

Jury Renders Split Verdict In Councilwoman’s Trial Over Recording Top Police Officials

By Mark Gutglueck
SAN BERNARDINO (September 9)—San Bernardino 7th Ward Councilwoman Treasure Ortiz this afternoon was convicted on a charge of unlawfully recording her August 29, 2024 conversation with San Bernardino Police Chief Darren Goodman but acquitted of a similar charge relating to her use of her cellphone to electronically memorialize

another conversation she had two weeks earlier, on August 15, 2024 with Sergeant Jose Loera, the president of the San Bernardino Police Officers Association. While the jury’s verdicts have brought the curtain down on the trial court proceedings in what was a tightly circumscribed airing of facts that proceeded out of a far wider circumstance than what was

framed by the San Bernardino County District Attorney’s Office for the jury’s consideration, Ortiz’s attorney vowed to pursue an appeal and press forward with Ortiz’s civil case against the City of San Bernardino and its police department. It was Ortiz’s effort more than two years ago to document a series of events that formed the foundation of that civil

suit which resulted in the recordings that constituted the crimes the district attorney’s office alleged she had committed and which served as the primary evidence presented against her, which ultimately led to both her conviction and acquittal. Ortiz, a professor in the field of public administration at Cal State San Bernardino has been involved in county and local politics for the better

part of the last decade. In 2018, she applied for and was considered by the four remaining members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors for appointment to replace James Ramos as Third District County Supervisor after he was elected to the California Assembly that November with two years remaining on his term as supervisor. She did not garner that **See P 2**

Chino City Council Rejects Two Separate Efforts By Development Companies To Evade Required Undergrounding Of Electrical Lines At 26.6 Units Per Acre Housing Tracts

In order for two separate development companies to proceed with developments that will exceed a density of more than 26 units per acre, they will need to underground the overhead power lines that stretch across the property where the building is to take place, the Chino City Council ruled on September 1. Both Warmington Homes and BCT Development Acquisition sought to convince city staff and the city council that in exchange for reserving ten homes of the 100 the former intends to build on 3.76 acres and 21 of the 210 apartment units the latter is going to construct on eight acres for low-income homebuyers or renters that they should be excused from the requirement contained in the city’s code that they take the power lines span across those properties and run them the length of each development through underground vaults. Traditionally in California, land use decisions were province of local governments rather than that of the state legislature or bureaucrats in the state capital. In this way, city councils or planning commissions, in consultation with city planning staffs determined the character of the development that was **See P 3**

Redlands Police Chief Leaving Three Years After Her Situational Diversity Promotion

The City of Redlands’ grand but short-lived experiment with Rachel Tolber as its police chief is about to end, not with a bang but a whimper, along with some costs City Hall might not have otherwise sustained, while leaving the city in essentially the same fix it was in when she was brought in to head up the troubled department three years ago.

Tolber’s ascendancy to police chief had not been anticipated. The traditionally male-dominated law enforcement profession in recent years has given way to some distaff police chiefs across the country, in California and Southern California, but Redlands did not seem a likely candidate for that particular brand of modernization. Indeed, the Redlands Po-

lice Department of the last decade of the Twentieth Century and first two decades-plus of the Third Millennium was famous, or infamous, for being, if not hostile toward, certainly unaccommodating of, ambitious woman who wanted to rise in rank and meaningful accomplishment in the field of countering criminal activity. That was something best

left to the boys, was the seeming attitude. If a woman working for the Redlands Police Department truly wanted to be of service and get ahead, the best way to do that would be on her knees providing one of the department’s captains or lieutenants or watch commanders – someone who might have some sway with regard to who was to get promoted –

with some oral appreciation and tension relief. Tolber was the exception that proved the rule. She hired on with the department as a policewoman in 1998. She promoted to sergeant in 2011. In 2017, her 19th year as a law enforcement professional, she was made lieutenant. In 2019, she was promoted to commander, overseeing the special **See P 3**

Hydrogen Fuel Cell Busses In Use In The High Desert

In the denouement to over five years of planning and arrangements, the Victor Valley Transit Authority has begun to phase into operation 13 hydrogen fuel cell electric. The Victor Valley Transit Authority, headquartered in Hesperia, operates one route into South Adelanto, another into North Adelanto, on that travels Highway 395, Palmdale Road, Air Expressway and rejoining Highway 95, six routes serving Apple Valley, six serving Barstow, three regional and inter-city connections to and from Helendale/Silver Lakes and Lucerne Valley, five within and around Hesperia and Oak Hills, nine commut-

er lines in Victorville, two commuter routes to Fort Irwin National Training Center and provides service South on the I-15 Freeway to California State University, San Bernardino and westward to Fontana and back. A hydrogen fuel cell generates electricity by combining hydrogen, which is the fuel for the vehicle stored in pressurized tanks, and ambient oxygen through an electrochemical interreaction. A fuel cell has three has three core components that are layered, including an anode – a negative electrode around which the hydrogen is introduced, a cathode – a negative electrode at the point where hydrogen flows into the mix and an electrolyte, a membrane between the anode and cathode chambers that allows only positive ions pass through. Pres-

surized hydrogen enters the anode side of the cell, whereupon a catalyst, generally consisting of platinum, splits the hydrogen molecules

“Mad Dog” Crawford In Custody After Lamming It Following Shooting Of Barstow Man

Barstow Police on September 4 arrested Maurice Antonio “Mad Dog” Crawford, more than four weeks after he is believed to have shot another man in the head. “On Thursday, August 6, 2026, Barstow Police officers responded to the 700 block of East Virginia Way regarding a shooting,” according to the Barstow Police Department. “Upon arrival, officers located

a 32-year-old Barstow resident suffering from a gunshot wound to the head. Barstow Fire Protection District and Desert Ambulance personnel responded and began life-saving measures. The victim was transported by helicopter to a regional trauma center, where he remains hospitalized and continues to receive treat- **See P 3**

Apple Valley Homeless Aid Effort Nets Eleven Arrests

What started ostensibly as a homeless outreach operation in the Town of Apple Valley on September 9 missed its originally stated purpose of helping the dispossessed who have been reduced to living on the streets, and turned into a round-up of at least 11 people. While officials stuck

by their assertion that the action initiated was benign or intended as such, the paramilitary approach that was taken in approaching the homeless encampments, which included guns being drawn on at least two occasion, together with the more than a third of those involved being dressed in combat gear, led some to question whether the goal from the outset was to make arrests. What was dubbed the Town of Apple Valley Multi-Enforcement Team, consisting of the Town of Apple Valley code enforcement division, the sheriff’s department’s Homeless Outreach Proactive Enforcement Team, known by its Orwellian acronym H.O.P.E., the sheriff’s department’s Innovative Remote On-site Assistance Delivery Team, known **See P 11**

**Information That
Appeared To Have
Originated With A
Law Enforcement
Network Database
Was Used During
The 2024 Campaign
By A San Bernardi-
no City Council
Candidate Endorsed
By The SBPOA**
from front page

appointment, but ran in the specially called May 2019 election to fill the vacancy created on the San Bernardino City Council as a consequence of then-Third Ward Councilman John Valdivia having gained election as mayor in the same November 2018 election and his having resigned from his council post with, likewise, two years remaining on the term to which he had been previously elected. Ortiz lost the May 2019 election to Juan Figueroa, who had been handpicked by Mayor Valdivia to replace him and proved unbeatable with Valdivia's endorsement and the support of the same network of donors who had backed Valdivia.

