

Sentinel

Friday, August 28, 2026 A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service 10808 Foothill Blvd. Suite 160-446 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 (951) 567-1936

Inadmissability Of Evidence Implicating SBPD Handcuffs Defense In Ortiz Trial

The trial of San Bernardino County City Councilwoman Treasure Ortiz began in earnest on Monday morning and ran into immediately intractable complication as the prosecution's case from the outset has been reliant on evidence implicating a law enforcement officer the district attorney's office deliberately excised from the underlying case.

The rulings by the

judge overseeing the case accommodating the prosecution's effort to keep the action of the law enforcement officer in question from becoming a focal point for the jury resulted in the creation of holes in the prosecution's narrative of guilt and the defense's narrative of innocence, such that the presentation of evidence and testimony became so awkward and disjointed by

judge-attorney sidebar interruptions that jury distraction had become a major concern of the judge.

By late Thursday afternoon, at which point the prosecution had rested and defense witnesses were being heard from, doubt was cast over the proceedings as a member of the jury had reported to a bailiff who in turn informed the court that another

juror had expressed an opinion about what verdict should be reached, a premature conclusion with regard to the facts of the case, given that the presentation of evidence and testimony had yet to conclude and deliberations had not yet begun. That juror is due to be questioned Monday morning, prior to the witness who was on the stand Thursday and who had not completed her

testimony, former San Bernardino City Councilwoman Kimberly Calvin, coming back into the courtroom, Department S-18, located on the sixth floor of the 11-story San Bernardino Justice Center to conclude her testimony.

The case against Ortiz is a complicated and highly nuanced one, rife with political implication and questions with regard to the **See P 2**

Despite Civil Libertarians' Misgivings, Local Flock Surveillance Systems Remain In Place

Increasingly over the last 18 months throughout the United States, concern with regard to the civil liberty threat posed by surveillance systems developed by Flock Safety, also known as Flock Group Inc. has, in pockets throughout the country, escalated to a fever pitch.

The Atlanta, Georgia-based company, founded in 2017 by Garrett Lang-

ley, Matt Feury, and Paige Todd, has grown in leaps and bounds through its successful product line of automated license plate readers, video cameras, surveillance technology and public safety software.

But inevitable bugs in the system, not all of which have been worked out and the consideration that more than 130,000 active license plate read-

ers and an unknown number of other types of surveillance cameras developed by the company have been installed in approaching 6,000 communities across 49 states has sparked worries that invasions of privacy and unwarranted, unconstitutional and outright illegal data sharing are routinely taking place in areas in which more than 67 percent of the

entire country's population lives.

The introduction of ever more advanced surveillance tools, including the expansion of artificial intelligence features, such as searching vehicle attributes, clothing, or physical descriptions beyond standard license plates has created, a sizeable number of people fear, an Orwellian comprehensive tracking

infrastructure.

That uprating in capability has come as there has been extensive publicity about the technologies misuse by law enforcement agencies and personnel. There have been documented cases of police officers utilizing the cloud database to track residents absent court-issued warrants, carryout discriminatory or idiosyncratic **See P 4**

Despite Crackdown, RR Freight Thefts Persist

Stepped-up vigilance and the concerted efforts of a wide range of law enforcement agencies working with railroad officials to heighten security and reduce pilferage from trains along San Bernardino County's rail corridor by both sophisticated criminal organizations and opportunistic bandits has continued now past the dog days of summer. Inroads on that criminality have been made, but the thefts continue, it seems, unabated.

Authorities over the last three weeks have collared at least six individuals involved in stealing substantial quantities of merchandise from rail cars. At the same time, it is believed, an equal number of thieves involved in those same

incidents were able to elude capture.

On Monday, August 24 at around 7 a.m., according to the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, a group of people of at least four people were seen breaking into a Burlington Northern Santa Fe boxcar in the unincorporated San Bernardino County area east of Barstow near Daggett, and were unloading **See P 3**

Arguments For & Against Upland Measure M

As the result of action taken by the Upland City Council on August 3 22, the city's voters will be called upon to vote on the approval of what the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters' Office has designated Measure M.

Measure M will revamp the city's business licensing schedules to

change the cost of obtaining a business operation permit in the City of Gracious Living.

Measure M will intensify the burden that the city's most successful businesses bear for doing businesses in the city. Indeed, those businesses cataloged as the highest grossing in the city would see the cost of their city business licenses jump by a whopping 3,240 percent, from the current \$864 to \$28,000, if a majority of the city's voters support Measure M, which has been placed on the upcoming November ballot.

All five of the council's members – Mayor Bill Velto, First District Councilwoman Shannon Maust, Second District Councilman James Breitling, Third District Councilman Carlos Garcia and Fourth District Councilman **See P 3**

Duo Arrested In Killing Of A Highland Man

A man from Highland and a younger man from San Bernardino, described by personnel with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department as shady characters, have been arrested in connection with the stablbing murder of a slightly older man living in Highland.

33-year-old Samuel Canales was at a home in the 7600 block of Elm Street in Highland when he was stabbed, resulting in the loss of a critical amount of blood, on Monday, August 3.

Sheriff's deputies who had been dispatched to an emergency call from the residence at 10:37 a.m., arrived to find him gravely wounded inside a detached secondary unit on the property. He was transported to a hos-

pital, where he expired, shortly after arrival.

Detectives with the homicide detail of the specialized investigations bureau identified two suspects potentially involved in the killing.

At 1:54 a.m. on August 4, Angel Santiago Macias De La Cruz, 23, with a birthdate of February 25, 2003 was located at 25813 11th Street in San Bernardino, very close to the boundary with Highland. He was arrested. T

At 8 p.m., the following day, August 4, they tracked down one of the second suspect, Brian Anthony Huidor, 27, to a residence at 6672 Roca Circle in San Bernardino, where they took him into custody.

Macias De La Cruz was booked on a charge of murder, Penal Code 187(A) into the Central Jail in San Bernardino. He is being **See P 8**

Resident Mistrust Of City Council At A Fever Pitch As Adelanto Mulls Data Center Zones

Resident suspicion and distrust of Adelanto's top municipal officials is intensifying as those officials are seeking to rezone a substantial portion of the 52.87-square mile city to allow for the operation of data centers.

Adelanto, San Bernardino County eighth smallest city in terms of population, is also one of its most impoverished. With a mean household income of \$68,685, Adelanto is ahead of only two of the county's 24 cities and incorporated towns in that regard, as 17.2 percent of the overall population lives below the federal poverty line, while family-level poverty in the city is reported at around 15.9 percent to 16.4 percent.

Nearly twelve years ago, in the aftermath of the clean sweep that was effectuated in the 2014 election when Rich Kerr ousted Mayor Cari Thomas and John Woodard and Charles Glasper defeated Steve Baisden Charles Valvo, Kerr joined forces with incumbent Councilman Jermaine Wright and Woodard to embrace the long-in-coming liberalization of California's marijuana laws that were fully effectuated with the passage of Proposition 64 in 2016. Presciently anticipating Proposition 64's passage, the three spent 2015 acclimating the city's populace to the concept of simply allowing a limited number of warehouses in the city industrial park zone to operate as indoor marijuana farms where medical marijuana was to be cultivated.

Over the ob- **See P 3**

Ortiz Trial from front page

integrity of the San Bernardino Police Department. In seeking to simplify the case, which was one originally angled at former San Bernardino Police Department Detective Steve Desrochers rather than Ortiz, who was considered a reporting witness in the matter at the outset, has paradoxically complexified the matter, resulting in Judge Melissa Rodriguez, a former prosecutor herself, granting a series of motions in limine, that is, restrictions on the evidence to be presented, questions to be asked and answers by witnesses to be heard by the jury, which pertain to the crime Desrochers was accused of committing.

At issue in *People vs. Ortiz*, is the district attorney's offices contention that Ortiz in reporting what she contends was Desrochers' unlawful use of police department facilities and assets made audio recordings of her conversations with San Bernardino Police Chief Darren Goodman and San Bernardino Police Sergeant Jose Loera, the president of the San Bernardino Police Officers Association, without first obtaining their permission to do so, a violation of Penal Code Section 83.5. The district attorney's office now maintains that Ortiz victimized Goodman and Loera. Compounding the paradox is that both Goodman and Loera made statements on those audio recordings that Desrochers had indeed improperly exploited access that the San Bernardino Police Department has to state and national law enforcement data bases to obtain restricted information relating to Ortiz that was

utilized in electioneering material against her put out by her political opponent in the 2024 election, whom the San Bernardino Police Officers Association had, at least initially, endorsed.

The case has drawn widespread attention for a multiple of reasons, not the least of which is the circumstance in which the basis of the charges against Ortiz evolved, which included Goodman and Loera having acknowledged two years ago that Desrochers, one of the past presidents of the police officers association, had utilized privileged law enforcement information for political purposes, only to retract those admissions in the face of intensive controversy and condemnation of the police department. The juxtaposition of denials by Goodman and Loera that the San Bernardino Police Department's access to a privileged data base had ever been abused and their statements, in the form of Ortiz's recordings of voices and written transcriptions of what they said that were posted to the internet last year manifested as a potentially devastating blow to the credibility and professionalism of the police department.

It was in that atmosphere, which was rendered all the more acrimonious by Ortiz having lodged a claim with the City of San Bernardino in May 2025 followed by the filing of a lawsuit against the city in November 2025 relating to Desrochers' accessing of the data base and the use of the information against her during the 2024 election cycle, that the district attorney's office made a decision against pursuing a criminal case against Desrochers, who was at that point retired from the department. In stead, the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office filed two misdemeanor charges against Ortiz for having recorded her exchanges with Goodman and Loera.

For generations, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association has proven the most influ-

ential entity in determining the make-up of the seven-member city council representing the 62.24-square mile city's seven wards and that panel's presiding officer, the mayor, who is elected at large. Going back at least until the 1980s there have been reports, none of which were ever officially confirmed, that the police officers' union and its smaller and less powerful counterpart, the San Bernardino Police Management Association representing the department's lieutenants and captains, have made information gleaned from various electronically-linked data bases law enforcement agencies are granted access to available to candidates for city office the members of those unions favor. Those data bases include the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, known by its acronym CLETS, which connects public safety agencies across the state to criminal histories, driver records, and other databases; JDIC, the Justice Data Interface Controller, a law enforcement data communications system operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Data Systems Bureau which serves as the central message switching hub for law enforcement agencies across Los Angeles County, providing instant access to local, state, and federal criminal justice databases and enables agencies to send and receive official administrative messages across the county, state, and nation, information from which is available to the San Bernardino Police Department by special dispensation; the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department's Central Name Index, that agency's cybernetic file system that logs deputies' field contacts with, detainment of, citations issued to and arrests of subjects or suspects, along with charges filed against them and resulting convictions, as well as victim and witness statements, granted to the San Bernardino

Police Department at the sheriff's discretion; and NCIC, the National Crime Information Center, considered the United States' primary database and information registry for tracking crime-related information, maintained by the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

NCIC, CLETS, JDIC and CNI data are all subject to slightly variant but generally uniform restrictions with regard to authorized access, how the information can be utilized, with contents restricted to official purposes related to law enforcement, criminal justice, and national security.

On November 8, 2023, after Ortiz took out nomination papers to challenge then-incumbent Damon Alexander in the March 5, 2024 Primary Election to represent San Bernardino's Seventh Ward, she met with former San Bernardino City Attorney Jim Penman, who was also vying for election to the Seventh Ward post. At that meeting, Penman informed her that the San Bernardino Police Officers Association intended to conduct a campaign against her candidacy, in so doing referencing information relating to her that had been gleaned from a law enforcement data base. He urged her to drop out of the 7th Ward race to avoid sustaining damage to her reputation. Ortiz thereafter looked into the matter and scheduled a meeting with Police Chief Goodman. She told Goodman about the union's incipient efforts to oppose her in the election and how that effort was based, at least in part, on information relating to her contained in at least one law enforcement data base. Goodman said he had looked into the matter and had determined that no such use of the data base by members of the department had taken place.

On March 4, 2024, Ortiz and Penman. Respectively, proved the two top finishers in the Seventh Ward contest,

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

qualifying for a run off against one another in the November 5, 2024 race.

Ortiz, despite having been told by Goodman that there was no substance to her contention that the department had run her name through any of the law enforcement data bases to dig up derogatory information that could be used by the Penman campaign against her during the election season, continued to bird-dog the police chief with regard to the issue, insisting there were individuals within the department who had direct knowledge about the efforts against her. Goodman continued to express his skepticism about what Ortiz was telling him, seeking to assure her that the professionalism among the department's ranks was such that no one employed there would have abused the department's authority or resources to push a political agenda. In a final effort to assure her that she was barking up the wrong tree, he acceded to her request to launch an inquiry with the custodians of the various data bases to ascertain whether anyone in the department had accessed the entries relating to her in the cybernetic files shared by local, state and federal law enforcement agencies.

Just as the 2024 election season was heating up, on August 8, 2024, Goodman contacted Ortiz, informing her that the California Department of Justice had responded to his request that it do an audit of requests of

the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System for information on individuals matching Ortiz's identity and birthdate, and that it had been verified that her name had been run and information pertaining to her retrieved from the database. Goodman apologized for having expressed doubt about the veracity of what she had told him and for the department's invasion of her confidentiality. He identified Desrochers as the party that had accessed the system in retrieving her file, provided her with the date and time that the access had been made and told her there was going to be a criminal case put together against Desrochers, based on his illegal use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System. Six days later, late in the morning on August 14, 2024, Ortiz texted Goodman, inquiring about the Department of Justice Audit Report. Goodman said he would attempt to schedule a meeting with her the following week to go over the report. Over the course of the afternoon and into the evening, there were internal department communications between Goodman and other members of the department at the command level about the misuse of CLETS and its application for political purposes, in particular how it had, at the very least, the appearance of being related to the San Bernardino Police Officers Association's endorsement of Penman. Loera was brought into

Continued on Page 6

Soaking Successful Businesses For More Revenue Is Good For The Community; Not So, Say Tax Increase Opponents
from front page

Rudy Zuniga – are in favor of Measure M.

The argument they make in their pitch for the city’s voters to support of it is “Out business license structure is 31 years old. Yes on M simply reforms this structure to match the mix of business in our

city today. Measure M applies only to businesses. Yes on M will not increase taxes for residents or homeowners. Currently, our local small businesses pay significantly higher rates than the largest businesses – in some cases, more than 100 times as much. That’s simply unfair.”

The argument in favor of M further states that the measure “ensures the largest businesses step up and pay their fair share for the essential city services residents and small businesses al-

ready pay for. Yes on M reduces taxes for a majority of small, mom and pop businesses, so they can afford to stay in our community during these challenging times. Yes on M is a win-win for our community: millions more to address our local needs, without asking residents to pay more. Yes on M fixes streets and potholes. Yes on M keeps our parks, streets and public areas safe and clean. Yes on M maintains fast 911 emergency response times.”

The argument against

Measure M states, “Upland businesses and taxpayers did not cause the city’s budget problems. Current and past city council members’ financial mismanagement caused any budget shortfalls. This city council gave its members generous pay raises, Unbelievably, they hired a third city manager. We now pay for a city manager and two assistant city managers to run the city. Outrageously boated government bureaucracy doesn’t justify tripling the business tax to \$3.3

million annually. Upland residents soundly rejected city council proposals to increase sales taxes in 2022 and 2024,”

The argument against Measure M continues, “Don’t be fooled by untrustworthy politicians. The proposed \$3.3 million tax increase on businesses’ gross sales receipts will be passed onto we consumers. Businesses and residents have just been hit hard by increased city water, and sewer and Burrtrec trash rates. With record high food, energy, gaso-

line prices and insurance costs, hard-working families and seniors cannot afford additional city-imposed taxes. The mayor recently admitted sales tax revenues have declined. That is because residents have cut back on spending due to the higher cost of living. This has negatively impacted Upland businesses large and small. Many businesses are in survival mode. Just like businesses and residents, the city must operate within its bud-

Continued on Page 14

Railroad Freight Thefts
from front page

boxed items into vehicles near the spot.

En route to the location of the reported thefts, a deputy encountered a van matching a description of one of the vehicles into which the stolen merchandise was being loaded heading west on the 40 Freeway.

