hagman, Bowman and Leon.

Sehremelis donated \$49,100 to Leon between 2020 and 2023; \$26,200 to Wapner's campaign fund between 2019 and 2025; \$12,400 to Hagman between 2018 and 2024; and \$5,000 to Bowman since 2020.

His generosity to local politicians appears to have been effective. In August 2025, Sehremelis's company, Parkcrest Construction, secured from the County of San Bernardino a 30-year lease for 40-acres of "surplus" land on the grounds of Chino Airport. When the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors voted on entering into that lease, Hagman abstained, but arranged for his four board colleagues to approve it.

Over the years, Hagman has written letters of support to various city councils in both Los Angeles and San Bernardino County, including the Chino Hills City Council of which he was formerly a member, with regard to Sehremelis's project proposals.

Steve Lambert, the spokesman for the Ontario International Airport Authority, told the *Sentinel*, "We are aware of an investigation being conducted by federal authorities. Because this is an active investigation, it would be inappropriate to comment further while that process is underway. We will continue to cooperate as appropriate and have no additional information to provide at this time."

Ashley Jones, a deputy public information officer with San Bernardino County on Thursday told the *Sentinel*, "We are aware of a federal investigation taking place in our region. As this is an active matter, we are not able to provide additional comment at this time. We will cooperate as appropriate and do not have any further information to share."