During and in the aftermath of the 2019 election, Ortiz demonstrated herself as an implacable opponent of the pay-to-play political culture that was festering around Valdivia in which he was receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign donations and under-the-table cash payments from landowners, real estate speculators, developers, city franchise holders and entities competing for those franchises, business owners and principals whose businesses were competing for or had obtained contracts with the city to deliver goods or services and entrepreneurs seeking business operating permits and then militating on behalf of those who had given him the money to obtain city council decisions in their favor. In this context Ortiz leveled barbs at the San Bernardino Police Officers Union for its involvement in the Valdivia graftfest, based upon

the union's endorsement of him and his support of police officers association in its collective bargaining with the city for pay raise and benefit increases for the city's police officers.

In 2022, Ortiz was among six candidates who challenged Valdivia for the mayor's post up in that year's June primary election. She finished fourth, not too far behind Valdivia, whose third place finish behind former San Bernardino City Attorney Jim Penman and former San Bernardino Human Services Director Helen Tran kept him out of the run-off in the November 2022 race, ultimately won by Tran.

Ortiz remained active in civic affairs.

In 2023, having relocated to a residence in the city's Seventh Ward, Ortiz resolved to run for the city council once again, challenging the Seventh Ward incumbent, Damon Alexander, in the March 2024 primary.

Shortly after taking out nominations papers for the Seventh Ward slot, Ortiz was contacted by Penman, also a Seventh Ward resident, who was likewise intent on running against Alexander. Ortiz met with Penman, who informed her that members of the police union were intent on preventing her from capturing a position on the city council and were researching her thoroughly to find damning information that would be utilized by the union's political action committee as the basis for "hit pieces" – mailers attacking her on the basis of her arrest record and interactions with law enforcement officers memorialized in data bases shared by local, state and national law enforcement agencies. He advised her to pull out of the race at once to avoid irreparable harm to her reputation. Shortly thereafter, a push-poll was mailed to high propensity voters in the Seventh Ward featuring suggestive questions insinuating that that Ortiz had a criminal record and inquiring whether, that being the case, the

voter would be more or less likely to vote for her.

Ortiz scheduled an appointment with San Bernardino Police Chief Darren Goodman on November 18, 2023, at which she alerted him that members of his department were, on behalf of the police officers association of which they were also members, accessing the one or more of the criminal justice system data bases – NCIC, JDIC, CLETS CNI – to assemble damaging or prejudicial information relating to the opponents of the political candidates the San Bernardino Police Officers Association was backing. Goodman expressed utter skepticism about what Ortiz was telling him, insisting that the men under his command were law enforcement professionals committed to upholding the law and abiding by the protocols and regulations pertaining to accessing and utilizing the information contained in those data bases, which is deemed confidential and is therefore closely guarded. That information, under the data sharing arrangements among the departments and agencies that make up those network, is strictly limited to use in investigations and legitimate law enforcement operations. The misuse of information gleaned from the system or its diversion into the hands of those using it for illegitimate purposes, including political campaigning, would risk the department's continuing participation in the network and future access to information critical to the department's operations. It was unthinkable, indeed impossible, Goodman said, that what Ortiz told him had happened could have occurred. Nevertheless, Goodman said, there were what he called "trails" showing what terminal at specific agencies tied into the network had requested information from the data bases, and he would look into whether an inquiry with regard to Ortiz had been.

Two months later, in January 2024 and just

as the campaign for the March primary was intensifying, Ortiz contacted the police chief again about the matter. Goodman, in explaining why he had not gotten back to Ortiz, said that he had run an audit of the data bases and that there were no trails between the department and data files relating to her in the data bases.

In the March 2024 primary, both Ortiz and Penman outdistanced Alexander, but neither polled a majority of the vote, which would have resulted in the council post being awarded to the winner outright. Instead, Penman, with 31.1 percent of the vote was consigned to a runoff in the November balloting against Ortiz, who had captured 39 percent of the March primary vote. Ortiz's stronger showing in the primary was alarming to Penman and his supporters, among the most prominent of which were the members of the San Bernardino Police Officers Association.

Penman had been the elected city attorney in San Bernardino for 26 years, having first been elected in 1987 and re-elected six times. He had, in 1994 vied unsuccessfully for San Bernardino County district attorney, a run which had widened and increased his name recognition. He had garnered, in addition to the police officers association endorsement, the support of other public employee and public safety unions. He had greater political experience and a greater depth of support throughout both the political, business and social establishment in the county seat. One factor that ran counter to that and in Ortiz's favor was that she had Scott Beard, an established real estate professional and developer, in her corner. Beard had proven over the years to be one of the most prolific of political donors in San Bernardino and the surrounding cities. More notably still, he had championed a recall effort against all seven of the city's coun-

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

cil members, the mayor, the city attorney and the city clerk in 2013. He abandoned that effort against two of the council members when they ran aground themselves with regard to other legal issues and he did not follow through on trying to remove the mayor, who opted out of seeking reelection that year, rendering his recall moot. The petition gatherers came up short in getting sufficient signatures to remove the city clerk and three of the council members. The recall effort proceeded against Penman, who was then the city attorney, as well as Wendy McCammack, a councilwoman who was running for mayor that year, and Councilman Valdivia. Valdivia managed to retain his seat, with 705 of his constituents voting to keep him in office and 425 voting to remove him. McCammack, however, was ousted from office by a vote of 1,460 to 1,033. Penman, likewise, was voted out of office, by a vote of 7,730 to 5,013, ending his streak of five straight electoral victories since what was at that time his only his previous electoral defeat when he ran for district attorney in 1994.

Beard brought to the 2024 7th Ward campaign not just his wealth, but a degree of experience and political savvy that included contacts with campaign consultants and publicity professionals, the ability to put the arm on other potential donors, some of whom came across with money provided to the Ortiz

campaign and a built-in animus toward Penman, based on the 2013 recall and issues that had grown out of that. For that reason as well as Ortiz's appeal to a grass roots element in the city that stood generally in opposition to the political, social and business establishment, the 2024 Seventh Ward November runoff was a spirited contest that was by no means one-sided or predictable in its outcome.

By July, the Seventh Ward race was heating up and the electioneering was becoming ruthless. Ortiz again contacted Goodman, this time providing him with multiple specifics about what sort of information was surfacing during the campaign. The police chief once again expressed his doubts, but said he would redouble his inquiry.