When the deputies conducted a traffic stop, a suspect, later identified as Leonardo Martinez Navarre, 29, of Perris,

sprung from the van and attempted to run into the desert. Deputies gave chase, and the foot pursuit ended with Navarre in custody.

On Saturday, August 22, sheriff’s department investigators came across an abandoned vehicle in which boxes of Brooks running shoes worth \$123,000 were found. The sheriff’s department recovered the shoes but did not arrest any individuals in connection with the theft.

Previously, on Monday, August 17, deputies

came across a van with \$28,000 worth of Lego sets which had been removed from a rail car.

While no arrests were immediately made in that case, the vehicles are sources of clues which, upon the application of forensic analysis, may lead to those who had stolen the merchandise.

Authorities say there has been a persistent pattern of highly organized thefts involving international criminals targeting railroad cargo cars in San Bernardino County

and elsewhere in San Bernardino County going back over the last 18 months. .

According to the Association of American Railroads, “In recent years, organized criminal groups have increasingly targeted the nation’s railroads using sophisticated tactics and technology to commit cargo theft.”

Beginning last fall, an intensified crackdown on railroad cargo theft has been pursued by a multitude of agencies and entities, includ-

ing the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Police as well as the FBI and Department of Homeland Security.

In Southern California in particular, investigators have learned that at least some of the perpetrators have previously succeeded because they had inside information about railroad company operations.

Individuals linked to cargo theft rings who have specific knowledge of the placing and tim-

ing of the shipment by rail of high-value goods is a common vulnerability and a major factor in the success of criminals who target rail cars for theft. Railroad police, the sheriff’s department, the San Bernardino Police Department, the Colton Police Department, the Rialto Police Department and the FBI have information that organized crime is employing individuals who assume relatively low-ranking and even temporary positions with

Continued on Page 14

searches, including the stalking of their own wives or girlfriends.

In addition, predictable manifestations of the data being made available, by virtue of “agency-to-agency privilege” by one governmental entity to others have emerged into the public consciousness. Data collected by local agencies has been, in some cases,

commandeered by state law enforcement agencies, federal law enforcement agencies and other federal agencies, including the Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Opposition to not only the ubiquity of the technology but to the use of data of the type gathered by Flock in any degree has popped up among civil liberty groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the Electronic Frontier Foundation.

Beyond the authori-

tarian misuse that carries with it the potential, at least in the minds of some, that Flock and companies completing with it for surveillance industry dominance could become the foundation an American totalitarian state, is the possibility, which may have already manifested, of criminals – including criminal networks and organized crime – tapping into the data Flock is compiling and using it for its own or their own nefarious purposes.

Flock Safety maintains its core cloud platform and central database have never been nor will ever be hacked or subjected to massive or even limited data exfiltration.

The reality, however, is such breeches, ones of unknown seriousness, depth or breadth – because of the aura of secrecy that surrounds Flock – have already occurred. Security professionals and cybernetic

researchers, as well as investigators who are not connected with and therefore have no motive to protect Flock or its reputation have detected, found and exposed significant vulnerabilities and data exposure issues in the devices Flock sells along with the software those devices use to coordinate with the law enforcement agencies using those products.

More than one set of security researchers, perhaps most famously

collaborators Benn Jordan and Jon “GainSec” Gaines, in multiple contexts have shown elements of Flock camera and surveillance systems can be tapped into. On more than one occasion, it was clearly demonstrated flock products in use by law enforcement agencies, have been left open to on-line access, either because the password protections or encryption used could be defeated or no such

Continued on Page 18

jections of then-Councilman Ed Camargo and Glasper, the troika of Kerr, Wright and Woodard undertook to transform Adelanto into a cannabis-based economy by making Adelanto, in Kerr’s words, “the marijuana capital of the world.”

What was at play was a series of get-rich-quick real estate sale schemes. Comparatively speaking,

land in Adelanto was inexpensive. Both real estate speculators and individuals interested in establishing marijuana-oriented businesses began delivering bribes to Kerr and Wright with the understanding that they would open the way for commercial cannabis or marijuana cultivation operations to set up and/or get permits on various properties around

the city. This involved changing the zoning in certain areas of the city. Woodard, a real estate agent/broker, functioning on inside information he obtained as a city council member, would pass that along to would-be marijuana growers or prospective cannabis shop or prospective dispensary operators. They would purchase relatively inexpensive land

somewhere in Adelanto and Woodard, as the broker, would get a commission on the sale. That land would subsequently be rezoned for use as an indoor marijuana farm or cannabis processing plant or cannabis product/marijuana distribution or wholesale or retail establishment.

Kerr, Wright and Woodard profited by their exploitation of their

governmental decision-making authority. Ultimately, however, because of the sloppiness in their manner and mode of operation, Wright and Kerr were both taken down by the FBI on political corruption and bribery charges, and were ultimately convicted and sent to federal prison. Woodard with his more sophisticated approach, avoided being prosecut-

ed. All three – Kerr, Woodard and Wright – were out of office by the end of 2018.

An element of the graft and fraud the three had perpetuated while they were yet riding high in 2015, 2016 and 2017 was inadequacy of most of the land in Adelanto for the purposes those securing a profit off of it by selling it to

Continued on Page 5

Ortiz Trial *from page 2*

the conversation, where-upon a consensus was developed that it would be best all around for the Police Officers Association to rescind its endorsement of Penman. At 9:54 p.m. Goodman texted Ortiz to let her know he was still working on the matter. Discussions continued among principals in the police department, and Goodman called upon Loera to meet with Ortiz. Communication between Ortiz and Loera ensued, and they agreed to meet at DJ Coffee Shop, located at 265 East 40th Street in San Bernardino that afternoon. Ortiz arranged for San Bernardino Sixth Ward City Councilwoman Kimberly Calvin to attend the meeting. By the time that meeting took place at 2:45 p.m., the Police Officers Association had made a withdrawal of its endorsement of Penman. Ortiz used her cellphone, which was placed on the table, between her and Calvin sitting on one side and Loera opposite them, to record the conversation that ensued. On the recording, Loera can be heard telling Ortiz and Calvin that he had not been aware of Desrochers' use of the CLETS database for political purposes until the previous day, but that he had been thoroughly brought up speed with regard to what had happened. He owned up to what had occurred. "I'm here to formally apologize for what they did in the past," Loera is heard saying. "Clearly, I got a phone call yesterday. You got a phone call too. And I was just like, 'What? Are you kidding me?' Like, that's just the way they told me was, 'You need to sit down.' I'm like, 'What happened?' First of all,

I thought that one of my members was injured. I was like, 'Oh, my God something happened, right?' And they told me. I was like, 'Oh, Hell, no, there's no way. There's no way.' Because, we, during that time, clearly, [immediate past San Bernardino Police Officers Association President Jon] Plummer and I were not in charge. And something happened: that. You know that. It was the guys, the people that were in charge at that time. And that is not the way we do business – ever since Plummer and I took over. While Plummer's not in charge anymore, I am. We said we were different, right? And when I heard that, I was like, 'Oh, I'm gonna burn down the house right now, because that is not okay, one hundred percent, you know, and I immediately removed the endorsement of Jim Penman, canceled the forum and all that stuff, because it's not okay. It's not. It's not what Plummer and I created. It's not.' Loera told Ortiz, "I wanted to have a conversation with you, because we're paying, obviously, we're paying for the mistakes of our forefathers."

The San Bernardino Police Officers Association president then told Ortiz that she should pursue pressing criminal charges against Desrochers. "Do what you got to do with the criminal portion of it, which I highly recommend, because it is a crime doing that," Loera told Ortiz. "The same way you hold bad people accountable. I get it." Two weeks later, On August 29, 2024, Goodman met with Ortiz at the San Bernardino Police Department headquarters. Accompanying her was Scott Beard, one of Ortiz's major political contributors. Goodman provided both Ortiz and Beard with a print-out of the audit showing that Desrochers had run Ortiz's name through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System database. Upon showing Ortiz

the audit report, Goodman indicated to both Ortiz and Beard that he was seeking to have Desrochers prosecuted by the district attorney's office for having unlawfully utilized the department's equipment and informational databases. He indicated that he believed a criminal case could yet be made against Desrochers, even though four years and the timeline within which a crime must be prosecuted, which is specified in the penal code under what is referred to as the stature of limitations, had elapsed. "The statute of limitations is on the date of discovery [of the crime's commission], which is why I'm pursuing the charges on Desrochers, because it's from the date of discovery, not from the date of which he did it, which was back in 2020," Goodman is heard saying on the audio recording. "So, we just learned about it now. I'm going to submit to the DA now and hopefully, they will file it."

In 2019, when she was then a resident in the city's Third Ward, Goodman indicated his belief that, measured by both Desrochers' intent and what the information he obtained was used for, the offense the former Police Officers Association president had engaged in constituted a serious offense. "It's a minor crime to just run someone you like, you know: 'Oh, I'm just curious where this person lives' versus 'I want information and then I'm going to use this information to hurt this person.' That's a whole other level," Goodman said. "And that's how I feel about this, and I want to nip this in the bud and, quite frankly, want to make an example of Desrochers, whether he is retired or not, to send a message to anybody else that's playing these games." Goodman told Ortiz and Beard he was in the course of preparing the case to be presented against Desrochers by compiling a report along with the

evidence of how he had used the state law enforcement data base for an illegitimate purpose. "I'm planning on going forward," Goodman is heard saying. "The DA has already been notified – not the DA but the DA's office – and they know this is coming and I wanted to preface it with them because of the whole concern about the statute of limitations and I said, 'Hey, look, I think this is different because we just discovered it' and they said, 'Yeah, you might be right and there may actually be some exceptions because there is a lot of new law based on use of technology and use of information from criminal databases.' So, we're hoping that they see it that way once it gets there and they see the entirety of the report." A little more than two months later, in the November 2024 run-off against Penman, Ortiz registered a relatively convincing 11.5 percent victory to capture the Seventh Ward council position, capturing 3,929 votes or 55.78 percent to Penman's 3,115 votes or 44.22 percent. The following month, with the installation of the three new members of the council, Ortiz among them, Mayor Tran was hoping to form a consensus on the council that would allow her to log more achievements in the second two years of her first mayoral term that would serve to convince the city's voters to grant her a second term. Initially, there was not just a show of but actual bonhomie on the council dais that created the perception that Tran's hoped-for formula of granting each of the council members an opportunity to bring back to their districts go-ahead on projects or programs to benefit their constituents while creating an atmosphere of cooperation that would facilitate her achieving broader objectives for the city as a whole. At the public level, it is unknown whether Ortiz in closed-session discussions sought to convince her colleagues to

in some fashion address the police department's interference in the Seventh Ward election or if in making such a request she dwelt on the police department's opposition to some of their electoral efforts, including bank-rolling and orchestrating campaigns against Shorrett and Ibarra, which likewise involved some underhanded tactics. By March, the prosecution of Desrochers that Loera encouraged Ortiz to involve herself in and which Goodman had suggested was to be forthcoming had not manifested.

On March 25, 2025, Ortiz filed a \$2 million claim for damages against the city, the police department and the police union along with several named individuals, alleging members of the police department illegally searched the CLETS database to determine whether she had a criminal history as part of an effort to sabotage her election.

The accusations created a firestorm. Reflexively, the city categorically denied the accusation. In May 2025, the San Bernardino City Council voted unanimously, 6-to-0, with Ortiz abstaining, to reject her claim. The city doubled down, having Mayor Tran read an official statement condemning the Ortiz's filing, which was intended to serve as a precursor to a lawsuit. Tran characterized the claim as one that was "frivolous... fraudulent... filed in bad faith... and dishonest," and which existed as "an attempt to swindle the city of San Bernardino out of \$2 million" in taxpayer funds. The city then tripled down, warning Ortiz that she was risking criminal prosecution, as he had filed the claim under the penalty of perjury."

Caught in between the accusations in Ortiz's claim and the city's reflexive denials, Goodman and Loera were forced into the position of having to go along with the city establishment's emerging extemporaneous narrative. Statements they made

or ones attributed to them were contained in city statements that the police department unequivocally denied that its access to local, state and national criminal information data bases had ever been used for political purposes.

It is unclear whether Ortiz approached the district attorney's office or if the investigation of the matter pertaining to Desrochers Goodman had alluded to during his August 29, 2024 conversation with Ortiz and Beard had been spurred along by events, prompting the district attorney's office to contact her. At any rate, Ortiz through contact with the district attorney's office, specifically its investigators Darnel McDermott and Jorge Chavez, was led to conclude that the district attorney's office was looking into Desrochers' misuse of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System. She provided the office with documentation and materials, including access to the recordings she had made of her conversations with Loera and Calvin on August 15, 2024 and Goodman and Beard on August 29, 2024. She made further statements to McDermott and Chavez, believing their focus was on the criminal activity which Goodman and Loera had confirmed Desrochers was engaged in.

On November 5, 2025, Attorney Peter Schlueter filed on Ortiz's behalf a lawsuit, registered as Case 5:25-cv-03045, in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. That lawsuit alleged a member or members of the San Bernardino Police Department had improperly accessed the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System to obtain access to her confidential records and had engaged in a conspiracy in doing so and thereafter. The suit sought \$2 million in damages.

On January 21, 2026, the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office filed the two

Continued on Page 6

Adelanto's Last Cycle Of Politicians Sought Pay-offs From Cannabis Entrepreneurs While The Current Crop Of City Elected Officials Have Their Hands Out Palms Up To Data Center Developers *from page 5*

the would-be marijuana entrepreneurs.

Located in Mojave Desert, Adelanto has shortages in two areas to modern indoor marijuana cultivation – electricity and water.

Kerr, Woodard and Wright were able to capitalize on the greed of those intent on becoming large -scale marijuana producers by representing themselves as willing – which indeed they proved to be – to rubberstamp massive marijuana cultivation operations, even before the zoning and other entitlement issues relating to the development of the property in question was settled. The commercial marijuana operation proponents/applicants, blinded by the dollar signs in their eyes, generally acted hastily, delivering the payoffs virtually simultaneously with purchasing the land, which would shortly thereafter be rezoned for marijuana cultivation or cannabis product derivation, manufacturing, distribution or sale. It would only be later that they learned that the necessary utilities – water and electricity – were unavailable.

Kerr Wright and Woodard got out of those deals the money they were after. The real estate speculators got out of those deals what they were after in the form of the profit they realized when they sold the property they had purchased at a bargain basement price to those prospective marijuana farmers who anticipated getting in on the marijuana bonanza. A handful of marijuana/cannabis-related entrepreneurs who somehow, by hook or crook were able to get the water and electricity they needed to actually operate, profited, as well. A far larger number got burned.

With the 2018 election, a set of politicians who in some fashion

touted themselves as reformists were elected, with Gabriel Reyes replacing Kerr as mayor and Gerardo Hernandez and Steevonna Evans supplanting Woodard and Gasper Earlier in 2018, Kerr had installed Joy Jeannette as Wright's replacement. In the nearly eight years since, Reyes and Evans remain in place, while Camargo, Jeannette, and Hernandez are gone, having been replaced, in no particular order, by Daniel Ramos, Angelo Meza and Amanda Uptergrove.

While the prospect of Adelanto becoming the “marijuana capital of the world” is no longer operative, “the next big thing,” as it were, is sweeping across the globe, the United States, California, Southern California, the Mojave Desert and into Adelanto, if not in actuality, in concept. That concept is data centers.

Intensive computing capability is a primary underpinning of artificial intelligence and robotics, two manifestations of technology that have captured the popular imagination at the moment. As a result, there is both an actual current, and anticipated future, need for densely-layered computing power, which is attained through data centers.

Data centers house hundreds of interlinked computers and thousands of servers operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, utilizing electricity throughout literally thousands of miles of circuitry. The electricity produces heat, lots of it. High-density artificial intelligence and its necessarily accompanying computing racks can draw 30–80 kilowatts per rack, producing heat equivalent to dozens of homes per rack. Without effective cooling, processors overheat, throttle performance, and risk permanent damage,

making water essential for maintaining safe operating temperatures and stable humidity levels, which typically stand at 40 percent to 60 percent relative humidity, to prevent static electricity and corrosion.

Data centers use massive quantities of water primarily to cool the thousands of servers that generate enormous heat, with water-based cooling systems being more efficient than air alone.

Across the globe, hundreds or perhaps more than one thousand companies, ones that have long been established or only recently established or untested start-ups, led by AWS, Microsoft Azure, Digital Reality, Equinix, NTT Global, Google Cloud Platform, GDS Holdings, Alibaba Cloud, QTS Data, Oracle Cloud are looking to get in on the ground floor of the data center frenzy. Accordingly, those companies are looking for settings where they can secure the land and necessities to construct those data centers.

Among those necessities are governmental entities willing, in accordance with their land use, business-licensing and regulatory authority to accommodate the data centers in their jurisdictions.

In recent months and weeks, there has been intensive contact between on one end, Adelanto officials, extending to Reyes, Evans, Ramos, Meza and Uptergrove, as well as City Manager Jessie Flores, and on the other side, representatives of companies known to be focused on developing data centers. Members of the city council have been traveling hundreds of miles to hobnob with large-scale data center moguls. To even those who are most knowledgeable about those contacts and what they entail, it is unclear as to who is seducing whom.

From a certain perspective, it appears executives with the data center companies are pressing Adelanto's city fathers to give them a chance to make a pitch

for what they can do to improve and transform the community by setting up an operations or operations there. From another perspective, it looks as if it is Adelanto officials who are the ones making the pitch, trying to persuade the companies' executives that they could do a whole lot worse than choosing Adelanto as the site for the data centers they need to build.

A wide cross section of Adelanto residents believe that no matter which side is trying to transform Adelanto into the data center of the world, the concept is a bad one. Among those are a subset who see an outright and conspiratorial attempt at fraud.

As has already been demonstrated when Kerr & Company sought to usher Adelanto into becoming the most prolific source of domestic indoor-grown marijuana, the city is located in the middle of an electricity-stressed and water-stressed region. Despite that, Adelanto's elected officials, all five of them, are enthusiastically embracing the concept of clearing the way for large-scale, indeed massive, data centers being established in the city.

In lining their pockets, Kerr and Wright simply took thinly-disguised bribes, as in Wright's case, accepting cash payments in secret, or in Kerr's case, having “donors” provide his wife's “charity” with generous contributions, ones that were generally in the form of cash. Woodward did a far better job of masking what was going on, having the money laundered to him in what came across as his perfectly legal reception of a fee or commission for selling property, indistinguishable from what real estate professionals do on an everyday basis. Those closely examining the current situation see the present council members engaging in an effort to exploit the outside world's enthusiasm for a product that is suddenly all the rage to line their pockets in a way that replicates

in some measure what Woodard or those who speculated in property located in Adelanto with his assistance did. That gift involves, allegedly, the securing of property at current market rate or tying the property up through an option to purchase at the current market rate, and then unloading the land at a substantial profit after it has been rezoned to allow for its development as a data center.

A move is now on to have the city tweak its city code, development code and zoning maps to better accommodate energy and utility facilities, data centers, battery energy storage, and microchip, semiconductor and drone manufacturing.

On the table for discussion and further study are amendments to the city's general plan and land use guidelines that will redo the language relating to the elements of production and actuation relating to artificial intelligence and super-high speed data processing.

The contemplated language changes in the various codes do not pertain to any specific proposals at this point, but rather laying out standards and perhaps protocols to allow those who in the future have plans that are either modest, moderate, large or grandiose and include data centers and the like will know where the city stands and how to get started in bring a proposal to City Hall to see if it will fly.

On August 19, the Adelanto Planning Commission considered, for discussion and recommendation purposes only, the updating of the city's zoning code that would clear the way for data centers to be built in the city.

That update pertained to Title 17 of the Adelanto Municipal Code to identify, according to the city, “additional land uses that may be considered in the Light Manufacturing, Manufacturing/Industrial and Airport Development District zoning districts, subject to discretionary

permit approval. These uses include energy and utility facilities, data centers, battery energy storage systems and microgrids, microchip and semiconductor manufacturing and drone manufacturing.”

Ahead of the meeting, the city council and Flores had designated Planning Commission Chairman Chris Waggener to make a skillful and non-threatening introduction and illustration of the proposed code changes, followed by a persuasive explanation of their benefits to the community while allaying any concerns those in the community had about them before orchestrating what the members of the council hoped would be a unanimous recommendation from the commission to adopt the new standards.

As it turned out, however, Waggener employed all the subtlety of a bull in a China shop in seeking to carry out his assignment. Wearing a red Make America Great Again hat to the meeting and conjuring President Donald Trump's bromide that those who are opposed to data centers are backward-looking and will never get ahead financially in the current technological climate.

It did not appear Waggener anticipated either the number of those who turned up the meeting to go on record as being opposed to data centers – 47 of the 59 people who went on record – or the vehemence of their sentiment against the facilities.

The proposed amendment being considered pertained to a textual change to the code. It did not involve the approval of any actual data center application, as no project proposal had been submitted to the city. To those expressing opposition to data centers, Waggener iterated, more than once, that what the commission was taking on that night did not entail approval a data center or give go-ahead to any such development.

“This isn't about data
Continued on Page 20

Ortiz Trial from page 4

Section 632(a) charges against Ortiz.

Seven months and three days later, this Monday, August 24, opening statements were heard in the case, following a set of pretrial motions and jury selection last week.

In those opening remarks, DiCesare told the jury that Ortiz met with Loera on August 15, 2024, for an hour and 19 minutes at DJ Coffee Shop and again with Goodman on August 29, 2024 in a conference room at San Bernardino Police Headquarters, seeking to familiarize those who are to ascertain Ortiz's guilt or innocence with settings where the crimes he said occurred took place. At neither meeting, according to DiCesare, did Ortiz say the conversations were being recorded and she did not ask for the consent of either Goodman or Loera to do so. DiCesare vowed that the jurors would have the opportunity to listen to the recordings, such that "you'll be able to listen to them and confirm all of this for yourself." He told the jurors that in listening to the conversations they will hear "nothing about being recorded. You will not hear the word recorded in the recording at all."

The prosecutor then sought to jump ahead of the defense. Anticipating that Schlueter would assert that Ortiz signaled to Loera that she was recording their conversation shortly after they were seated at a booth in DJ Coffee Shop, DiCesare told the jury that when Ortiz said, "Just so we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say," she was not referring to the cellphone with its audio recording mechanism activated she had in her hand as she set down on the table between them but that she was referring the pres-

ence of Councilwoman Calvin, who had just arrived. Loera did not take her statement to be an announcement that she was recording the conversation or that she was asking for his consent, the prosecutor said.

DiCesare said that the audio recording of the conversation with Loera began before Ortiz greeted DiCesare outside the coffee shoprestaurant and the recorder was still running after Loera departed from the premises. the

Similarly, DiCesare asserted, during Goodman's "hour-and-a-half-long" meeting with Ortiz on August 29, 2024, "she never said anything about a recording. She never asked whether [Goodman consented to her recording their conversation]. He saw no recorder. He did not consent and he would not have consented."

Schlueter, in his opening statement, sought to put Ortiz's meetings with Goodman and Loera into context, but was met with objections from DiCesare as he touched on the issue with regard to the accessing of the database.

Thwarted in his effort to zero in on what the issues were that had led to his client's meetings with Loera and Goodman, Schlueter took aim at Loera's assertion that he considered the conversation with Ortiz to be confidential. Loera told the district attorney's office's investigators that upon arriving at the coffee shop "he specifically asked for a booth away from other people so they could have a secure conversation." The recording contradicts that, Schlueter said, and Loera can be heard telling Ortiz that they should sit wherever she preferred. The exchanges between Ortiz and Loera with Calvin there as a witness in a restaurant full of people where they could be overheard could not be considered

confidential, such that Loera had no reasonable expectation of privacy, Schlueter said.

During the meeting with Goodman, Schlueter said, Ortiz was there with a third party "to listen to the conversation" as a witness and "she was not taking notes." Furthermore, he said, Ortiz "Placed the phone between them. The device is clearly recording. Goodman knows what that means."

Schlueter referenced the ubiquity of recording that takes place in modern society and suggest that when taken together with the consideration that Ortiz was speaking to sworn police officers about criminal activity, he asked. "Was this recording confidential in regards to the law?"

Following the opening arguments, Goodman was called by the prosecution as the first witness.

Goodman, who came to San Beranrdino in 2022 when he was hired as police chief, testified that he knew of Ortiz because of her civic and political involvement, but had not been formally introduced to her prior to November of 2023. He testified that he knew Beard as a member of the business community who was involved in local politics and that he had met him previously.

Following Monday's lunch break and the return of the jury to the courtroom. Goodman returned to the witness stand.

He said he greeted both Ortiz and Beard on the ground floor at police headquarters on August 29, 2024 and went upstairs to a conference room on the second floor to conduct the exchange with them.

"Why did you close the door?" DiCesare asked.

"Because it was a private meeting," Goodman responded.

He sat at the head of a long conference table in the room with Beard sitting to his right and Ortiz next to Beard, Goodman recollected. He estimated his distance from Ortiz during the meeting as

being roughly five feet.

"I could see them both from the angle I was at," Goodman said. He said that each of them had placed their cell phones on the table.

"Did you expect your actual voice would be recorded?" DiCesare asked Goodman

"No, I did not," Goodman replied.

"Did she tell you she was recording?" DiCesare asked.

"No, she did not," Goodman said.

"Did you intend or want that conversation to be confined to the three people in that room?" DiCesare asked.

"Yes," Goodman said, adding "There was some language I used that I would have changed if I knew it was being recorded." In the course of the conversation, Goodman said, there were "personal things I was sharing that would be used against me later."

Goodman said that he was not made aware of the recording's existence until the district attorney's office informed him about it roughly a year later, in August 2025.

Goodman testified that he was outraged to learn of the recording. "I think it's an affront to anybody who ever believes that they're having a private conversation to be illegally recorded," the police chief said. Goodman said, adding that the recording was used as a "tool to hurt or to defame people."

Goodman said that Ortiz had taken advantage of the situation in which she was surreptitiously recording the exchanges to "frame the conversation" and "lead with questions" and "repeatedly manipulating" the subject matter in a way that was "hurtful, quite frankly."

Goodman also testified that he wanted the DA's office to pursue a prosecution over the recording and that he wanted to become personally involved in putting handcuffs on Ortiz for what she had done. "Did you ask if you could make the arrest?" DiCesare asked.

"Yes," said Goodman. "Why?," DiCesare asked.

"Because I was the one that was victimized and I believed wholeheartedly she should be arrested for that," Goodman said. .

Thereafter, after DiCesare had the court bailiff distribute transcripts of the recording Ortiz had made of the August 29, 2024 conversation among Goodman, Ortiz and Beard, DiCesare played the recording in the courtroom.

Thereafter, the court was in recess until the following morning.

Seven months and three days later, this Monday, August 24, opening statements were heard in the case, following a set of pretrial motions and jury selection last week.

DiCesare told the jury that Ortiz met with Loera on August 15, 2024, for an hour and 19 minutes at DJ Coffee Shop and again with Goodman on August 29, 2024 in a conference room at San Bernardino Police Headquarters, seeking to familiarize those who are to ascertain Ortiz's guilt or innocence with settings where the crimes he said occurred took place. At neither meeting, according to DiCesare, did Ortiz say the conversations were being recorded and she did not ask for the consent of either Goodman or Loera to do so. DiCesare vowed that the jurors would have the opportunity to listen to the recordings, such that "you'll be able to listen to them and confirm all of this for yourself." He told the jurors that in listening to the conversations they will hear "nothing about being recorded. You will not hear the word recorded in the recording at all."

The prosecutor then sought to jump ahead of the defense. Anticipating that Schlueter would assert that Ortiz signaled to Loera that she was recording their conversation shortly after they were seated at a booth in DJ Coffee Shop, DiCesare told the jury that when Ortiz said, "Just so

we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say," she was not referring to the cellphone with its audio recording mechanism activated she had in her hand as she set down on the table between them but that she was referring the presence of Councilwoman Calvin, who had just arrived. Loera did not take her statement to be an announcement that she was recording the conversation or that she was asking for his consent, the prosecutor said.

DiCesare said that the audio recording of the conversation with Loera began before Ortiz greeted DiCesare outside the coffee shoprestaurant and the recorder was still running after Loera departed from the premises. the

Similarly, DiCesare asserted, during Goodman's "hour-and-a-half-long" meeting with Ortiz on August 29, 2024, "she never said anything about a recording. She never asked whether [Goodman consented to her recording their conversation]. He saw no recorder. He did not consent and he would not have consented."

Schlueter, in his opening statement, sought to put Ortiz's meetings with Goodman and Loera into context, but was met with objections from DiCesare as he touched on the issue with regard to the accessing of the database.

Thwarted in his effort to zero in on what the issues were that had led to his client's meetings with Loera and Goodman, Schlueter took aim at Loera's assertion that he considered the conversation with Ortiz to be confidential. Loera told the district attorney's office's investigators that upon arriving at the coffee shop "he specifically asked for a booth away from other people so they could have a secure conversation." The recording contradicts that, Schlueter said, and Loera can be heard telling Ortiz that they should sit wherever she

Ortiz Trial *from page 6*

preferred. The exchanges between Ortiz and Loera with Calvin there as a witness in a restaurant full of people where they could be overheard could not be considered confidential, such that Loera had no reasonable expectation of privacy, Schluter said.

During the meeting with Goodman, Schluter said, Ortiz was there with a third party “to listen to the conversation” as a witness and “she was not taking notes.” Furthermore, he said, Ortiz “Placed the phone between them. The device is clearly recording. Goodman knows what that means.”

Schluter referenced the ubiquity of recording that takes place in modern society and suggest that when taken together with the consideration that Ortiz was speaking to sworn police officers about criminal activity, he asked. “Was this recording confidential in regards to the law?”

Following the opening arguments, Goodman was called by the prosecution as the first witness.

Goodman, who came to San Bernardino in 2022 when he was hired as police chief, testified that he knew of Ortiz because of her civic and political involvement, but had not been formally introduced to her prior to November of 2023. He testified that he knew Beard as a member of the business community who was involved in local politics and that he had met him previously.

Following Monday’s lunch break and the return of the jury to the courtroom. Goodman returned to the witness stand.

He said he greeted both Ortiz and Beard on the ground floor at police headquarters on August 29, 2024 and went upstairs to a conference room on the second floor to conduct the exchange with them.

“Why did you close the door?” DiCesare asked.

“Because it was a private meeting,” Goodman responded.

He sat at the head of a long conference table in the room with Beard sitting to his right and Ortiz next to Beard, Goodman recollected. He estimated his distance from Ortiz during the meeting as being roughly five feet.

“I could see them both from the angle I was at,” Goodman said. He said that each of them had placed their cell phones on the table.

“Did you expect your actual voice would be recorded?” DiCesare asked Goodman

“No, I did not,” Goodman replied.

“Did she tell you she was recording?” DiCesare asked.

“No, she did not,” Goodman said.

“Did you intend or want that conversation to be confined to the three people in that room?” DiCesare asked.

“Yes,” Goodman said, adding “There was some language I used that I would have changed if I knew it was being recorded.” In the course of the conversation, Goodman said, there were “personal things I was sharing that would be used against me later.”

Goodman said that he was not made aware of the recording’s existence until the district attorney’s office informed him about it roughly a year later, in August 2025.

Goodman testified that he was outraged to learn of the recording. “I think it’s an affront to anybody who ever believes that they’re having a private conversation to be illegally recorded,” the police chief said. Goodman said, adding that the recording was used as a “tool to hurt or to defame people.”

Goodman said that Ortiz had taken advantage of the situation in which she was surreptitiously recording the exchanges to “frame the conversation” and “lead with questions” and “repeatedly manipulating”

the subject matter in a way that was “hurtful, quite frankly.”

Goodman also testified that he wanted the DA’s office to pursue a prosecution over the recording and that he wanted to become personally involved in putting handcuffs on Ortiz for what she had done. “Did you ask if you could make the arrest?” DiCesare asked.

“Yes,” said Goodman. “Why?” DiCesare asked.

“Because I was the one that was victimized and I believed wholeheartedly she should be arrested for that,” Goodman said.

DiCesare had the court bailiff distribute transcripts of the recording Ortiz had made of the August 29, 2024 conversation among Goodman, Ortiz and Beard, whereupon he played the recording in the courtroom.

Thereafter, the court was in recess until the following morning.