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 the survey go back more than the three years Goodman had previously requested after his November 2023 contact with Ortiz. Goodman, somewhat sheepishly, told her that the more comprehensive audit had indeed verified that her name had been run and information pertaining to her retrieved from the California

Continued on Page 4

Hydrogen Fuel Cell Powered Busses Now Deployed In The Victor Valley *from front page*

into positive protons and negative electrons, after which the protons pass through the electrolyte membrane to migrate to the cathode chamber. The membrane simultaneously blocks the electrons, which are bled off into wires that form an external electrical circuit. That electron flow becomes the electric cur-

rent used to power the vehicle. Air, comprised of about 20.95 percent oxygen is pumped into the cathode side. This yields water, the nonpolluting byproduct of the process.

The hydrogen fuel cell buses are currently being deployed on routes throughout the Victor Valley Transit system, including Interstate 15. University, San Bernardino (CSUSB).

"This is an exciting moment for the Victor Valley Transit Authority because our investment

in hydrogen technology is no longer something we're simply planning for; it's here, and our passengers are starting to benefit from this today," said Victor Valley Transit Authority Chief Executive Officer Rod Goldman. "These buses represent our commitment to providing safe and reliable transportation while continuing to embrace technologies that make public transit cleaner, more efficient, and more sustainable for the areas we serve."

According to the Vic-

tor Valley Transit Authority's website, "The 13 hydrogen fuel cell electric buses were officially unveiled during a ribbon-cutting ceremony on January 14, celebrating the arrival of the new vehicles and the infrastructure and technology needed to support their operation. The event brought together regional, state, and federal transportation leaders and representatives from industry partners, including New Flyer, Ballard Power Systems, and

Continued on Page 16

Philosophically Speaking

Twenty-five Years Of Crimes and Cnspiracies



The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe. —Albert Einstein

9/11/2001 "changed everything," except—it didn't. —Phill Courtney

By Phill Courtney

On the morning of 9/11/2001, I was teaching English at Perris Lake High School in Perris California, when those planes flew into those buildings that dark day twenty-five years ago. I didn't find out at school, but on the radio before I'd left, and while my duties at the school included teaching, I also supervised student volunteers in the main office as we announced various timely bulletins over the P.A. system, ranging from reminders about overdue library books to afterschool activities, but that morning, of course, was decidedly different.

I decided that my main duty that morning over the P.A. was to calm students' fears (and perhaps some faculty members' as well) with a measured and factual account of just what was known by that early point in time, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. I've never been a big fan of that recitation's rote nature, often replacing it with a "highlight from American history" to satisfy the California Ed Code, but, again, that morning was different, so the Pledge took on an added emotional intensity.

However, despite my attempts to be factually accurate during the announcements, later that morning I immediately experienced one student's reaction to the events that would, unfortunately, be shared by many adults in the coming weeks; months; and years: an unfounded "buying into" various alternate versions of what had "really happened"—or, in the student's case, what was happening.

Since I did the announcements, and, thinking that I must be the campus source of information about the ongoing events, she had breathlessly rushed to my room to find out if it was true that one of the planes was heading towards Disneyland—a fear that at least made a distorted sort of sense for a teenager—and was relieved when I was able to reassure her that, as far as I knew, there was not.

If only dealing with adults in the future had been as easy. Almost immediately I was hit full force with the reality of that problem when I went to my brother's house for the annual family Thanksgiving dinner just a few days after the W. Bush administration had decided to start bombing the people of an entire country for the crimes of some radical jihadists hiding out there.

Later that afternoon, after some socializing and a lawn game, my father—who, up until then, with one exception, had never met an American bombing he didn't like (he and his one brother had not approved of the Japanese atomic bombings) decided that we needed to discuss the war around the dinner table, and despite my advice that perhaps it would be best if we didn't, informing him that my column about it would soon be published, which we could discuss later, he wouldn't have it.

Over the next thirty minutes or so, I soon discovered that every member of my extended family (some ten that day, including my dad's brother and my former girlfriend), supported the bombing of Afghanistan, and despite my heartfelt pleas and arguments

Continued on Page 5

Mad Dog Crawford In Custody *from front page*

ment for his injuries."

The Barstow Police Department Detective Division responded and assumed the investigation. During the course of the investigation, detectives determined the shooting to be gang-related. Detective Bryce Carson identified the suspect as 22-year-old Barstow resident Maurice Crawford.

An arrest warrant was issued for Crawford. A week later, a Penal Code

Section 664/187(a), attempted murder charge was filed against him in San Bernardino County Superior Court.

Crawford remained at large for three weeks, as detectives were unable to locate him at any of his usual haunts in Barstow.

On Friday, September 4, 2026, acting on information that had been developed during the investigation and with the assistance of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department Special Enforcement Division, Barstow de-

tectives found Crawford and arrested him at 2:21 p.m. at 11610 Chamberlain Way in Adelanto.

He was subsequently booked at the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department High Desert Detention Center in Adelanto on the attempted murder charge, being a felon in possession of a firearm and operating motor vehicle without a license.

Crawford's criminal history is not confined to cases adjudicated in San Bernardino County Superior Court.

Garcia. Moved into Garcia's position was then-Commander Christopher Catren. Catren's next in command was Assistant Chief Travis Martinez. Immediately beneath them were commanders Will Goff, Sean Flynn and Esteban Valenzuela. In addition to Martinez, Goff, Flynn and Valenzuela all holding higher ranking positions than Tolber when she became a lieutenant in in 2017, there was one lieutenant, Michael Reiss, with more seniority than her and another lieutenant, Stephen Crane, with se-

who lived in the places that were to be impacted by the decisions. Developers, as a consequence of wanting to make a profit, wanted to build as intensely as possible. By building on ever smaller lots, they could put twice or three times or four times or six times or eight times as many houses on an acre as was the case in the 1940s or 1950s or 1960s, so they could sell more houses and make more

With A Slender List Of Accomplishments Beyond Her Groundbreaking Promotion As The First Woman To Lead The Department, Redlands Police Chief Tolber Opting To Retire After Three Years *from front page*

services bureau, which entailed the department's community policing, traffic unit, parking control and field training functions as well as oversight of custody specialists, community service officers and citizen volunteer programs, including business liaison and community engagement.

She coexisted with but

Developers Want Greater Density & To Be Excused From Infrastructure Requirements *from front page*

to take place in their individual cities and how intensely the properties in their communities were to be developed. Hanging in the balance was the question of density, or how many dwelling units were allowed to be constructed per acre,

somehow remained aloof from the department's "boys will be boys" ethos, putting up with, as she had no choice, that element of the department's reputation.