With the resumption of DiCesare’s direct examination of Goodman on Tuesday, there was another seemingly minor manifestation of the complication besetting the trial as a consequence of the limitation on the testimony relating to the context within which the alleged crimes occurred when the DiCesare was compelled to ask about the investigation into Desrochers and its outcome, which was aimed at both discrediting Ortiz by undercutting the basis for her recording of Goodman and Loera and establishing, from the prosecution’s perspective, that there were no loose ends remaining from the underlying case.

Goodman’s testimony was that the investigation into Desrochers’ activity had not been completed or even initiated in earnest at the time of Ortiz’s meeting with Loera and himself in August of 2024, which clashed somewhat with the statements Goodman and Loera made on the August 29, 2024 and the August 15, 2024 recordings. Goodman testified

that upon the conclusion of the investigation, which was undertaken and completed by Detective Myra Doner, there had been no prosecution and no internal discipline was meted out.

DiCesare also asked whether he and Loera had filed lawsuits of their own against the City of San Bernardino. Goodman acknowledged they both had and that his was based on the mistreatment he had received at the hands of Ortiz, a high-ranking city official.

In his cross-examination of Goodman, much of Schluter’s focus was on the August 29, 2024 meeting involving the police chief, his client and Beard, but he encountered extremely rough sledding as he sought to give the jurors an understanding of the issues that were being discussed during that meeting, as DiCesare peppered Judge Rodriguez with constant objections with regard to the area Schluter was getting into or approaching with his questions. While DiCesare’s objections were made with the general intent of keeping the subject of Desrochers’ accessing of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System and the use of the data extrapolated from the system against Ortiz in her 2024 city council campaign and Judge Rodriguez sustained the lion’s share of those objections, Schluter remained persistent in seeking to elicit from the police chief what his exchanges with the defendant, which had begun in 2023 and consisted of phone and text messages in addition to the August 29, 2024 meeting, entailed. Schluter, often pausing for several seconds or as long as a half minute or more when a question he asked was disallowed, took different angles in his approach to the subject or substituted a seemingly unrelated question to then make a circuitous return to the issue, sometimes succeeding and other times encountering further ob-

jections.

In a minority of cases which yet proved to be significant, Judge Rodriguez was inconsistent with regard to what she deemed irrelevant or beyond the scope of permissible inquiry. Thus, Schluter succeeded in extracting from Goodman that when he met Ortiz in person at a restaurant for the first time in November 2023, “It’s possible” the use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System by members of his department for political purposes had been discussed and that the investigation of the misuse of CLETS by members of the San Bernardino Police Department was assigned to Detective Myra Donner as of, or after, August 2024.

Goodman said he had not socialized with Ortiz before or after the meetings at issue in her prosecution. When Schluter attempted to delve into how Goodman, when Ortiz had initially sought to have him explore the reports she had about members’ of the department misusing the data bases available to the department put her off and “told her that you could only look back three years into CLETS,” DiCesare objected to the question on the grounds of its relevance and Judge Rodriguez sustained the objection. Schluter’s question as to whether Goodman had attempted to dissuade Ortiz from pushing for an investigation of the crossover between police department personnel’s access to privileged information available to law enforcement agencies and their political activity, Judge Rodriguez, in reaction to DiCesare’s objection, shut off that avenue of inquiry. Schluter double-clutched and then transitioned into questions about whether Beard also expressed concern about improper political activity by members of the department and had been pressuring Goodman and the police department’s command echelon to investigate

those reports and whether Beard had threatened to have the sheriff’s department launch an investigation into the matter. DiCesare’s objection and Judge Rodriguez’s ruling sustaining it, did not dead-end the subject for Schluter, who did not give up on seeking to illustrate to the jury the extraordinary sensitivity the department’s higher ups, culminating in Goodman as police chief, had with regard to the CLETS access issue. The defense attorney did this by directly asking what the police chief what he had told Loera. When that line of questioning provoked objections that were sustained, Schluter asked Goodman if as police chief he had supervisory authority over the police union. Goodman responded that the police union existed as an independent entity, Schluter used that as the basis for suggesting that Loera had been designated to speak with Ortiz on August 15, 2024 to have him speak as a representative of the union and in his own words lay responsibility for the misuse of the CLETS data at the feet of Desrochers and the past union leadership and distance the current union leadership, the department and the department’s current hierarchy, including Goodman, from what had happened. That litany of questions was met with a corresponding litany of objections which were sustained.

Schluter brought up that at his meeting with Ortiz and Beard, he had provided them with a print-out of the audit of the running of Ortiz’s name through CLETS, an extraordinary gesture, given the confidentiality of the system.

DiCesare’s sustained objections succeeded in keeping Schluter from getting from Goodman what the police chief’s objective was in having Loera meet with Ortiz. Schluter then asked whether Loera’s meeting with Ortiz had resolved the question of whether the department had been officially in-

Ortiz Trial from page 7

volved in the misuse of the law enforcement data bases. Questions posed to Goodman about what his communication with Loera after the meeting with Ortiz extended to and if that communication indicated the problems relating to Ortiz's knowledge about the misuse of CLETS had been diffused and whether Loera's report relating to Ortiz having been placated by the meeting comported with text messages and communications the chief had with Ortiz were not answered due to sustained objection.

When Schlueter asked Goodman if he had asked Dr. Ortiz what occurred during the meeting with Loera, DiCesare's objection was overruled.

"I may have," Goodman responded.

When Schlueter asked Goodman if Ortiz had responded that Loera had apologized for the department's misuse of the law enforcement data bank against her, DiCesera objected and Judge Rodriguez sustained it.

"What was purpose, then, of you meeting with Dr. Ortiz?" Schlueter asked.

"The purpose of my meeting on August 29 was to show her the single entry on the audit I had received from the DOJ [Department of Justice]," Goodman said. "What I had at the time didn't reflect the entry I had in August." Goodman's reference to August meant earlier that month and the prior month, July 2024, at which time Ortiz had been pestering him about her contention that someone in the department had used one of the law enforcement data bases available to it to obtain information about her that had surfaced in Penman's electioneering material or independent expenditure committee mailings attacking her. On at least one occasion in July 2024 and as late as August 7, 2024,

Goodman had told there was no documentation to establish that was the case. On August 8, 2024, however, Goodman contacted Ortiz, verbally informing her of an audit by the California Department of Justice that he had requested which confirmed her name was accessed.

Schlueter asked Goodman about the circumstances that led to the August 29, 2015 meeting.

Picking up on Goodman's previous statement that the meeting was called for him to show Ortiz the read-out showing that she had been run through CLETS, Schlueter said, "To be fair this was about a politically sensitive matter that was transpiring." He then asked, "Is that a fair statement?"

"No," Goodman replied.

"There was an accusation of impropriety leveled at one officer or at least one office, correct?" Schlueter asked.

"That's correct," Goodman said.

"It's fair to say you would not want to be misquoted?" Schlueter asked.

DiCesare objected and Judge Rodriguez sustained the objection.

Schlueter then sought to obtain from Goodman an acknowledgment that audio-recording and video-recording is utilized by law enforcement personnel and agencies in gathering evidence and to ensure the integrity of that evidenc.

"One of the key tools officers have are audio recorders to record conversations?" Schlueter asked.

"Objection, relevance," DiCesare said.

Sustained," said Judge Rodriguez.

Schlueter sought to explore whether Goodman had provided Ortiz with the audit print-out, whether he intended to allow her to keep it and whether she took it from the meeting without his

permission. DiCesare objected to the question, but Judge Rodriguez overruled the objection.

"I did not give it to her," Goodman said, adding he had displayed to her and Beard what was otherwise considered to be a confidential and sensitive document "to show her I was being honest and forthright. There was no intention for her to take it. This was in a secure area," he said, meaning the locked conference room on the second floor of police headquarters where the meeting was taking place.

Schlueter explored with Goodman the placement and locations of the cellphones of all three participants in the August 29, 2024 meeting.

Schlueter in his questioning, which provoked objections from DiCesera, suggested that Goodman recently, within the last three months, told investigators with the district attorney's office something different with regard to the positioning of Ortiz's phone on the conference table than what he told those investigators in August 2025. When Goodman responded, DiCesera moved to have his response stricken from the court record.

"At any time during the August 2025 interview, did you describe where Dr. Ortiz's phone was?"

Schlueter asked.

"I believe I did," said Goodman.

"So, when did she place the phone on the table?" Schlueter asked.

"I think we all put our phones on the table when we sat down," Goodman said. "If your're asking me the exact time, I don't know what time it happened."

Schlueter pressed Goodman on whether Ortiz had place her phone face down.

"I think her phone was sitting right in front of her," Goodman said.

Goodman at one point asserted that Ortiz was five feet from him and that Beard was between him and Ortiz.

"Cell phones are also

recording devices," Schlueter said. "You were certainly aware that they can be used as recording devices?"

"Yes," Goodman said.

After reiterating that the cellphones of all three participants in the conversation had their cellphones on the table, Schlueter referenced Goodman's testimony under direct examination by DiCesare that he did not want the August 29, 2024 conversation to be recorded.

"How does that fit in with being transparent?" Schlueter asked.

DiCesare objected to the question on relevancy grounds, to which Judge Rodriguez responded, Sustained, argumentative, as well."

Schlueter redoubled his efforts.

"One of the issues, something you wanted to convey, certainly, to Dr. Ortiz was the police department wanted to be transparent about any wrongdoing, correct?"

"Correct," Goodman said.

"How does not wanting something recorded further the appearance of the department being transparent?" Schlueter asked.

"Objection, argumentative," DiCesare interjected.

"Sustained," said Judge Rodriguez.

"You've been named in a lawsuit filed by Dr Ortiz," Schlueter said. "Did you see any benefits to her that she had this recording of you?" Schlueter asked.

"Objection," DiCesare said.

"Sustained," ruled Judge Rodriguez.

"That lawsuit deals with the same issues you discussed with her on August 29?" Schlueter asked.

When no objection was raised, Goodman responded, "Yes."

"You are currently denying that Detective Desrochers unlawfully used the CLET System," Schlueter stated. "Is that correct?"

No objection followed.

"My position is when we discovered this from Ms. Ortiz, we only had

her information and the results of the audit."

"Did Detective Desrochers do anything wrong?" Schlueter asked.

"He absolutely did not," Goodman responded.

Schlueter then sought to contrast Goodman's statement with what he had been heard saying on the recording of the August 29, 2024 conversation.

"During your conversation with Dr. Ortiz, you spoke about prosecuting Detective Desrochers even though he was retired..." Schlueter began.

"Objection, relevance," DiCesare expostulated.

"Sustained," said Judge Rodriguez.

"Would it be fair to say you made statements on August 29, regardless of what you [now believe occurred] that would lead Ms. Ortiz to believe Detective Desrochers had..." Schlueter began.

"Objection, court order," DiCesare spoke over him.

Judge Rodriguez sustained the objection.

At that point, Schlueter went for broke, trying to place before the jury the rationale for the action Ortiz took for which she is now criminally charged, cutting to the very heart of why she made the recordings – to be able to demonstrate that the police department and its members would say one thing and later deny saying it.

Schlueter, accepting arguendo the premise that the department's internal investigation into Desrochers had not begun until after Goodman's August 29, 2024 meeting with Ortiz and Beard, asked Goodman if he had ever informed Ortiz that the depart-

ment concluded Desrochers had done nothing unlawful.

That question fetched an objection, which was sustained.

Schlueter asked, "Did you ever contact her to make sure that Dr. Ortiz didn't misunderstand that conversation?"

Judge Reodriguez sustained the objection.

"If i understand this correctly," Schlueter said, "you wanted to be the person to arrest Dr. Ortiz, correct"

"Yes," said Goodman.

"Put handcuffs on her?"

"Yes."

"Because she recorded you?"

"Yes."

"You encourage all of your officers to record contacts with people?" Schlueter asked.

"Yes," said Goodman.

Schlueter asked Goodman why.

"We do that because it's lawful," Goodman said, noting that law enforcement officers are empowered under California Penal Code Section 633 to use recording devices in the everyday comportment of their duty.

"The reason is because they want to memorialize what occurred, right?" Schlueter asked.

"Yes," said Goodman.

Schlueter noted that the converse does not apply and it is unlawful for civilians or regular citizens to surreptitiously record police officers without their permission.

"In this case you did not expect Dr. Ortiz to do the same?"

"No," Goodman said.

"You did not expect her to be able to prove what was said in that conversation?" Schlueter half-stated, half-asked.

"I don't expect to be recorded in a private

on August 17, 1998, was booked on a charge of murder, Penal Code Section 187(a) , as well as possession of nitrous oxide. He is to appear in courtin Department 11 on September 4. His bail has been set at \$2 million.

-Mark Gutglueck

Two Held On Murder Of Highland Man from front page

held on \$2 million bail. He is to next appear in court on September 1 in San Bernardino Superior Court Department 11 on September 1.

Huidor, who was born

Public Notices

SUMMONS
CASE NO. CASE NO.:
D-26-731629-D
NOTICE TO DEFEN-
DANT: FEI XIAO
YOU ARE BEING
SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
YUXIA PENG, Plaintiff
EIGHTH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY,
NEVADA
DEPT.: T

A Complaint for Divorce has been filed by Plaintiff YUXIA PENG against you. The object of this action is divorce. Plaintiff seeks a decree dissolving the marriage and the other relief requested in the Complaint for Divorce filed in this case.

If you intend to defend this lawsuit, within 21 days after this summons is served on you (not counting the day of service), you must:

1. File with the Clerk of Court a formal written answer to the Complaint for Divorce.
2. Pay the required filing fee to the court, or file an Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis and request a waiver of the filing fee.
3. Serve a copy of your answer upon Plaintiff YUXIA PENG at the address shown below.

If you fail to respond, Plaintiff can request your default. The Court can then enter a judgment against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint for Divorce.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT DEPT.: T
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO.: D-26-731629-D

YUXIA PENG, Plaintiff,
vs.

FEI XIAO, Defendant.
STEVEN D. GRIERSON
CLERK OF COURT By: Cecilia Dixon Date issued: 06/24/2026 Eighth Judicial District Court Family Courts and Services Center 601 North Pecos Road Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

ISSUED ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF: YUXIA PENG, Self-Represented 4110 SANDERLING CIRCLE #432 LAS VEGAS, NV 89103

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel August 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE FOR CHANGE
OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV
SB 2622340

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner STACY MARIN GARCIA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

STACY MARIN GARCIA to STACY GARCIA
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 18, 2026
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Department: S27
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.

Janai Piedra, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: August 4, 2026

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE FOR CHANGE
OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R

CIVSB2621360

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioners CHRISTINA and BRIAN TAYLOR filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: SOPHIA ROSE COLLINS-TAYLOR to SOPHIA ROSE TAYLOR.

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: 09/08/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S30
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the 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: 07/24/2026
Indian Cuen, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court

Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel August 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2026.

Dated: 07/24/2026

Indian Cuen, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court

Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel August 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2026.

FBN20260005255
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

RC PIANO LESSONS 8006 HENBANE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739: LINO LEVERAGE GROUP INC. 8006 HENBANE ST. RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

Business Mailing Address: 8006 HENBANE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

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: 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/ KIMBERLY LINO, Secretary

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

Public Notices

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/ Deputy J9676

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 26 and July 3, 10 & 17, 2026. Corrected on August 7, 14, 2 & 28, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARIA GUADALUPE CALDERON aka GUADALUPE CALDERON

CASE NO. PRO-VA2600567

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARIA GUADALUPE CALDERON aka GUADALUPE CALDERON: a petition for probate has been filed by MARIA G LENNON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MARIA G LENNON be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held September 9, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335

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

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

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

YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If

Public Notices

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

Attorney for Maria G Lennon:

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 14, 21 & 28, 2026.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC LIEN SALE

Notice is hereby given that personal property in the following units will be sold at public auction pursuant to Sections 21701-21716 of the California Self-Service Storage Facility Act. A public lien sale will be conducted by www.storage treasures.com on the 4th day of September 2026, at or after 9:00 am. The property is stored by All American Storage Ontario located at 505 S. Mountain Avenue, Ontario, CA 91762. Purchases must be made in CASH ONLY. Items are sold AS IS WHERE IS and must be removed at the time of sale. All American Storage Ontario reserves the right to refuse any bid or cancel auction. The items to be sold are generally described as follows: miscellaneous personal and household goods stored by the following persons:

Unit Name
E079 Joseph Ray Gonzales
D004 Jose L Vazquez
Dated: 08/19/2026
Signed: Garrett Gossett
storage treasures.com

Sales subject to prior cancellation in the event of settlement between Owner and obligated party.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 21, 2026 and August 28, 2026

ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE FOR CHANGE
OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R

CIVSB2623127

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner RAFAEL SAVAGE ESPINOZA MONARREZ JR. filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

RAFAEL MARCIAL ESPINOZA MORALES JR. to RAFAEL MARCIAL ESPINOZA MONARREZ JR.

[and]
ALEXANDER FELIX ESPINOZA MORALES to ALEXANDER FELIX ESPINOZA MONARREZ

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:

Public Notices

Date: 09/23/2026, Time: 09:00 AM, Department: S24

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the 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: 08/12/2026

Sarena Perez, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court

Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 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.

FBN20260007308

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

BEST ONTARIO SMOG CHECK 2201 E 4TH ST ONTARIO, CA 91764: EDWEN AURELIUS

Business Mailing Address: 2201 E 4TH ST ONTARIO, CA 91764

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name 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/ EDWEN AURELIUS, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/04/2026

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 K5930

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be

Public Notices

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

FBN20260007256

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

KAREFURPAWS 7721 LOCKHAVEN CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: KAREN CIFUENTES

Business Mailing Address: 7721 LOCKHAVEN CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name 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/ KAREN CIFUENTES, Founder

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/04/2026

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 K5930

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 August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

FBN20260007299

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

PREMISE LEDGER FINANCIAL 6618 AMETHYST AVE A306 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737: DEIDRA E LOWE

Business Mailing Address: 6618 AMETHYST AVE A306 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name 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/ DEIDRA E LOWE, Bookkeeper

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/06/2026

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 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 August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

FBN20260007102

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

CULTIVATOR CO 17404 MADRONE ST. FONTANA, CA 92337: KENNY CAO

Business Mailing Address: 17404 MADRONE ST. FONTANA, CA 92337

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

Public Notices

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name 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/ KENNY CAO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/29/2026

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 L3743

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 August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

FBN20260007080

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

BLUEWELL ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 16346 MAGNOLIA WAY FONTANA, CA 92336: BLUEWELL LLC 16346 MAGNOLIA WAY FONTANA, CA 92336

Business Mailing Address: 16346 MAGNOLIA WAY FONTANA, CA 92336

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 name 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/ SAIER SADIQ, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/29/2026

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 August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

FBN20260005984

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

ANOVIS I SOURCE 3350 SHELBY STREET SUITE 200 ONTARIO, CA 91764: ANOVIS SOLUTIONS LLC 3350 SHELBY STREET STE 200 ONTARIO, CA 91764

Business Mailing Address: 3350 SHELBY STREET SUITE 200 ONTARIO, CA 91764

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number B20260250841.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or name 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/ CINDY ALEJANDRA MALDONADO GOMEZ, Manager

Statement filed with the Coun-

Public Notices

ty 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 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, 10 & 17, 2026. Corrected on August 14, 21 & 28 and September 4, 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 CORPORATION registered with the State of California.

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

FBN 20260006466
The following person is doing business as: LA ALEGRÍAS CREATIONS 700 E WASHINGTON STREET SPC 204 COLTON CA 92324[MAILING ADDRESS 700 E WASHINGTON STREET SPC 204 COLTON CA 92324]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO J C M MORALES
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUL 10, 2026
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ J C M MORALES, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/10/2026
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 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 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026 CNBB29202607MT

APN 1061-681-34-0-000 TS NO. 2026-1631 Order NO. 2814146CAD

Public Notices

NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 9/10/2025. 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 PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER. A public auction sale to the highest bidder, payable at time of sale in lawful money of the United States, by a cashier's check drawn on a state or national bank, check drawn by a state or federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, or savings association, or savings bank specified in Section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state; will be held by the duly appointed trustee as shown below, of all right, title, and interest conveyed to and now held by the trustee in the hereinafter described property under and pursuant to a Deed of Trust described below. The sale will be made, in an "as is" condition, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by the Deed of Trust, with interest and late charges thereon, as provided in the note(s), advances, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, interest thereon, fees, charges and expenses of the Trustee for the total amount (at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Sale) reasonably estimated to be set forth below. The amount may be greater on the day of sale. Trustor: ALEXIS DANIEL AVALOS AND CYNTHIA SOPHIA AVALOS, HUSBAND AND WIFE AS COMMUNITY PROPERTY WITH RIGHT OF SURVIVORSHIP Duly Appointed Trustee; S.B.S. TRUST DEED NETWORK, A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION Deed of Trust recorded 9/19/2025 as Instrument No. 2025-0226382 in book XX, page XX of Official Records in the office of the Recorder of San Bernardino County, California, Date of Sale: 9/21/2026 at 1:00 PM Place of Sale: NEAR THE FRONT STEPS LEADING UP TO THE CITY OF CHINO CIVIC CENTER, 13220 CENTRAL AVENUE, CHINO, CALIFORNIA 91710 Amount of unpaid balance and other reasonable estimated charges: \$162,004.83 Street Address or other common designation of purported real property: 5644 DRESDEN STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701 A.P.N.: 1061-681-34-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the trustee within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks 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 d????es 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

Public Notices

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 2026-1631. 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 2026-1631 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. Date: 8/12/2026 S.B.S. TRUST DEED NETWORK A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION Published in the SBSC Rancho Cucamonga on 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ROBERT LLOYD LOGSDON CASE NO. PROVA26000619 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ROBERT

Public Notices

LLOYD LOGSDON: a petition for probate has been filed by ANN CUNANAN in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION for Probate requests that ANN CUNANAN be appointed as administrator with will annexed to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests the decedents wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. THE PETITION requests 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 September 22, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Ann Cunanan: Laila Bidaki (State Bar Number 357583) Bidaki Law Firm 1255 West Colton Avenue #593 Redlands, California 92374 (909) 848-5750 and (951) 313-7703 laila@bidakilawfirm.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 21 & 28 and September 4, 2026.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DELLA MAE WEEKS

CASE NO. PROVA26000559

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

Public Notices

THE PETITION for Probate requests that SHIRLEY YAMAMOTO 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 September 14, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at

San Bernardino County Superior Court Fontana District

Department F1 - Fontana 17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, CA 92335 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Shirley Yamamoto:

Mathew Alden (California Bar Number 288429) 255 North D Street Suite 200 San Bernardino, CA 92401 (909) 414-0797 mralden123@gmail.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 31 and August 7 & 14, 2026.

Black Gold Legal Notice Kevin Rashaan Golden ("living natural man / trustee") of BLACK & GOLD

II LIT is making claim to all rights, title and interest to the legal name

KEVIN RASHAAN GOLDEN, GOLDEN, KEVIN RASHAAN, KEVIN R GOLDEN or any variation / derivation thereof. Contact blackdiamond4978@gmail.com.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 21 & 28 and September 4 & 11, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2623300,

Public Notices

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner Jhala Angelique Welch, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Jhala Angelique Welch to Jhala Angelique Welch Kelly.

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: 10/01/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S17 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 SBSC ? Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition. Dated: 08/13/2026 Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T. Ortiz Published in the SBSC Rancho Cucamonga on 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026,

EDICTO

Se radica Juicio Sucesorio Intestamentario A Bienes De Maria Jesus Encinas Valenzuela Promovido Por Jose Jaime Graciano Gonzalez, convoke a quienes se crean con derecho a Herencia y acreedores, deducirlo a Junta de herederos a las diez horas del dia diez de septiembre dos mil veinueis en el local de este juzgado primero de primera instancia de lo familiar del distrito judicial de Ciudad Obregon, Sonora, Bajo Expediente numero 24/2025.

S// Secretaria Primera De Acuerdos

Lic. Elvira Cruz Valenzuela

Publication: Por Dos Veces De Diez en Diez Dias, Boletín Oficial Del Estado, Y Periódico De Mayor Circulación

EDICT

An Intestate Succession Case concerning the Assets of Maria Jesus Encinas Valenzuela, initiated by Jose Jaime Graciano Gonzalez, is being filed. Anyone who believes they have a right to inherit or are creditors should appear at the heirs' meeting at 10:00 AM on September 10, 2026, at the office of the First Family Court of First Instance of the Judicial District of Ciudad Obregon, Sonora, under Case Number 24/2025. S// First Secretary of Agreements Lic. Elvira Cruz Valenzuela Publication: Twice, every ten days, in the Official State Bulletin and the most widely circulated newspaper.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 21 & 28 and September 4 & 11, 2026.

FBN20260007538
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as HTAC 9597 BOLTON AVE MONTCLAIR, CA 91763: HOLGUIN TRAINING & CONSULTING, LLC 9597 BOLTON AVE

Public Notices

MONTCLAIR, CA 91763 Business Mailing Address: 9597 BOLTON AVE MONTCLAIR, CA 91763

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 name 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/ RICHARD ENGERSBACH, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/13/2026

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 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 August 21 & 28 and September 4 & 11, 2026.

FBN 20260006990
The following person is doing business as: RUBI EXTENSION. 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC #169 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410;[MAILING ADDRESS 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC #169 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARIA DEL RUBI GARCIA NAVARRO
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ MARIA DEL RUBI GARCIA NAVARRO, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/27/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 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 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 CNBB31202601MT

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

Lubertha Winters Case NO. PROVA26000612

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Lubertha Winters A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Sabrah Miller 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

Public Notices

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., Sabrah Miller 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 09/22/2026 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana Division

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

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

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

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

Public Notices

in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Dylan P. Hyatt:
1555 River Park Drive,
Suite 108 Sacramento CA 95815
Telephone No: (916) 292-8009
Published in the SBCS Ontario on:
0 8 / 2 8 / 2 0 2 6 ,
09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:
Linda Borden Stark
Case NO. PROVA2600465
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Linda Borden Stark A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Craig Edward Leland Stark in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. F3 - Fontana at 09:00 AM on 09/23/2026 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California, County of San

Public Notices

Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Probate Division - Fontana District

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.

Nicholas Beljajev:
2102 Business Center Drive, Ste 130, Irvine, CA 92612 Irvine CA 92612
Telephone No:
(657)300-9893
Published in the SBCS Upland on:
0 8 / 2 8 / 2 0 2 6 ,
09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN20260007038
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

AMOR A LA MEXICANA 743 S SANDALWOOD AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316: XIOMARA E LOPEZ ELIAS

Business Mailing Address: 743 S SANDALWOOD AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: July 28, 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

Public Notices

becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ XIOMARA E LOPEZ ELIAS, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/28/2026

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 August 28 and September 4, 11 & 18, 2026.

FBN20260007691
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

DEZUM'S DELICACIES 8582 FOUNDERS GROVE ST CHINO, CA 91708: JENNIFER F NGALLA

Business Mailing Address: 8582 FOUNDERS GROVE ST CHINO, CA 91708

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/ JENNIFER F NGALLA

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/19/2026

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 August 28 and September 4, 11 & 18, 2026.

Public Notices

FBN20260007801
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

+57 BARBERSHOP 9765 SIERRA AVE, STE D FONTANA, CA 92335: YORS A SANTOFIMIO VELOSA

Business Mailing Address: 9765 SIERRA AVE, STE D FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/21/2026

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 August 28 and September 4, 11 & 18, 2026.

FBN20260007853
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

INLAND GRAPHICS 19308 SILVER CIR RIALTO, CA 92376: MARCOS A PASILLAS

Business Mailing Address: 19308 SILVER CIR RIALTO, CA 92376

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: August 24, 2026.

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

Public Notices

mation on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ MARCOS A PASILLAS, Owner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/25/2026

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 F3010

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 28 and September 4, 11 & 18, 2026.

FBN 20260007177
The following person is doing business as: SIGNS FONTANA 9368 SIERRA AVENUE FOINTANA CA 92335:[MAILING ADDRESS 9368 SIERRA AVENUE FOINTANA CA 92335]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JOSE R ESTRADA RIVERA
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 01, 2017
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/ JOSE R ESTRADA RIVERA, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/03/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026 CNBB32202607MT

FBN 20260007131
The following person is doing business as: STRAIGHT TAPERZ 1241 W BASELINE ST SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411:[MAILING ADDRESS 1241 W BASELINE ST SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO STRAIGHT TAPERZ, LLC. 1241 W BASELINE ST SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411 STATE OF ORGANIZATION XA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20260340120
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ JONATHAN I. DELGADO ORTIZ, MANAGING MEMBER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/30/2026
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 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

Public Notices

of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026 CNBB32202606MT

FBN 20260007180
The following person is doing business as: J & M INCOME TAX 108 ORANGE ST STE #12A REDLANDS CA 92373:[MAILING ADDRESS 108 ORANGE ST STE #12A REDLANDS, CA 92373]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAIME FUENTES
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ JAIME FUENTES, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/03/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026 CNBB32202605MT

FBN 20260007179
The following person is doing business as: J & MOFFICE AND MORE 108 ORANGE ST STE #12A REDLANDS, CA 92373:[MAILING ADDRESS 108 ORANGE ST STE #12A REDLANDS, CA 92373]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAIME FUENTES
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ JAIME FUENTES, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/03/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026 CNBB32202604MT

FBN 20260007049
The following person is doing business as: ANGELWINGSUAS 25590 PROSPECT AVE #42D LOMA LINDA CA 92354:[MAILING ADDRESS 25590 PROSPECT AVE #42D LOMA LINDA CA 92354]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JEVITA R WEBSTER
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ JEVITA R WEBSTER , OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/28/2026
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

Public Notices

S LILAC AVE SUITE #107 BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316;[MAILING ADDRESS 2249 HANFORD ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SERGIO I CUEVAS The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SERGIO CUEVAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 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 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 07/10/2026, 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026 C N B B 2 8 2 0 2 6 0 1 M T CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260005958 STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTICIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT The following person is doing business as: WRIGHT MOUNTAIN METAL WORKS 8079 MIRAMAR RD PHELAN CA 92371;[MAILING ADDRESS 8079 MIRAMAR RD PHELAN CA 92371]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TIMOTHY M MACDONALD The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The fictitious business name referred to above was filed on 11/07/2024. Original File #20240010367. County of SAN BERNARDINO 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

Public Notices

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 C N B B 2 7 2 0 2 6 0 1 M T CORRECTION DATES 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 CORRECTION DATES 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026 & 08/07/2026 CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260005732 The following person is doing business as: SIERRA LAKE CLEANERS. 16953 SIERRA LAKE PKWY #109 FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 16953 SIERRA LAKE PKWY #109 FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO THC TRABUCO, INC. 16953 SIERRA LAKE PKWY #109 FONTANA CA 92336 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION C2201898 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JEAN H. CHUNG, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/17/26 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 viola-

Public Notices

tion of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 06/26/2026, 07/03/2026, 07/10/2026, 07/17/2026 C N B B 2 6 2 0 2 6 0 1 M T CORRECTION DATES 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260007022 The following person is doing business as: PAMELA C JENKINS MAYFIELD ESTATE. 2800 LONGHORN ST ONTARIO, CA 91761;[MAILING ADDRESS 2800 LONGHORN ST ONTARIO, CA 91761]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO PAMELA C JENKINS MAYFIELD The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ PAMELA C JENKINS MAYFIELD Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/28/2026 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 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 C N B B 3 1 2 0 2 6 0 9 M T CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260006619 The following person is doing business as: GAD TIRES & WELDING SERVICE. 9525 MARCONA AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92335;[MAILING ADDRESS 9525 MARCONA AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92335]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MAURO RAFAEL JARA The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business un-

Public Notices

der the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 02/13/2026 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MAURO RAFAEL JARA, 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 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 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 C N B B 3 1 2 0 2 6 0 8 M T CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260006198 The following person is doing business as: OASIS BEAUTY STUDIO. 7307 APACHE TRAIL YUCCA VALLEY, CA 92284;[MAILING ADDRESS 7307 APACHE TRAIL YUCCA VALLEY, CA 92284]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NAILSXLINDAA LLC 7307 APACHE TRAIL YUCCA VALLEY CA 92284 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUN 23, 2026 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ LINDA ANGELICA MADRIGAL-TORRES, MANAGING MEMBER 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 Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new