Tolber's move into the lieutenant's billet came with the same wave of promotions that occurred around the time of the retirement of then-Police Chief Mark

the height of buildings, the ratio of space occupied by buildings to the space occupied by unpaved ground with grass or plants growing on it, the mix of residential, commercial, industrial development and open space to be permitted in a city, along with whether apartments and condominiums should be allowed to displace single family homes. These decisions historically were left to the people

While Being Recorded, They Maintain Unknowingly And Ortiz Claims Wittingly, Goodman And Loera Admitted At Least One Police Department Detective Tapped Into A Law Enforcement Agency Network Database To Carry Out Illicit Political Opposition Research *from page 2*

Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) 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 Stephan Desrochers, a recently retired detective with department who had been the president of the SBPOA and was subsequently one of the association's board members, as the party who had accessed the system in retrieving her file, provided her with the date and time in March 2020 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. He told her he would provide her with a copy of the Department of Justice audit report. Six days later, late in the morning on August 14, 2024, Ortiz texted Goodman, inquiring about the Department of Justice Audit Report. Goodman told her he had thought he had previously made it available to her, but she told him she had yet to see it. The police chief 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. Sergeant Jose Loera, who had only recently before been elected president of the association,

succeeding the immediate past president, Jon Plummer, was brought into the conversation, whereupon a consensus was developed that it would be best all around for the Police Officers Association to rescind its endorsement of Penman. Goodman asked Loera to meet with Ortiz as part of an effort to defuse an explosive situation. Loera agreed to do so and Goodman called Ortiz, telling her that Loera was going to call her to schedule a meeting with and for her to please make the meeting. Loera called Ortiz early the next morning, August 15, 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 to 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 statute 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 2020, 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. Ortiz was installed as Seventh Ward councilwoman on December 18, 2024. Three months later, more than six months after Goodman said he was going to work through the district attorney's office to pursue a criminal case against Desrochers and which Loera encouraged Ortiz to involve herself in, no action in that regard had been taken. After reverifying that no investigation was taking place within the police department or the district attorney's office, Ortiz on March 25, 2025, filed a \$2 million claim against the City of San Bernardino, alleging that the police department, in the person of Desrochers, had illegally accessed her criminal history through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System without lawful authorization in the 2019-2020 timeframe, doing so for political purposes and used that information to harm her political campaign by claiming she had been arrested for domestic

violence. She alleged the San Bernardino Police Officers Association endorsed her opponent, Penman, and was maintaining a file on her that was compiled to silence her and that it was brought forward years later when she became a serious candidate. 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 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 she 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 which propounded 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.

In the spring of 2025, Ortiz approached both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office with regard to the CLETS issue. Unbeknownst to Ortiz at the time, the district attorney's office was then and is yet involved in a cooperative operation with the FBI through the FBI's Office of Partner

Continued on Page 6

In California's Pro-Development Climate, Companies Want Chino Solons To Allow Them To Up Density And Evade Traditional Infrastructure Requirements *from page 3*

the rapid deterioration of the property that had been developed, the way in which those who lived in apartments or tenements took less pride in renting or in ownership than did those who lived in, if not an estate, then a semi-estate in which they could enjoy some personal space, not be cramped and create an aesthetic about themselves that was good for them psychologically, socially and financially in terms of owning something of value.

California's perceived housing shortage has prompted the California Legislature to impose increasingly bureaucratic prescriptive state housing mandates on local governments, with the stated goal of accelerating production across all income levels. Core frameworks such as the

Housing Element and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process require cities and counties to plan for significant increases in housing capacity. Under the Housing Element and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, known by its acronym RHNA, Chino is mandated to clear the way for 6,978 housing units it is mandated to permit to be constructed within its city limits between 2021 and 2029. According to the California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2,113 of those 6,978 units are supposed to be affordable to those with very low income, meaning those who earn zero to 50 percent of the area median income, equated to \$37,650 or less annually; 1,284 of the units are to be affordable to those

of low income, meaning those who earn 51 percent to 80 percent of the area median income, or \$37,651 to \$60,240 annually; 1,203 units of those units are to be affordable to those of moderate income, meaning those earning 81 percent to 120 percent of the area median income or \$61,241 to \$90,360 annually; and 2,378 of the units are to be reserved for those earning an above moderate income, defined as 120 percent of the area median income or more than \$90,361.

In seeking to cure what the State of California has defined as a housing crisis, the state legislature has passed laws and statutes to streamline the development approval process and reduce the ability of local governments to impose conditions on the development or exercise discretion with regard to the quality and density of the development occurring within their jurisdictions. Among

those laws and statutes is California's State Density Bonus Law, which outlines what "bonuses" local governments have to give to development companies that are undertaking housing projects that will make inroads on the defined housing shortage. Some of those bonuses entail the suspension of regulations that would otherwise apply to residential construction projects and exemptions that must be made to restrictions counties, cities or incorporated towns can impose on development projects.

Development companies have in the last several years taken to approaching cities with proposals to construct homes or apartments for very low and low income homebuyers and renters, seeking from those cities waivers on building requirements out of the belief that the cities, which are looking, or are even desperate, to meet the state mandates on per-

mitting the construction of residential projects, will go along with waiving or suspending those requirements. Those requirements to be waived can include density requirements or other conditions of approval. If the development companies can construct those subdivisions without meeting those conditions, they can save tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars in the process, greatly upping their profits.

Regent Land Company in conjunction with Warmington Homes filed a proposal with the city to construct 100 three-story townhomes on 3.76 acres at the southwest corner of Riverside Drive and Magnolia Avenue. In making that proposal, Warmington offered to reserve 10 percent of the homes to be sold at an affordable rate. It made no commitment about the remaining 90 percent – that is 90 – of the homes. In

return it asked for nine concessions from the city. Those concessions were waivers of conditions the city normally applies, and which could be legally enforced. Those waivers included intensifying the density such that each acre will accommodate 26.6 units, i.e., each unit having a footprint, meaning space for the structure and its yard, of 1,637.9 square feet or a plot of 40.5 feet by 40.5 feet. That puts roughly six-and-a-half dwelling units on the space occupied by the typical single-family homes that were built in Chino's neighborhoods in the 1950s and 1960s. Other requested waivers included diminished setbacks from the units' property lines, which eliminated or greatly reduced spacing between the units and the virtual elimination of outdoor living area, meaning, essentially, the homes will have no yards to speak of. Eight of the waivers

Continued on Page 12

A Quarter Century On, Pundit's View On The September 11, 2001 Attacks Is Even More Grim Than It Was At The Time *from page 3*

that bombing the country during our government's alleged "War on Terror" would do no "good," was unable to "move the needle" (or any hearts) when it came to the bombing. That night I went home and sobbed in bed after my futile attempt to divert any in my own family from a path that I knew would soon lead to unspeakable tragedy for countless people.

And this was the unwavering way ahead for millions of Americans as they fell into line along this "patriotic path" in the weeks to come, with a few notable exceptions like the courageous African American congresswoman, Oakland's Barbara Lee, who questioned the wisdom of granting George W. unlimited power and time to wage his "War on Terror," and voted accordingly, becoming the sole vote against it amongst a

total of some four hundred plus representatives. Need I say that her reward for doing so was countless anonymous death threats.

Although I did have a number of "fellow travelers" when I came to opposing the war, not the least of whom were members of the Green party, many on the so-called "left" decided to make that radical left-hand turn into the twisting corridors and halls of mirrors that many of the 9/11 conspiracy theories inevitably led to; theories that have ultimately led to yet more conspiracy theories and, finally, to nowhere.

Looking back on it, in particular I remember one gathering in the Redlands Smiley Library Assembly room a couple of years later that packed the place with people eager to hear the "truths" of 9/11, particularly those put forth by a group calling itself "Engineers and Architects for 9/11 Truth," which was then riding high on the crest of countless videos about the subject.