Public Notices

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 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 C N B B 3 1 2 0 2 6 0 7 M T CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260007029 The following person is doing business as: LAC MEDIA STREAMING SERVICES 1422 LINVILLE LN COLTON CA 92324;[MAILING ADDRESS 1422 LINVILLE LN COLTON CA 92324]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUIS E RAMOS The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOV 18, 2021 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/ LUIS E RAMOS, INDIVIDUAL Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/28/2026 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 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202601MT

FBN 20260007671 The following person is doing business as: ONCALL TERMITE AND PEST CONTROL 324 RYAN ST REDLANDS CA 92374;[MAILING ADDRESS 324 RYAN ST REDLANDS CA 92374]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAVIER SALGADO; GERMAN FIGUEROA The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP The registrant commenced to transact busi-

Public Notices

ness under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JAVIER SALGADO, PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/18/2026 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 Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202602MT

FBN 20260007590 The following person is doing business as: COCINANDOCONMAMACHUY 9379 LIVE OAK DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA91730;[MAILING ADDRESS 9379 LIVE OAK DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA91730]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JOSE AJIMENEZ LOPEZ The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: AUG 12, 2026 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JOSE AJIMENEZ LOPEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/14/2026 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

Public Notices

under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202603MT

FBN 20260007520 The following person is doing business as: SMOG CHECK USA 1218 W MERRILL AVE UNIT A RIALTO CA 92376;[MAILING ADDRESS 1218 W MERRILL AVE UNIT A RIALTO CA 92376]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ISRAEL A MERCADO The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 12, 2026 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISRAEL A MERCADO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/12/2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202604MT

FBN 20260007748 The following person is doing business as: Y&R TACOS MEXICAN FOOD 13040 DEEPWATER ST VICTORVILLE CA 92392;[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA CA 92701]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NANCY YORENI CASILLAS 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

Public Notices

Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ NANCY YORENI CASILLAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/20/2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202606MT

FBN 20260007733 The following person is doing business as: DIVINE PLUMBING; SIMPLY DIVINE PLUMBING 18603 CENTENNIAL ST HESPERIA CA 92345;[MAILING ADDRESS 18603 CENTENNIAL ST HESPERIA CA 92345]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O RAYMONDT.DEVINEIII The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RAYMOND T. DEVINE III, OWNER

Even With Stepped Up Enforcement And More Arrests Than Previously, Cargo Theft From Railcars Is So Profitable, It Hasn’t Diminished from page 3

rail companies or at rail terminals and rail yards to obtain information about what goods are being transported on which trains and in specific rail cars, together with information about when and where the trains are to remain stationary for an extended period.

Other vulnerabilities

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/20/2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202607MT

FBN 20260007742 The following person is doing business as: HERITAGE MARKET 7470 CHERRY AVE STE #101 FONTANA CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 7470 CHERRY AVE STE #101 FONTANA CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O SIKANDER S KAHLON; GURPEET S MANN The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SIKANDER S. KAHLON, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/20/226 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the

consist of spots where moving trains must slow considerably or on sidings where a line of rail cars full of merchandise can remain sitting for as much as a week before they are coupled with an engine or engines to travel to their destination.

Trains reduce speed considerably at curves or bends in the rail line, such as at certain spots along and at the bottom of the slope descending from the Cajon Pass near Devore. Trains are obliged to decelerate to navigate the sharp, sweeping curves along the track course, as tak-

Public Notices

original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202607MT

FBN 20260007743 The following person is doing business as: SILK 888 BEAUTY SPA 9509 CENTRAL AVE #A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763;[MAILING ADDRESS 9509 CENTRAL AVE #A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O GUJIA LIU The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ GUJIA LIU, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/20/2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new

ing the turns at too high of a speed poses a severe tipping hazard for heavy, multi-platform freight cars. Both the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company and the Union Pacific Railroad Company impose strict speed reductions for engineers driving trains at that location. This affords those on foot determined to jump onto a passing train an opportunity to do so, albeit with a certain degree of difficulty and some danger. Once on the trains, the thieves can break locks and seals on individual cars to gain entry to them and liberate their

Public Notices

fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202608MT

FBN 20260007737 The following person is doing business as: EL TRAILERO MAGAZINE. 1016 N DEL NORTE AVE ONTARIO, CA 91764;[MAILING ADDRESS 1016 N DEL NORTE AVE ONTARIO, CA 91764]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O PUBLICIDAD ARTE PRODUCCIONES CORP. 1016 N DEL NORTE AVE ONTARIO CA 91764 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 3034495 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ CINTHIA C ROMERO DE DE UGARTE, C.E.O. Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/20/2026 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name

contents.

Barstow’s 600-acre Burlington Northern Santa Fe classification yard boasts 48 tracks and is the main hub for almost all freight traffic to and from Southern California. As such, the area in and around it is a bottleneck for eastbound

Measure M Will Sock It To Upland’s Most Profitable Business Operations from page 3

get and transform the way it functions. Over the last 25 years, the city has been through various budget shortfalls, yet al-

Public Notices

statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202609MT

FBN 20260007792 The following person is doing business as: STUINING SKIN STUDIO. 6815 PACHECO CT FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 6815 PACHECO ST FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O JNE FAMILY LLC 6815 PACHECO CT FONTANA CA 92336 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ NICHELLE R ERBY, MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/21/2026 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

Public Notices

in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202610MT

FBN 20260007825 The following person is doing business as: LUNA FLASH PHOTO BOOTH. 17078 ELAINE CT FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 17078 ELAINE CT FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O DORIS I ALVAREZ; JOHNNY VALENZUELA The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 01, 2026 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DORIS I ALVAREZ, CO OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/24/2026 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 Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business

Public Notices

and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202611MT

FBN 20260007974 The following person is doing business as: EMPIRE CONCESSIONS 909. 7555 CATAWBA DR FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 7555 CATAWBA DR FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN B E R N A R D I N O EDGAR F AVILES D E L G A D O The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: AUG 27, 2026 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ EDGAR F AVILES DELGADO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/27/26 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026 CNBB35202612MT

many hours or even several days for a locomotive to attach to them to take them eastward. These unguarded and stationary cars make attractive targets for those intent on stealing their contents.

-Mark Gutglueck

Measure M concludes, “Many businesses large or small and residents are financially struggling. As members of the Upland Residents for Good Government, we urge residents to vote no on M.

ways finds a way to increase employee salaries and benefits. During this time, resident-driven financial workout plans and task force recommendations forced city councils to improve efficiency and reduce costs. More can be done.”

The argument against

conversation in a private office,” Goodman said. “It is not lawful for someone to surreptitiously record you without your permission.”

“You were there as police chief,” Schlueter stated.

“Are you asking if I alright with being recorded?” Goodman asked.

“Usually you do not enter into a discussion with individuals about police misconduct,” Schlueter stated, before inquiring to make sure that Goodman understood Ortiz was reporting police misconduct.

“We had not started the investigation,” Goodman insisted. “I had merely done an audit of our CLET System.

“At any point in that conversation, did you make it clear that an investigation had not begun and your findings were just preliminary?” Schlueter asked.

Goodman gave indication that the law enforcement data bases had a record of what terminal within the department had been used to make the access to them on any particular occasion and that the department had the means to determine who had used a particular terminal. He said it was pretty clear in August 2024 that an investigation had to take place.

Schlueter asked Goodman if in his conversation with Ortiz he had “named the detective you suspected of running CLETS?” DiCesare objected and the judge sustained the objection.

Schlueter dispensed with getting Goodman to acknowledge that during the August 29, 2024 conversation he had identified Desrochers as the primary suspect in the unauthorized use of CLETS and asked, “If this was preliminary on your part, why would

you name the officer?”

“The officer was named because she provided me with that,” Goodman said. Goodman explained that the department’s inquiry into the accessing of the data base for information on Ortiz came back negative but that after she re-approached him about the matter. “She knew someone must have ran [sic] it,” Goodman said. “I was adamant, because we went back over two years. Then she told me who it was. It was a detective. I I told her, ‘why didn’t you tell me who did it?’ Then, she went on and told me this person, this officer did it for political purposes. That absolutely gave me the ability to focus on an individual.”

When was that conversation when she named the individual?” Schlueter asked.

“That conversation happened in late July or early August of 2024,” Goodman said.

Having made a breakthrough in illustrating how Ortiz had been met with denial after denial of department wrongdoing over a roughly nine-month period before finding someone in the department who confirmed what she suspected or knew all along, Schlueter sought to escalate that into an illustration of why making a reliable record of what members of the department were telling her was imperative. That tack, however, was shut down by DiCesare and Judge Rodriguez.

“The second you knew that Ortiz was subjected to a CLETS run...” Schlueter began.

“Objection,” DiCesare said.

“Sustained,” ruled Judge Rodriguez.

“You had the option of finding out if she had been the object of [a law enforcement data base inquiry] when she she

reported that to you in November 2023, correct?” Schlueter asked Goodman.

Judge Rodriguez sustained DiCesare’s objection to the question.

Schlueter than referenced what Goodman had said at the August 29 meeting and which was caught on the recording say he was “going to pursue criminal charges on Desrochers.”

DiCesare objected to the question and Judge Rodriguez sustained it.

Goodman was thereafter subjected to a short round of re-examination by DiCesare, who made an effort to disabuse the jury of some of the notions Schlueter had endeavored to inculcate in the jury, followed by a briefer cross-examination by Schlueter. Goodman was excused from the witness stand, subject to recall by either side. Judge Rodriguez, however, made clear later in statements outside the presence of the jury that with Goodman having been diverted from his daily function as police chief over the course of more than a day, she would not sustain a motion for him to be recalled as a witness without a substantial showing of proof.

At that point, the trial had devolved into what over the next two days would come to resemble an absurdist ballet in which most of the performers – DiCesare and the witnesses for the prosecution – danced around the primary topic that had been the subject at hand when Ortiz met with the police chief and police union president, while Schlueter sometimes met and sometimes did not meet Judge Rodriguez’s expectations and recurrent admonitions not to stray into the area circumscribed by the court as forbidden territory.

While trials typically feature occasional objections by lawyers from either side followed by a slight pause during which the judge makes a determination to overrule or sustain it, which in turn disturbs the organic rhythm of the ques-

tion and answer process, those interruptions are relatively infrequent and generally do not break the focus of the jury on the issues at hand. In the Ortiz case, however, beginning with the defenses opening statement and during the defense’s cross examination of the prosecution witnesses, the constant imposition of objections, disrupting the flow of speech in Schlueter’s opening statement or in the case of his questioning of the witnesses, the delay in or outright nullification of a response in the aftermath of the frequently sustained objections began to have a telling effect on the jurors, whose faces by mid-afternoon Tuesday were registering obvious frustration.

All three of the prosecution witnesses – Goodman, who testified Monday and Tuesday, Loera, whose testimony took place on Tuesday and Wednesday and District Attorney Office Investigator Darnel McDermott, who testified on Thursday – relatively quickly adapted to the flow of interruptions during Schlueter’s questioning by engaging in what came across as an unnatural pause after most of his questions to ensure that DiCesare had an opportunity to object and so as to not utter a response that DiCesare would have to then request Judge Rodriguez to strike from the record.

Another effect from the constant objections, both sustained and overruled, together with the constant stops and starts as the trial progressed was a surfeit of questions, which even though suspended by a sustained objection and therefore left unanswered, create impressions and suggestions that persist with at least some jurors, who typically over the course of a trial cannot catalog with absolute accuracy which objections were sustained and which were not.

Word throughout the courthouse and nine-to-16-square-block area surrounding it extending to San Bernardino County’s and the City of

San Bernardino’s governmental centers was that the prosecution of Ortiz, who over the last eight years has surfaced as a primary critic of and dissenter from the municipal, county, governmental and business establishments and who has vied for Third District San Bernardino County supervisor, mayor of San Bernardino and two positions, one successfully, on the San Bernardino City Council, has been given an extremely high priority by District Attorney Jason Anderson, who is intent on maintaining reciprocal support between his office, all other law enforcement agencies, municipalities and governmental entities in the county. The assigning of DiCesare, whose normal assignments with the San Bernardino County District Attorney’s Office going back a decade-and-a-half consist primarily if not exclusively of prosecuting murder, attempted murder, extortion, gang violence and other serious felony cases, to prosecute two misdemeanor charges is an indication of the intensity with which obtaining a conviction against Ortiz is being pursued. That carried over into the manner in which the case was maneuvered into the courtroom of Judge Rodriguez, who had been a leading prosecutor with the district attorney’s office and was elected to the bench in June 2022 with virtually universal law enforcement support. Rodriguez acceded to virtually every motion in limine brought by the prosecution prior to trial, limiting what evidence is to be deemed admissible and what evidence is to be excluded as well as what topics the attorneys could explore in questioning witnesses and eliciting their testimony. These limitations serve as the parameters of the trial itself. Rodriguez’s rulings adhere to the principle that the substance of the conversations that Ortiz had with the two individuals she is alleged to have victimized, Goodman and

Loera, are immaterial and irrelevant to whether she violated Penal Code Section 632 by recording those conversations without Goodman’s or Loera’s consent. The effect of those rulings matched the objective, shared by District Attorney Anderson, the City of San Bernardino, the San Bernardino Police Department, members of both the San Bernardino Police Department and the San Bernardino Police Association, the balance of the San Bernardino City Council other than Ortiz and the San Bernardino Mayor, not to mention Goodman and Loera, of preventing the details of the underlying criminal investigation pertaining to the unauthorized use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, from being given widespread public exhibition. The in limine motions Judge Rodriguez’s rulings granted were further intended to restrict the contextualization with regard to Ortiz’s actions in having recorded her conversations with Goodman and Loera, intensifying the focus on the consideration that she had made the recordings. Minus Ortiz’s ability to demonstrate that Goodman and Loera were explicitly informed that she was recording them, her conviction on the Penal Code Section 632 violations was virtually assured, Anderson and DiCesare calculated.

As the trial has progressed, however, Rodriguez’s reduction of the issue to be decided by the jury to one in which they are to be kept more or less in the dark about what Goodman and Loera were discussing with the Ortiz so they can simply make a call as to whether Ortiz engaged in an act of electronic eavesdropping, pure and simple, has resulted in a disjointed narrative that while highly challenging to the defense has presented problems for DiCesare as well. So unnatural and uncommon are the rules of litigation set up for this particular trial

Ortiz Trial *from page 8*

that on occasion, most particularly when he was questioning Goodman or Loera, DiCesare caught himself out in the midst of formulating a question which referenced the details it was the goal of everyone on his side of the equation – the district attorney’s office, the City of San Bernardino, the police department and most importantly, Goodman, Loera and Desrochers – to keep out of the public record. In some cases, DiCesare did not catch himself in time and put on the record a question or statement that provided a detailed glimpse of the issues that Ortiz had been seeking to trace out or have the police department trace out for her when she dialogued with Goodman and Loera.

In the later stages of Tuesday afternoon, Loera was put on the witness stand and DiCesare began his direct examination of the sergeant and union president.

The prosecutor led Loera through a description of what led up to his one-hour-and-19-minute meeting with Ortiz and Calvin at the DJ Coffee Shop on August 15, 2024, the general ambience of the premises and the overall circumstances.

DiCesare elicited Loera’s testimony that Ortiz had neither informed him that she was recording the conversation nor obtained his consent for her to do so.

Tuesday’s testimony concluded around 4 p.m.

Wednesday morning, Loera returned to the witness stand.

DiCesare asked Loera’s about the claim he had filed against the City of San Bernardino in which he alleged that Ortiz’s actions and statements about him were defamatory and had created a hostile work environment. Loera acknowledged having filed the claim but in response to DiCesare said it had no impact on his testimony.

Under cross-examina-

tion by Schlueter, Loera said that in his capacity as a police sergeant and as union president he attended a lot of city events, including city council meetings, where Ortiz was also in attendance.

Schlueter asked Loera if he knew about the allegations Ortiz had been making with regard to the misuse of the law enforcement data bases before meeting with Ortiz. Loera said he had learned about the matter from Goodman on August 14, 2024, the day before his meeting with Ortiz.

Schlueter obtained from Loera his acknowledgment that as the union president, he was not answerable to Goodman as the chief of police, and that Goodman is not a member of the police officers’ union.