Although I was also eager to "keep an open

mind" about such theories as the claimed "controlled demolitions" that supposedly brought down the Twin Towers and the third building that collapsed that day, I also began to question the ability of theorists to counter every counter argument with a counter argument, particularly after I'd read the mainstream Popular Mechanics magazine report on the subject.

They did a thorough examination of the physics involved and dismissed basically all the theories, but I was told by a theorist I was dialoguing with then, that, of course, Popular Mechanics would be dismissive since they were "bought off," and part of the conspiracy. He also told me that the Osama bin Laden seen on a video taking credit for 9/11, was an impersonator hired by the CIA.

So, this was the way it went as the "War on Terror" morphed into the "War on Iraq," and the W. Bush administration pressed its case that we needed to use our military to pull off a pre-emptive invasion

of Iraq to prevent Saddam Hussein from acquiring those mythical "weapons of mass destruction," which I call mythical because—they were—proven beyond a doubt after W. got his invasion and none was discovered.

But W's and his co-conspirators' "full court press" and propaganda campaign about those weapons proved sadly convincing. Not only did they get England's Prime Minister, Tony Blair, to go along with it, many Americans did too, with a Time magazine poll showing that over seventy percent—yes, seventy percent—even believed W and company's later insinuations that Hussein had attacked us on 9/11—a boldface falsehood that was so obviously bogus it's still amazing to me that anyone believed it.

Now I use the term "co-conspirators" because this term strikes at the core of the problem in the years since 9/11, because, despite all those theories about what "really happened" on 9/11, none has been proven, while one absolutely has.

It soon became obvious to me that while the Bush administration did not "orchestrate" the attacks on 9/11, nor "allow" them to happen, they definitely took "advantage" of them and launched a conspiracy within the White House to do so.

Yes, here's a conspiracy that's thoroughly proven, and the problem is not any of the others that haven't, but the one that has, which, tragically for the world and our country, did not result in any government investigations that proved it and brought these co-conspirators, who were responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths, to justice because not a single one of them has served a single day in prison.

And that glaring lack of justice continued on into the following presidential administration of Barack Obama, who, when asked if he would prosecute any of the unindicted criminals in the W. administration for their illegal wars, famously told the American people that it was time to look forward, not backward, and to just

basically get over it, resulting in the continuing chain of criminality.

Not only was there that dereliction of duty, but, instead of, for instance, turning it all over to peacekeeping troops from the United Nations, Obama continued the illegal occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan which followed the internationally illegal wars on those countries, which, in turn, was also kept in place by that certain president which followed Obama in 2017.

Admirably, although chaotically, Joe Biden, the president whose one term was bookended by the two of Trump's, was courageous enough to see the futility after twenty years of occupation; faced reality; and ordered a pullout in 2021, he must have known full-well that he would face a storm of criticism by, of course, the attack-dog Republicans, but that he would also weather some pushback within his own party as well.

In the meantime, instead of pulling the plug, Biden made sure that our weapons pipeline contin-

Continued on Page 16

Ortiz, Gathering What She Thought Was Evidence Of The SBPOA’s Use Of Government Assets For Political Purposes, Delivered Into The Hands Of Prosecutors The Recordings They Alleged Proved She Was An Illicit Eavesdropper
from page 4

Engagement Program. An area of focus in that program are crimes perpetrated by public officials. The district attorney’s office’s liaison to the FBI is Investigator Jorge Chavez. Together with another district attorney’s office investigator, Darnell McDermott, Chavez would be assigned to the matter brought to the district attorney’s office by Ortiz relating to the misuse of the law enforcement data bases by the San Bernardino Police Department. Consequently, to avoid overlap and redundancy in the investigative process, the FBI agent heading the Office of Partner Engagement coordination with the district attorney’s office, C.J. Sanders, disengaged from the inquiry, leaving the investigation up to Chavez.

It is not clear on what date in either April or May of 2025 that Ortiz provided a flash drive containing copies of the recorded conversations with Loera and Goodman and PDFs if other documents and materials she felt would be relevant to the investigation.

On May 1, 2025 or May 3, 2025, a date which is in dispute, with Ortiz claiming the former and the district attorney’s office claiming the latter, Ortiz approached the district office, intending to supply it with the same flash drive provided to the FBI in order to assist its investigators in the investigation she had reason to believe, based on her conversation and text exchanges with Goodman in August 2024, the district attorney’s office was carrying out into the illicit CLETS accessing.

The district attorney’s office, however, did not accept the flash drive from her, instead directing her to fill out a digitized complaint form. In response to her approach

to the FBI, that agency had made a show of interest in the issue[s] she had contacted it about.

The district attorney’s office did not come across as interested in her complaint, which languished for three months. On August 14, Ortiz again went to the district attorney’s office with a flash drive containing copies of the audio recordings of the conversations with Loera and Goodman, along with other materials.

More than eleven months, at that point, had elapsed since Goodman had vowed to press the district attorney’s office into “making an example of Desrochers.” No head of steam on that prosecution had formed. There had been no enthusiasm for carrying out the investigation to formulate the report that would serve as the basis of any charges that were to be filed, indeed to the point that there had been no investigation whatsoever.

When McDermott and Chavez got around, a few days after Ortiz had dropped the flash drive off, to listening to the recordings, it was not Loera’s and Goodman’s admissions that a member or members of their department had violated the law by utilizing information complied exclusively for use in the context of criminal justice operations for use in a political campaign that interested them. Instead, they latched onto the lack, or what they took as the lack, of any overt verbal disclosure by Ortiz that she was recording the conversations. The nature of the crime McDermott and Chavez were ostensibly investigating, transmogrified into and investigation not of Desrochers but of Ortiz. From that point on, any pretext of getting to the bottom of the San Bernardino Police

Department’s misuse of the assets entrusted to it for law enforcement purposes was over. If the district attorney’s office was ever looking at Ortiz as a victim whose rights as a citizen had been trampled upon by the San Bernardino Police Officers Association using a law enforcement data base to obtain information to use against her in her runs for political office, its investigators and prosecutors immediately reversed course to pursue her as a criminal who had taken advantage of the police chief and the police union president by tricking them into making statements she secretly recorded.

Leading Ortiz, Calvin and Beard to believe they were looking into the crime relating to the misuse of CLETS, McDermott and Chavez interviewed each of them, angling their questioning away from the subject of the police union’s and Desrochers’ abuse of a data base restricted for use by law enforcement agencies to investigating alleged or actual criminal activity to formulate electioneering material to the conversations of August 15, 2024 and August 29, 2024 and the circumstances under which they had taken place. During those exchanges with Ortiz, Calvin and Beard, the three maintained that the recording using Ortiz’s Samsung Galaxy cellphone’s built-in recording facility had been done openly, with Ortiz deliberately making a show of her cellphone and that it was in recording mode when she placed it down on each of the tables she and both Loera and Goodman were seated at during those conversations. Ortiz openly disclosed to McDermott and Chavez how the device worked and was operated. In separate statements they made to McDermott and Chavez, Loera and Goodman each claimed he did not the conversation was being recorded. Prior to what would be the investigators’ final meeting with Ortiz, they obtained a warrant and seized the phone from her, and downloaded

from the phone the recordings.