Schlueter’s questions to Loera about whether the police department’s administration was investigating or taking corrective action against one of his union’s members were not met with answers when DiCesare objected to them and Judge Rodriguez sustained the objections.

Schlueter attempted but did not establish in questioning Loera that he had been complying with the police chief’s order or directive to meet with Ortiz.

Loera did acknowledge that “The chief set up that meeting for me.”

Judge Rodriguez overruled DiCesare’s objection to Schlueter’s inquiry as to why he had met with Ortiz and what his goal or intent in doing so was.

“I am the head of my department’s officers’ association,” Loera said. “My job at the present is to protect the reputation of my organization.”

“And did you do that during your conversation?” Schlueter asked.

Schlueter’s questions that followed in which he sought to determine if Loera had made a choice to speak frankly about Desrochers in order to

preserve the good name of his union, the department and its officers were rendered unanswered by sustained objections.

Schlueter sought to lure Loera, who had worked in undercover roles as an officer, into agreeing that recording statements is a productive means of collecting evidence but did not get far with that line of questioning.

“You know how to collect evidence?” Schlueter asked.

“Yes,” said Loera.

“You know how important it is to collect evidence?” Schlueter asked.

“Yes,” Loera responded. “It is very important.”

“She was collecting evidence about what could have been police misconduct,” Schlueter asked.

DiCesare’s objection was sustained.

“Did you want to prevent Ms. Ortiz from collecting evidence?” Schlueter asked.

DiCesare’s objection was sustained.

Did you have a motive not to allow her to record the conversation?” Schlueter asked.

“Objection,” DiCesare bellowed.

“Sustained,” said Judge Rodriguez.

“There was basically a single subject that was to be discussed between you and Ms. Ortiz?” Schlueter asked.

“Yes,” said Loera.

“Can you tell us what that subject was?” Schlueter asked.

“It was a discussion of the involvement of one of my former board members in an unlawful criminal act,” Loera said.

“The POA [the San Bernardino Police Officers Association] had endorsed her opposition?” Schlueter asked.

DiCesare’s objection to the question was sustained.

“You wanted to be transparent with Dr. Ortiz?” Schlueter asked.

“Yes,” said Loera.

“But you did not want her to record the conversation?” Schlueter asked.

“Yes,” Loera said.

“Did you disclose that

to Dr Ortiz?” Schlueter asked.

“I did not,” Loera said.

“Did you ask her at any time if you were being recorded?” Schlueter asked.

“Objection,” DiCesare said.

“Overruled,” said Judge Rodriguez.

“I did not,” Loera responded.

“You didn’t tell Ms. Ortiz that Ms. Calvin could not listen in?” Schlueter asked.

“I did not,” said Loera.

“You were already seated when Ms. Calvin arrived?” Schlueter asked.

“Correct,” said Loera.

Schlueter thereafter sought to explore with Loera the setting within the confines of the table where Loera, Ortiz and Calvin were seated and the section of the coffee shop they were in. Schlueter also pressed Loera on what he had done to refresh his memory of the event that took place more than two years previously, whether he had listened to the recording and had read the report by the district attorney’s office investigators relating to the charges filed against Ortiz. Schlueter explored with Loera his recollection of Ortiz had placed the phone used to record their conversation on the table between them. “She did not tell you orally that she was recording?” Schlueter asked.

“Correct,” said Loera.

Schlueter then explored with Loera his statement to district attorney’s office investigators McDermott and Chavez made in the summer of 2025 about telling the hostess at the coffee shop “I want to go sit in a corner pretty much away from everybody else” where he could have some degree of isolation for a private conversation.

Loera, somewhat cagily, said he did not understand the question.

Schlueter then sought to play the recording of the August 15, 2024 encounter between Ortiz and Loera, starting from their meeting in the parking lot and moving

through until they were seated at the table and after Calvin arrived.

In doing so, Schlueter sought to use an equalizer that would confine what was audible to the 70-to-290 megahertz range, within which male and female human voices normally fall, thus eliminating most of the sound clutter other than the conversation involving Loera, Ortiz and Calvin. In playing the recording on his laptop and amplifying it through the microphones on the attorneys’ station and the courtroom’s sound system, however, the recording sounded decidedly different from the recording that had been played on Monday, which caused Judge Rodriguez to call for the audio to be brought to a halt. DiCesare made an objection to the use of the equalizer. There followed some exchange between the attorneys and the judge with regard to the unsuitability of the recording as it had been played through the equalizer, with a mild hint that Judge Rodriguez had the perception that Schlueter had tried to pull a fast one.

Schlueter dropped using what he had hoped would be a clarified version of the recording, settling on using the recording that had been submitted as a prosecution exhibit. Schlueter’s intent had been to dampen the extraneous noise in the seconds that followed Ortiz’s statement, which could be heard clearly, that being, “Just so we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say.”

Less audible and obscured by the ambient sound is Loera saying, “I’m in.”

This buttresses Schlueter’s contention that Ortiz informed Loera she was recording the conversation and obtained his consent to do so.

In their testimony, both Police Chief Goodman and Sergeant Loera stated that the audio tape of the meetings presented as exhibits by the

prosecution and played in court on Monday and Tuesday were fair and accurate representations of what was said by the parties present at the meetings on August 15, 2024 and August 29, 2024.

Schlueter sought to explore with the court whether it would permit the preparation of a refined or enhanced recording of the August 15, 2024 meeting that would allow those listening to it to discern statements by Loera, Ortiz or Calvin that are difficult to make out on the exhibit put forth by the prosecution.

“Audios can be cleaned to get rid of background noise,” Schlueter told the court. When DiCesare objected to the concept of substituting another recording of the August 15, 2024 meeting for the one already deemed an exhibit and heard by the jury or augmenting that recording with an enhanced version, Judge Rodriguez sternly responded, “Move on.”

Later in the afternoon, at 2:46 p.m., while the jury was on a break and not present in the courtroom, Judge Rodriguez, from her position on the bench, in an open exchange with the lawyers gave discourse to the tension and mounting frustration that had been building over Schlueter’s persistence in trying to widen the evidence and testimony being presented to the jury.

“I have made rulings and you are not abiding by them,” Rodriguez said, her penetrating gaze focused directly at Schlueter. “I do not have to allow you to ask questions that are beyond the ruling of this court.” Judge Rodriguez said that Schlueter had evinced a “repeated pattern” of straying into topics deemed off limits for litigation in the case. Schlueter took the upbraiding the judge was giving him as an opportunity to push again for “a better copy” of the audio recording of the August 15 meeting.

“That topic is closed to all discussion,” Judge Rodriguez’s voice fairly

Ortiz Trial *from page 16*

boomed. “That is not coming into evidence.”

While Rodriguez came across as focused upon what she saw as Schluter’s attempt to expose and re-expose the jurors to the issues being discussed in Ortiz’s conversations with Goodman and Loera, Schluter’s intent was to make certain that the members of the jury had an opportunity to hear what he contends was Loera’s reaction to Ortiz’s utterance – “Just so we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say” – as she displayed the face of her phone with the recording app engaged.

Judge Rodriguez was dismissive of Schluter’s suggestion that the recording that was marked as an exhibit, logged in as evidence and provided to the jury was not up to the task of demonstrating Ortiz’s innocence if it indeed constitutes such proof.

“The copy they [i.e., the district attorney’s office received] received came from your client,” Judge Rodriguez said.

Schluter was not just creating a spectacle that led to nowhere during testimony before the jury, Judge Rodriguez said, but was taking up the court’s and the prosecutor’s time in what she characterized as unnecessary discussions outside the presence of the jury.

“We spent ad nauseum on particular topics, 35 minutes, because you wanted to be heard on the same issues we already discussed,” Judge Rodriguez said. “I ruled on and sustained four objections [on that issue when it was raised before the jury]. In judge’s chambers I had to remind you you are violating court orders. I have allowed you more than the opportunity to be heard. We had days of in limine motions where I allowed you to be heard.”

She said that Schluter was leading the witnesses into discussion of issues and facts that were “not relevant. The court has made rulings and you have violated them. If I have to start admonishing you before the jury, I will. You can disagree with me as much as you like but that does not give the right as an officer of the court to violated the rulings that I have made.”

After the jury returned and Loera was once again on the witness stand, Schluter questioned the union president with regard to Ortiz’s verbalization that could be clearly heard on the recording – “Just so we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say.”

Loera said Ortiz was not holding her phone when she said that. According to Loera, Ortiz put her phone down shortly after or immediately upon their having seated themselves. He indicated the phone was “to her right but it wasn’t between us.” Loera said he had placed his phone to his right side.

“You remember this from two years ago?” Schluter asked.

“I do,” Loera responded.

Noting that some highly controversial and potentially damaging issues had been discussed during the meeting Loera had with Ortiz and Calvin, Schluter asked him, “Did you do anything to protect yourself and the POA from being misquoted?”

“I should have brought my own recorder,” Loera quipped.

Schluter questioned Loera with regard to those who were dining in DJ Coffee shop proximate to him, Ortiz and Calvin and might have overheard or been able to overhear parts of their conversation. Loera acknowledged that the

server at the coffee shop came up to their table multiple times. Schluter asked Loera if he would know if anyone was listening to him, he said, “Not behind me.”

When Schluter sought to slip in a question to Loera about his statement made during that conversation that the San Bernardino Police Officers Association and its members were police officers were “paying for the mistakes of our forefathers” slightly botching it to make a reference to “sins of our forefathers,” it went nowhere. Judge Rodriguez sustained DiCesare’s objection.

Schluter then took up a statement Loera made during DiCheare’s direct examination, in which he dwelled upon how Ortiz’s recording of the conversation without his consent had violated his privacy rights. That call had touched off a brief exchange among Loera, Ortiz and Calvin about raising children. In this way, Loera had suggested, Ortiz’s recording had intruded into his family life.

“Your daughter called but you did not take the call,” Schluter said, and Loera acknowledged that he had responded to his daughter by text.

Schluter asked Loera if at any time during the meeting he told Ortiz or Calvin “you wanted to keep this conversation between them and them alone?”

“I did not,” Loera said.

When Schluter was able to get Loera to admit that “Ms. Calvin is an extremely outspoken individual” and moved beyond that to get him to say that she would be likely to go public with anything he disclosed during the conversation, Judge Rodriguez sustained DiCesare’s objection to that line of inquiry.

Nevertheless, Schluter did manage to wring from Loera that he at the very least suspected that Ortiz would disclose anything he told her.

“I thought eventually it would get out,” he said.

Loera’s testimony

wrapped up late Wednesday afternoon, and he was dismissed as a witness, subject to recall.

Thursday morning, DiCesare called Darnel McDermott, a district attorney’s office investigator who had been assigned with his office colleague, Jorge Chavez, to investigate Ortiz’s allegations that members of the San Bernardino Police Department had used their access to local, state and federal law enforcement data bases for political purposes, to the witness stand.

McDermott disclosed in his testimony that in May 2025 Ortiz emailed a complaint to the district attorney’s office relating to information she had been provided the previous year by Goodman and Loera pertaining to former San Bernardino Police Detective Steven Desrochers having accessed the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, managed by the California Attorney General’s Office which merges information in its possession with that contained in the data bases of the California Department of Motor Vehicles and law enforcement agencies throughout the state, to obtain information relating to her. By 2019, Ortiz had emerged as one of then-San Bernardino Mayor John Valdivia’s primary political antagonists, when she ran against Juan Figueroa in a special election to fill the city’s Third Ward council post, a position Valdivia had vacated after he was elected mayor in 2018. Valdivia was supported by the San Bernardino Police Officers Association as was Figueroa, who was Valdivia’s choice to succeed him. Over the next two years, Ortiz grew into an even more committed and vituperative Opponent to Valdivia, and she opposed him in the 2022 mayoral contest.

When McDermott and Chavez failed to get any traction or make meaningful progress on the investigation of Desrochers, Ortiz on August 13, 2025 provided

the district attorney’s office with a flash drive that contained copies of the recordings she had made of the conversation among her, Loera and Calvin on August 15, 2024 and the conversation she had with Goodman and Beard on August 29, 2024.

McDermott began as a law enforcement officer with the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department in 2014, where he served as a deputy until 2022, and hired on as an investigator with the district attorney’s office in 2023. Chavez began with the district attorney’s office as an investigator the same year.

Upon examining the contents of the flash drive and listening to the recordings, McDermott and Chavez heard no overt verbal disclosure by Ortiz that she was recording the conversations and they heard no consent to being recorded given by Goodman, Beard, Loera or Calvin. By August 18, 2025, McDermott’s and Chavez’s investigation had morphed from an investigation into improper use of governmental/law enforcement agency assets, equipment and authority by a law enforcement officer against a civilian/citizen into an investigation of Ortiz having violated California Penal Code Section 632 and victimizing two sworn police officers.

The investigation into Desrochers’ action, which Goodman in August 2024 said he had ordered up at the district attorney’s office, had languished for a full year, and was terminated a month later. Within five days of having received the recordings from Ortiz, which she considered probative of the case against Desrochers but which were perceived differently by those to whom they had been entrusted, the district attorney’s office had identified her as a primary suspect against whom it was ready to move with alacrity. Indeed, the following day, August 19, 2025, McDermott and Chavez interviewed Ortiz. While

they did not inform her that she had now become a target of their investigation rather than a witness/victim, they did tell her they were recording their exchange with her. The subject they delved into was the recordings Ortiz made of her exchanges with Goodman and Loera. with both city police officers.

Thursday morning, DiCesare played the interview turned interrogation that McDermott had recorded on August 19, 2025. In that exchange and her responses, Ortiz stated that her meetings with Goodman and Loera had been “on the record,” with everyone knowing that to be the case.

Unbeknownst to Ortiz at the time, McDermott and Chavez were securing statements from Goodman and Loera that they had not known their conversation with Ortiz were being recorded and that Ortiz had not asked them for permission to record their verbal exchanges.

This constituted a prima facie Penal Code Section 632 violation according to the district attorney’s office, which at that point had lost, assuming it had ever had any, enthusiasm for pursuing a criminal case against, Desrochers, a now-retired law enforcement professional. In October 2025, McDermott, Chavez and the district attorney’s office in general officially closed out the investigation of Desrochers’ misuse of the law enforcement data bases, making a conclusion that Ortiz’s accusations in that regard were “unfounded.”

In response to DiCesare’s direct examination, McDermott said he took photos of Ortiz’s cellphone, extending to determining what the screen displaying different apps looked like and what the screen looked like when an app was selected and what the screen looked like when an app was actuated.

Under DiCesare’s guidance, McDermott described photos he had taken of the section of DJ Coffee shop in which

Law Enforcement Surveillance Is Virtually Ubiquitous Countywide from page 3

protection was in place at all. This has resulted in live feeds and/or stored local footage to be accessed by means of simple uniform resource locator.

Flock Safety is adamant: None of its central cloud infrastructure has ever been compromised and no customer (i.e., law enforcement agency) data has been offloaded by bad actors. The few documented cases of exposed camera feeds that have taken place were, Flock maintains, isolated configuration errors or stand-alone units that broke down or were broken into and were not the outcome of a successful systemic cyber-attack on the company's database. Those who are knowledgeable about such systems who are not employed by Flock and who have examined those "isolated" failures say the manner in which some live feeds have been penetrated and administration interfaces tapped into is a clear indicator that the Flock system is less than fully secure and vulnerable to unauthorized access.

There are confirmed accounts of instances, including an infamous one locally, in which a law enforcement agency's account link protocol and/or credentials were compromised via third-party infostealer malware and shared or sold on cybercrime forums, prompting calls for stricter mandatory multi-factor authentication.

Earlier this year, there was a not insignificant outcry at the local level in San Bernardino County against Flock, including a very spirited push by the Warehouse Worker Resource Center, members of which locked arms with concerned residents, asking various city councils in the county to cancel their contracts with Flock Safety.

Nevertheless, unlike

in at least some communities elsewhere, that civil libertarian sentiment was met by and ultimately smothered throughout most of San Bernardino County by a degree of pro-law enforcement zeal that has prevented the Anti-Flockers from achieving any real traction.