In November 2025, represented by attorney Peter Schlueter, Ortiz filed a federal lawsuit against the City of San Bernardino, naming the police department, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association, Desrochers, Goodman, Loera, Penman and Eric McBride, who had been San Bernardino police chief when the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System data base had been accessed and the information relating to Ortiz extracted. A central element to that lawsuit were the admissions made by Loera and Goodman during the course of their August 15, 2024 and August 29, 2024 conversations that the CLETS data relating to Ortiz had been obtained by Desrochers.

On January 21, 2026, the district attorney’s office filed two California Penal Code Section 632(a) charges against Ortiz, one pertaining to the recorded conversation with Loera and the other relating to her conversation with Goodman.

During evidentiary hearings prior to the trial, the district attorney’s office made multiple motions in limine relating to limitations the prosecution was requesting as to what evidence and what testimony could be presented at trial. The prosecution’s theory of Ortiz’s guilt was that her criminal offense consisted of her violation of the all-parties consent law embodied in California Penal Code Section 632(a) when she recorded the conversations without explicitly informing Loera and Goodman that she was doing so and getting their informed consent. California Penal Code Section 632(a), which has been on the books since 1967 and is cataloged not as a felony but as a misdemeanor, makes recording someone without their knowledge or consent a criminal violation of privacy. The operative question was, according to the prosecution, whether Ortiz could establish that

she had given both Loera and Goodman adequate notice that she was recording and/or that neither Loera nor Goodman had a reasonable expectation of privacy. In this way, according to the prosecution, the subject matter of the conversations was immaterial and therefore irrelevant.

This approach was problematic for the defense in at least two ways. First, the subject at issue was criminal activity on the part of the police department or at the very least one of its members, such that Ortiz was, in both instances, reporting a crime to a sworn law enforcement officer, an inherently public act. Arguably, in this way, neither Loera nor Goodman might claim a reasonable expectation of privacy, and that argument would be an organic and logical element of the defense’s case. Second, Schlueter was serving as Ortiz’s lawyer in the federal civil trial and also as her criminal defense attorney in the state case brought against her in San Bernardino Superior Court. What he was being confronted with were motions that would greatly circumscribe, limit and weaken his ability to present a convincing show of his client’s innocence on the electronic eavesdropping charges. If she were to be convicted, the recordings, as a result of having been obtained illegally, would very possibly be deemed as inadmissible evidence in the civil trial.

Schlueter contested the prosecutions pleadings and line of logic in its motions in limine, asserting that substance of what was being discussed in the August 15, 2024 and August 29, 2024 conversations as well as the actual statements and admissions made by Loera and Goodman were of direct relevance to the question of whether his client had violated California Penal Code Section 632(a) in that making the utterances they did, Loera and Goodman could not have reasonably expected a politician in the midst of an election

campaign would consider what they were saying to be off-the-record.

Judge Melissa Rodriguez, who presided over the trial, however, found the assertions of Deputy District Attorney Carlo DiCesare, who was prosecuting Ortiz, to be more persuasive, and she granted virtually every motion in limine brought by the prosecution.

After jury selection and final pretrial motions, the case went before the six-man, six woman jury with two female alternate jurors, on August 25.

Following opening statements, DiCesare moved immediately into the prosecution’s case-in-chief, in which Goodman, testifying first, and Loera were the major prosecution witnesses. Their testimony would thereafter be augmented by McDermott.

In the case of both Goodman and Loera, while they were on the witness stand, DiCesare played for the jury the entirety of the recordings Ortiz had made, respectively, of their August 29, 2024 and August 15, 2024 conversations. DiCesare’s stated intent in doing so was to demonstrate to the jury that Ortiz had made no explicit disclosure of her intent to record the conversations, statement that she was recording the conversations or had sought Goodman and Loera’s consent to record the conversations.

Goodman, explicitly, and Loera, less directly, testified that there had not been any illegal use of the CLETS data base in carrying out a criminal history/informational search with regard to Ortiz. Those statements were diametrically opposite from what both of the law enforcement officers had said in their recorded conversations with Ortiz. When Schlueter attempted to explore the issue of the utilization of police department assets for political purposes or to contrast what Goodman’s and Loera’s testimony during the trial was with regard to the illicit accessing and utilization of the law

Continued on Page 13

Public Notices

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,

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: S17The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SBCS ? Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.
Dated: 08/13/2026
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T. Ortiz
Published in the SBCS 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, convoquese 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 veiniseis 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

Public Notices

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: HOLLIGUIN TRAINING & CONSULTING, LLC 9597 BOLTON AVE 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]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO 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:

Public Notices

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

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

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

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

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

Dylan P. Hyatt:

Public Notices

1555 River Park Drive, Suite 108 Sacramento CA 95815

Telephone No: (916) 292-8009
Published in the SBCS Ontario on: 08/28/2026, 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.

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 Bernardino Fontana Division, 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

Public Notices

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: 08/28/2026, 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 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

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

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 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

Public Notices

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

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

DEANA CAROL LEE aka DEANA C. LEE Case NO. PROVA2600633

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DEANA CAROL LEE aka DEANA C. LEE A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by LAURA R. LEE in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. F-2 at 09:00 AM on 09/30/2026 at Superior Court of California, County of Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Fontana Division, , San Bernardino, 17780 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335, Fontana Division

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you 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

Public Notices

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.

Duane Paul Booth:
555 N “D” St Ste 110 San Bernardino, CA 92401 San Bernardino CA 92401

Telephone No: 909-888-7895

Published in the SBCS Ontario on:
09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)
CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVSB2435106

NOTICE TO WENSH-ENG JIANG
(AVISO DEMANDADO):

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

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

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelp-california.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court’s lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir

Public Notices

en su contra sin escuchar su version. Lea la informacion a continuacion

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CAL- ENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulano que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corta que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conace a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un a un abogado, es posible que cumpia con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratu de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendoso en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de vaior recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechat el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la direccion de la corte es):
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
24 W THIRD ST., SAN BERNARDINO California 92415 SAN BERNARDINO JUSTICE CENTER

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff’s attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la direccion y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
GENE H. SHIODA / SHIODA LANGLEY CHANG LLP
1063 E. LAS TUNAS DR. SAN GABRIEL CA 91776 Telephone: 6262811232 DATE (Fecha): 11/21/2024 Clerk (Secretario), by AL-LEXUS FIERRO

Published in the SBCS Ontario on: 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)
CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVSB2435106

NOTICE TO YIQING LI

(AVISO DEMANDADO):

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

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

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this sum-

Public Notices

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelp-california.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court’s lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su version. Lea la informacion a continuacion

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CAL- ENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulano que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corta que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conace a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un a un abogado, es posible que cumpia con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratu de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendoso en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de vaior recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechat el caso.

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

Public Notices

247 W THIRD ST., SAN BERNARDINO California 92415 SAN BERNARDINO JUSTICE CENTER

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff’s attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la direccion y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
GENE H. SHIODA / SHIODA LANGLEY CHANG LLP
1063 E LAS TUNAS DR. SAN GABRIEL CA 91776 Telephone: 6262811232 DATE (Fecha): 11/21/2024 Clerk (Secretario), by AL-LEXUS FIERRO

Published in the SBCS Ontario on: 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R CIVSB2625401

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner DORA MARIA LOPEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

DORA MARIA LOPEZ to DORA MARIA ESTRADA IBARRA

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: 10/30/2026, 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 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: 09/04/2026
Mariah Mora, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel September 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2624419

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

MICHAEL STEPHENS to MICHAEL NICHOLAS JR

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

Public Notices

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: October 14, 2026 Time: 9:00 a.m. Department: S23

Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino District-Civil Division

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

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

Joseph T. Ortiz
Judge of the Superior Court.

Amalia Molina Piedra, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Dated: August 25, 2026
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

N U M B E R CIVSB2625041,

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: ,Rong Bao, filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Xichen Xu to Rice Bao, 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: 10/27/2026, Time: 08:30 AM, Department: S27The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SBCS ? Ontario in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 08/31/2026
Judge of the Superior Court: Joseph T Ortiz
Published in the SBCS Ontario on 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026,

FBN 20260007496
The following person is doing business as: EBMRE; EBMRE. COM EBM REAL ESTATE 1808 FOOTHILL BLVD STE 160 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730[MAILING ADDRESS 1808

Public Notices

FOOTHILL BLVD STE 160 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EQUITY BUILDING MANAGEMENT REAL ESTATE, INC 1808 FOOTHILL BLVD STE 160 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20260356055 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/ M A PONCE DE LEON, PRESIDENT
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 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026 CN- BB33202605MT

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BRUCE DOUGLAS WINTERS

CASE NO. PROV 2600033

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

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

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held October 6, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at

San Bernardino County Superior Court Victorville District

Department V15 - Victorville

14455 Civic Drive Victorville, CA 92392

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

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and

Public Notices

mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

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

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

Attorney for Destiny Winters:

RACHEL KING SB 300298

KING LAW FIRM ATTORNEYS AT LAW, INC 34859 FREDERICK STREET, SUITE 108

WILDOMAR, CA 92595 Phone (951) 834 7715

Fax (951) 319 7129 cases@thelawyerking.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 11, 18 & 25, 2026.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) CIVSB2615993

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): MOHAMMAD SAEED SHAMAZADEH aka SAEED SHAMA, Individually and DBA MARKET EQUIPMENT USA; GERARDO MARTINEZ, Individually and DBA MTZ COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATION and DOES I to 50

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

NATIONWIDE MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

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

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

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

Public Notices

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

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

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas informacion en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida si secretario de la corta que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corta le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendolo en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperacion de \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesion de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desear el caso.

The name of the court is: (El nombre de la corte es): Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino San Bernardino District-Civil Division

The address of the court: (La direccion de la corte es): 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la direccion y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Michael Deal, Esquire (SBN 279480) Schneider, Hosmer & Ackert 18500 Von Karman Ave #300 Irvine, CA 92612 (949) 250-5536 DATE (Fecha): 06/02/2026 Clerk of the Court (Secretario), by Alexis Camacho, Deputy

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 11, 18 & 25 and October 2, 2026.

Public Notices

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL) CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) 26PSCV01357 NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO DEMANDADO): BRANDON JULIAN WILSON HERNANDEZ; and DOES 1 to 10 YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): LORRAINE RENEE DELGADO NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without you being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelp-california.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

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

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar on formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas informacion en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida si secretario de la corta que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corta le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente.

Public Notices

Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendolo en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperacion de \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesion de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desear el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la direccion de la corte es): West Covina Courthouse 1427 West Covina Parkway West Covina, CA 91790

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la direccion y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): M&Y Personal Injury Lawyers 6300 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 807 Los Angeles, CA 90048 (877) 850-6500 DATE (Fecha): 04/14/2026 David W. Slayton Clerk of the Court (Secretario), by A. Gutierrez, Deputy

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) Case Number: 26PSCV01357 Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, 1427 W West Covina Pkwy, West Covina, CA 91790, West Covina Courthouse. Plaintiff: Lorraine Renee Delgado; Defendant: Brandon Julian Wilson Hernandez; and DOES 1 to 10. To Brandon Julian Wilson Hernandez. Plaintiff: Lorraine Renee Delgado seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows: 1. General Damages: a. Pain, suffering and inconvenience \$1,000,000.00; b. Emotional distress \$1,000,000.00. 2. Special Damages: a. Medical expenses (to date) \$8,218.08; b. Future medical expenses (present value) \$150,000.00. Dated: April 20, 2026. Sarah Lopez, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 11, 18 & 25 and October 2, 2026.

ABANDONMENT OF A BUSINESS NAME FBN20260007850 The following entity doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as TOWN SQUARE FLO-RIST 4246 RIVERSIDE DRIVE CHINO, CA 91710: LYLE W. BALLARD [and] NANCY C. CHENG-BALLARD is abandoning its fictitious business name. The original FBN number was FBN20220007070. The original date of filing was 07/18/2022. Business Mailing Address: 4246 RIVERSIDE DRIVE CHINO, CA 91710

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 07/18/2007.

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/ LYLE W. BALLARD Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/25/2026

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 I4100

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 11, 18 & 25 and October 2, 2026

FBN20260008039 The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as CONNECTION THERAPY 7162 BRENO PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: MYRIAM REIGSTAD Business Mailing Address: 7349 MILLIKEN AVE #1400 PMB 97 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

/s/ MYRIAM REIGSTAD, Owner Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/08/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy I4100

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 11, 18 & 25 and October 2, 2026

FBN 20260007548 The following person is doing business as: INFINITY 27497 CAMINO VACUNA MENIFEE CA 92585;[MAILING ADDRESS 27497 CAMINO VACUNA MENIFEE CA 92585]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO IRMA SANTAELLA 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/ IRMA SANTAELLA, OWNER 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 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 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026 CNBB34202601MT

FBN 20260006149 The following person is doing business as: SHARPLINE PEST CONTROL 822 S BIRCHLEAF DR ANAHEIM CA 92804;[MAILING ADDRESS 822 S BIRCHLEAF DR ANAHEIM CA 92804]; COUNTY OF ORANGE JOHN SHARP 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/ JOHN SHARP, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/30/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Ber-

FBN 20260007924 The following person is doing business as: JC NAILS 4288 HOLT BLVD UNIT #5 MONTCLAIR CA 91763;[MAILING ADDRESS 4288 HOLT BLVD UNIT #5 MONTCLAIR CA 91763]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO JC BEAUTY UNION LLC 4288 HOLT BLVD UNIT #5 MONT-

Public Notices

CLAIR CA 91763 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20260242043 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/ GUJIA LIU, MANAGING MEMBER 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 under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026 CNBB34202602MT

FBN 20260007617 The following person is doing business as: HD BLASTERS 2770 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO CA 92405;[MAILING ADDRESS 2770 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO CA 92405]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO HD BLASTERS, LLC. 2770 SERRANO RD SAN BERNARDINO CA 92405 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20260334180