San Bernardino County, the largest such jurisdiction in the lower 48 states at 20,105 square miles, consists of 22 cities, two incorporated towns and no fewer than 56 distinct unincorporated towns, communities, villages, hamlets and districts and at least that many wide spots in the road. Ten of those cities — Chino, Montclair, Upland Ontario, Fontana, Rialto, Colton, San Bernardino, Redlands and Barstow have their own police departments. Twelve other cities and the two incorporated towns contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department for the provision of law enforcement services. The sheriff's department covers the remaining unincorporated portions of the county as well.

The sheriff's department has a contract with Flock for the use of its automated license plate readers and accompanying software and some other limited devices. The sheriff's department has installed those license plate readers in most, though not all of its contract cities and towns. In virtually all such instances, the contract city, as part of the contract, reimburses the sheriff's department for at least a portion of the sheriff's department's purchase of the technology from Flock.

The City of Twentynine Palms hosts a network of Flock cameras under a contract tied to the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department deployment of the devices that extends through 2027.

Yucca Valley utilizes Flock license plate readers through the sheriff's department.

Rancho Cucamonga uses Flock's automated license plate readers and

local surveillance networks, through the sheriff's department.

The city of Needles uses Flock's automated license plate reader technology operated by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.

74-square mile Victorville has heavily invested in expanding an extensive network of over 100 high-speed license plate reading cameras to create a functional perimeter around roadways and intersections.

The cities of Hesperia and Adelanto and the Town of Apple Apple host, through the sheriff's department, Flock cameras.

Chino Hills, a sheriff's department contract city, originally used license plate readers designed by Vigilant Systems, and now utilizes Flock's solar powered cameras trained on vehicles to catch their license plate numbers.

The city of Big Bear Lake does not have an independent municipal contract for Flock automated license plate reader cameras, but law enforcement in the area, consisting primarily of the sheriff's department with back-up by the California Highway Patrol, utilizes regional and portable license plate reading infrastructure manufactured by Flock and deployed by the sheriff's department. While the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Office utilizes and deploys Flock's license plate reading technology in various parts of the county, Big Bear Lake itself has not directly contracted or publicly installed a dedicated municipal network of Flock cameras.

Most of San Bernardino County's cities which have their own independent police department's use Flock systems, though in a few of those cities, they have more substantial contracts with other surveillance equipment companies, which are actually Flock's competitors. One city in particular purposely has spurned Flock in favor of other companies.

The City of San Bernardino operates license plate readers through an active contract with Flock Safety and features dozens of active cameras within city limits, which has been a point of active local community discussion and debate.

The City of Ontario uses Flock automated license plate recognition technology as do the cities of Upland, Barstow and Chino.

Redlands residents and civil liberties advocates have questioned the expanding network of Flock Safety cameras over concerns regarding warrantless mass surveillance and Fourth Amendment privacy rights. Nevertheless, Redlands has an active contract with Flock Safety for

The Fontana Police Department deploys Flock's automated license plate readers, and city records show approvals for purchasing and expanding contracts with Flock Group Inc. to monitor major intersections and roadways like Foothill Boulevard and Sierra Avenue. The Fontana PD Transparency Portal and official city policies state the cameras are used for official law enforcement needs, such as tracking stolen vehicles, locating missing persons, and investigating major crimes.

The Colton Police Department utilizes real-time Flock alerts to identify vehicles linked to crimes and assist units like the Multi-Enforcement Team during traffic stops and pursuits. The Colton Police Department also maintains a community camera registry, allowing residents and local businesses to voluntarily register private security cameras to help investigators request footage during an incident.

The City of Rialto, which was the first city in San Bernardino County to outfit its officers with body cameras, in doing so initiated a relationship with Flock's primary competitor, Axon.

Rialto Police Chief Mark Kling has spoken glowingly about Rialto's broader use of Axon's

AI-driven surveillance tools — including systems that can link police to participating businesses' security cameras with owner permission — as part of the city's most recent \$14.3 million Axon contract. The Rialto City Council approved a nine-year Axon Enterprise deal that expands the department's surveillance, software, and artificial intelligence capabilities. This package includes upgraded body-worn and in-car cameras, digital evidence platforms, automated video analysis, license-plate readers, and Rialto's first drone-as-a-first-responder program. Chief Kling has gone on record as saying the \$14.3 million contract has succeeded in assuring the department can "arm our officers with the best technology... to help officers do the job... and serve our community better." That contract gives the city the use of FUSUS, an Axon system that connects police to participating businesses' security cameras with the owner's consent, saying it "reduces delays in obtaining footage and can generate more investigative leads."

In recent months, Rialto's use of surveillance equipment brought it some unwelcome scrutiny when it was disclosed by John Oliver with HBO that HBO had, through a public records request, ascertained individual Rialto police officers' monitoring of the civilian videos the police department had access within the city had monitored 1,138,585 passages of unknown duration caught on those security cameras, which had in turn been logged into the department's data base. The print-out of that log ran to 30,413 pages, with no fewer than 45 video passages registered on each page. According to Oliver, officers spent over 100 hours monitoring cameras at the Days Inn hotel for "hundreds of hours," including the one facing the pool.

While it has been emphasized that Rialto does not contract with Flock

or utilized Flock's cameras or its data base and that the data collected in Rialto is managed on city-owned servers rather than through third-party vendors like Flock, there are civil liberties advocates who point out that Rialto's abuse of surveillance capability available to it more than equals that by nearby cities making use of Flock's systems.

The American Civil Liberties Union has noted that Flock's system records and shares vehicle data indiscriminately with and among law enforcement agencies contracting with it nationwide, based upon so-called agency-to-agency privilege, raising privacy concerns, including what limitations on the distribution of the information exist.

With local police defending automated license plate readers as a vital tool for solving retail thefts and locating stolen property, community pushback mirrors a broader statewide and national backlash against Flock any regarding data tracking and potential misuse.

In San Bernardino County, where in excess of 50 percent of the population is Hispanic and and oughty 119,000 of the county's 2.2 million population are undocumented foreigners in the country illegally, advocates for immigrants have expressed worry that the collected data could potentially be accessed or shared with federal immigration enforcement agencies such as the Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security. ICE and DHS.

There is no state or federal limitation on police departments sharing law enforcement networks, and individual departments and officer can choose to share data with other law enforcement agencies.

At issue in the use of automated license plate reading technology are operational effectiveness, privacy concerns transparency and the

Continued on Page 20

San Bernardino County Coroner Reports

Coroner’s Case #702604543: On Friday, 07/03/2026, at 07:52 a.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to the 400 block of Lemon Avenue in Ontario. Rebecca Valles, a 74-year-old homeless resident of Ontario, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/07/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604536: On Thursday, 07/02/2026, at 08:19 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to Highway 62 near mile marker 105 in the city of Rice for a traffic collision. Driver Robert Flores, a 55-year-old resident of Hemet, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/07/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604491: On Monday, 07/01/26, 01:20 a.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to 40000 block of Valley of the Falls Drive for a traffic collision. Passenger Andrew Whitehead, a 19-year-old male resident of San Bernardino, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/02/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604467: On Monday, 06/29/2026, at 9:50 p.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department responded to Main Street and Hesperia Avenue in Hesperia. Pedestrian Eric Jenkins, a 43-year-old resident of Hesperia, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/29/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604411: On Saturday, 06/27/2026, at 8:21 p.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department responded to Wichita Road and Zuni Road for a traffic collision. The driver, Lorena Lopez, a 33-year-old resident of Apple Valley, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/28/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604402: On Saturday, 06/27/2026 at 08:50 a.m., the Rialto Police Department responded to the 1400 block of Foothill Boulevard. Robert Luna, a 71-year-old male resident of Rancho Cucamonga, name withheld pending positive identification, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the Rialto Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/30/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604388: On Friday, 06/26/2026, at 8:50 p.m., the Rialto Police Department responded to the Metrolink Willow Avenue Railroad Crossing in Rialto. Ryan Reid, a 46-year-old resident of Rialto, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Rialto Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/27/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604379: On Friday, 06/26/2026, at 02:46 p.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded to Highland Avenue and Del Rosa Avenue for a traffic collision. Motorcyclist Jason Rowland, a 49-year-old resident of San Bernardino, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/26/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604360: On Friday, 06/26/2026, at 12:12 a.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Southbound US 95 south of Vidal California for a traffic collision. The driver Esther Gonzalez Aguila, a 61-year-old resident of Tijuana Mexico, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/27/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604358: On Friday, 06/26/2026, at 10:03 p.m., the Redlands Police Department responded to the Orange St and Pioneer Ave in Redlands for a traffic collision. Pedestrian Virginia Yglesias, a 38-year-old resident of Redlands, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Redlands Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/26/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604343: On Thursday, 06/25/2026, at 07:10 a.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department responded the 15900 block of Smoke Tree Street in Hesperia. Christina Bly Mora, a 64-year-old resident of Hesperia, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino Sheriff’s Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/26/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604282: On Monday, 06/22/2026, at 12:50 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Northbound Interstate 15 and Calico Road in Yermo for traffic collision. Passenger William Hernandez, a 35-year-old male resident of Los Angeles, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol in Barstow. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/23/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604281: On Monday, 06/22/2026, at 12:50 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Northbound Interstate 15 and Calico Road in Yermo for traffic collision. Passenger Adelyn Hernandez, a 7-year-old male resident of Los Angeles, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol in Barstow. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/23/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604280: On Monday, 06/22/2026, at 12:50 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Northbound Interstate 15 and Calico Road in Yermo for traffic collision. Driver Karen Perez, a 33-year-old female resident of Los Angeles, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol in Barstow. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/23/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604278: On Monday, 06/22/2026, at 06:30 p.m., the Barstow Police Department responded to the 2900 block of Lenwood Road in Barstow. Tony Jones, a 57-year-old resident of Michigan, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Barstow Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/23/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604261: On Sunday, 06/21/2026, at 09:53 a.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to the 3700 block of E. Inland Empire Boulevard in Ontario. Richard Nowak, a 55-year-old resident of Ontario, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/22/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604258: On Sunday, 06/21/2026, at 09:02 a.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to the area of S. Mountain Avenue and W. Mission Boulevard in Ontario. Miguel Avelar, a 31-year-old homeless resident of Ontario, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/22/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604239: On Saturday, 06/20/2026, at 06:51 a.m., the Barstow Police Department responded to the 2800 block of Lenwood Road in Barstow. Jessica Ricordati, a 46-year-old homeless resident of Barstow, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Barstow Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/23/2026)

Coroner’s Case #702604237: On Saturday, 06/20/2026, at 00:30 a.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded to the 1600 block of E. Highland Avenue in San Bernardino. Nisani Montgomery, a 19-year-old resident of Redlands, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the San Bernardino Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 06/22/2026)

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

Ortiz Trial from page 18

Leora, Ortiz and Calvin had met, some of which had electronically inserted measurements to show the width of the aisle and dimensions of the tables. According to McDermott, the depth, i.e., the length of the section of the coffee shop where they met was 16 feet and one inch. The width of the aisle between the tables on either side of the section was 4 feet and 8 inches, McDermott said.

In his cross-examination of McDermott, Schlueter sought from the investigator what he had concentrated on with regard to his client’s recording of the police chief and sergeant, in particular the placement of the three phones on the tables when they met, most particularly

Ortiz’s. Schlueter’s question of McDermott elicited that while he had listened to the entirety of the recording of the conversation among Ortiz, Loera and Calvin before he interviewed Loera, he had not listened to the entirety of the conversation with Goodman before he interviewed the police chief.

Schlueter’s questioning also brought out that while McDermott recorded his single interview with Loera and his first interview with Goodman, when he returned to interview Goodman a second time, in particular about the placement of Ortiz’s phone during their August 29, 2024 meeting, that interview was not recorded.

Schlueter asked McDermott if during his interview with Loera he had asked if the police sergeant where he was

looking when Ortiz uttered “Just so we make sure of everything we say to each other, so that what we talk about, you know what I say and I know what you say.”

“No,” McDermott said.

“Why not? Schlueter asked.

“I didn’t think of the question at that time,” McDermott responded.

After McDermott stepped down as a witness and some exchanges among the attorney’s with regard to exhibits and evidence, the prosecution rested.

Called by Schlueter as the first defense witness was Scott Beard.

In Context, Promoting Water & Electricity Intensive Development Without Adequate Utilities In Place, Adelanto Solons Appear To Be On The Take from page 5

centers,” Waggener repeated over and over.

Those in attendance understood that, however, and recognized that what the meeting was about was giving the city

council political cover, meaning that in adopting changes to Title 17 of the Adelanto Municipal Code pertaining to data centers at some point in the relatively near

future, the mayor and council members would be able to cite the planning commission recommendation to do so as a rationale for their decision.

As it turned out, however, the mayor and city council will not be able to do that, as the planning commission, in def-

erence to the overriding public opposition to data centers, voted 3-to-2 against recommending the zone changes to the city council. Waggener and Vice Chair Ricardo Rubalcava voted to recommend the adoption of the amendment, asserting in union, essentially, that an influx of

data centers will benefit the city economically. They were opposed in that view by Terry Delgado, Paul Casilla and Jayshawn Johnson.

Though the highest ranking members of the planning department do not want to get in Dutch with the mayor, the city council or the city manager by openly coming out against constructing data centers en masse in the city, planning division staff members and those in the city’s engineering division are against the zoning update that is being forced upon them. Some of those have expressed the opinion that “money in brown paper bags” going to the city’s top decision makers is the rationale behind the zone code re-vamping.

In reaction, the city council is now moving to scapegoat Waggener.

“I was extremely disappointed with how the business was handled,” Mayor Reyes said at the August 26 Adelanto City Council meeting, a week after the August 19 debacle. He made it sound as if it was Waggener who was seeking to push the city into accepting the building of data centers.

“That is not who we are and how we conduct ourselves.”

Reyes indicated he believed Waggener should be removed as commission chairman.

Evans, who is vying against Reyes for mayor in this years election, joined in with him, but went further. She said she wanted Waggener bounced off the commission completely. “We have removed commissioners in the past when we didn’t agree with the way they addressed the commission,” Evans asserted, saying that Waggener had spoken to residents “in a way that was completely inappropriate.”

Reyes used his mayoral authority to call for a vote by the council next month to remove Waggener as the commission chairman.

Meanwhile, a band of outspoken residents say they are not fooled by Reyes’ or Evans’ words and that the entire council – Reyes, Evans, Ramos Meza and Uptergrove – are in the pockets of the nascent data center industry.

-Mark Gutglueck

We Are Not Big Brother But Just Trying To Do An Efficient Job Of Collaring Criminals, Police Say from page 18

law. In some ways, efficiency, transparency and privacy rights are incomparable.

Some cities, like Chino, have a “Flock transparency portal.” Clever criminals or those looking to invade people’s privacy can take advantage of that.

Searches of the surveillance system used by police agencies are logged and tied to a specific user account so supervisors can review who searched for what and when, but there is no legal leverage for those outside the realm of law enforcement agencies to

audit those uses or use patterns. Public oversight and tracking tools are slim or nonexistent. Audits can only be done internally or by the California Attorney General’s Office of the U.S. Justice Department.

There have been attempts to create public records databases by civil liberties groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union or the Electronic Frontier Foundation to monitor how law enforcement agencies use and share automatic license plate reader data. Some of these have proven to be of limited effectiveness. Tools like Have I Been Flocked? compile public records and search logs obtained from government agencies so citizens can check if their license plates have been run through the system.

Those civil libertarians are dupes of the criminal class, several of San Bernardino County’s law enforcement professionals have suggested.

According to Chino Police Chief Kevin Mensen, video cameras set up all around Chino have proven an irreplaceable factor in the about half of the cases solved by the detectives in the department he oversees. Chino has 86 Flock automated license plate readers within its city limits.

The civil libertarians in San Bernardino County have learned that when it comes to dictating whether law enforcement agencies can or cannot use electronic means to keep an eye on everyone, the law enforcement agencies, in the personages of their chiefs of police are boss.

When the question of whether those agencies and their police chiefs or Flock is the boss on the territory they commonly inhabit is asked, it seems Flock is higher up the totem pole.

There are a few examples of the tail wagging the dog when it comes to surveillance technology. Within the last six to eight months, Flock has imposed on law enforcement users mandatory security measures, which extend to reducing the standard data retention window from 30 days to seven days, requiring an opt-in for audit assistance to detect abnormal search behavior and case code searches from the records management system.

-Mark Gutglueck