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/ GUILLERMO LEIVA, MANAGING MEMBER 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 under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026 CNBB34202603MT

FBN 20260004829 The following person is doing business as: OPWDIGITAL 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395;[MAILING ADDRESS 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO OCEAN PEAK WAVE, INC. 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE RD D3 VICTORVILLE CA 92395 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

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

s/ DAVID E. CANTONG, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/22/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 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 CNBB28202601MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN 20260004829 The following person is doing business as: OPWDIGITAL 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395;[MAILING ADDRESS 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO OCEAN PEAK WAVE, INC. 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE RD D3 VICTORVILLE CA 92395 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

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

s/ DAVID E. CANTONG, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/22/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 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 CNBB28202601MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN 20260006149 The following person is doing business as: SHARPLINE PEST CONTROL 822 S BIRCHLEAF DR ANAHEIM CA 92804;[MAILING ADDRESS 822 S BIRCHLEAF DR ANAHEIM CA 92804]; COUNTY OF ORANGE JOHN SHARP 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/ JOHN SHARP, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/30/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Ber-

FBN 20260007924 The following person is doing business as: JC NAILS 4288 HOLT BLVD UNIT #5 MONTCLAIR CA 91763;[MAILING ADDRESS 4288 HOLT BLVD UNIT #5 MONT-

Public Notices

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026 CNBB29202602MT CORRECTION DATES 08/21/2026, 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN 20260006313 The following person is doing business as: A&A RESTORATION 15828 DEL OBISBO RD FONTANA CA 92337;[MAILING ADDRESS 15828 DEL OBISBO RD FONTANA CA 92337]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO A&A RESTORATION, LLC. 15828 DEL OBISBO RD FONTANA CA 92337 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20260264258

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/ ABEL LOPEZ, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/06/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 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 CNBB28202604MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN 20260004829 The following person is doing business as: OPWDIGITAL 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395;[MAILING ADDRESS 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE D3 PMB 1005 VICTORVILLE CA 92395]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO OCEAN PEAK WAVE, INC. 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD, SUITE RD D3 VICTORVILLE CA 92395 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

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

s/ DAVID E. CANTONG, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/22/2026

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy 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 CNBB28202601MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026

FBN 20260005958 STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT The following person is doing business as: WRIGHT MOUNTAIN METAL WORKS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371;[MAILING ADDRESS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO

Public Notices

06/05/2026, 06/12/2026, 06/19/2026 CNBB22202605MT CORRECTION DATES 07/10/2026, 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026 & 07/31/2026 CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260006021 The following person is doing business as: LA TIENDITA CATRACHA DE ZOE. 142 E 42ND ST 29 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404;[MAILING ADDRESS 142 E 42ND ST 29 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO LA TIENDITA CATRACHA DE ZOE LLC 2607 DEL ROSA AVE SAN BERNARDINO CA 92404 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20260230934

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/KARENE.HERNANDEZ-GONZALES, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/26/2026

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 07/10/2026, 07/17/2026, 07/24/2026, 07/31/2026 CNBB28202604MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260006360 The following person is doing business as: SERGIO'S ELECTRIC. 1377 S LILAC AVE SUITE #107 BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316;[MAILING ADDRESS 2249 HANFORD ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO 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 CNBB28202601MT CORRECTION DATES 08/28/2026, 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026

FBN 20260005958 STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT The following person is doing business as: WRIGHT MOUNTAIN METAL WORKS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371;[MAILING ADDRESS 8079 MIRA MAR RD PHELAN CA 92371]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO

Public Notices

ment expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026 CNBB36202601MT

FBN 20260007863
The following person is doing business as: LEGACY MACIAS TRUCKING 674 W 41ST APT A6 SAN BERNARDINO CA 92407;[MAILING ADDRESS 674 W 41ST APT A6 SAN BERNARDINO CA 92407]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO ERICK G MACIAS
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/ ERICK G MACIAS, 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 Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026 CNBB36202602MT

FBN 20260007987
The following person is doing business as: HUSKIES SUPER-MART 26498 BASELINE ST STE A HIGHLAND CA 92346;[MAILING ADDRESS 26498 BASELINE ST STE A HIGHLAND CA 92346]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO HUSKIES SUPER-MART INC 26498 BASELINE ST STE A HIGHLAND CA 92346 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20260371448
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/ MOHAMMED ALI, C.E.O.
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/27/2026
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 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026 CNBB36202603MT

FBN 20260007946
The following person is doing business as: AMAAPHO BRAID-ED WIGS 26159 MERRILL PL LOMA LINDA CA 92354;[MAILING ADDRESS 26159 MERRILL PL LOMA LINDA CA 92354]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO PHOEBE A OLUKAIKPE
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

Public Notices

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/ PHOEBE A. OLUKAIKPE, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/26/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026 CNBB36202604MT

FBN 20260006905
The following person is doing business as: ABELINO'S HOME-MADE STYLE MEXICAN FOOD. 652 E REDLANDS BLVD REDLANDS, CA 92374;[MAILING ADDRESS 652 E REDLANDS BLVD REDLANDS, CA 92374]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO ABELINO'S HOMEMADE STYLE MEXICAN FOOD LLC 652 E REDLANDS BLVD REDLANDS CA 92374 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION B20260281766
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/ ISAAC GOMEZ GARCIA, MANAGING MEMBER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/23/26
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 07/31/2026, 08/07/2026, 08/14/2026, 08/21/2026 CNBB31202604MT CORRECTION DATES 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

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]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO 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 - T O R R E S , MANAGING MEMBER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/30/2026

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 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 CNBB31202607MT CORRECTION DATES 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

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]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO MAURO R JARA
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under 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 CNBB31202608MT CORRECTION DATES 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

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]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO PAMELACJENKINSMAYFIELD
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 CNBB31202609MT CORRECTED DATES 09/04/2026, 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026

Public Notices

FBN 20260001735
STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT
The following person is doing business as: EXCLUSIVE DESIGNS SMOG CHECK 1015 W 5TH ST SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411;[MAILING ADDRESS 1015 W 5TH ST SAN BERNARDINO CA 92411]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO BRANDON G BAZAN, DANIEL BAZAN
The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
The fictitious business name referred to above was filed on 03/07/2022. Original File #20220001975. County of San Bernardino.
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/ BRANDON G BAZAN, GENERAL PARTNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 03/05/2026
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 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202602CV

FBN 20260007748
The following person is doing business as: Y&R TACOS MEXICAN FOOD. 13040 DEEWATER ST VICTORVILLE, CA 92392;[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO NANCY Y 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 Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ NANCY Y 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 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202601CV

FBN 20260007540
The following person is doing business as: QB CONSTRUCTION. 4833 ORANGE BLOSSOM LN CHINO, CA 91710;[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO HF SOLUTIONS 4833 OR-

Public Notices

AGE BLOSSOM LN CHINO CA 91710 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20260335615
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/ SABINE BURGOS, 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 Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202602CV

FBN 20260008098
The following person is doing business as: BEADED HAND-CAFTED BEAUTIES. 25941 E 9TH ST #23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410;[MAILING ADDRESS 25941 E 9TH ST #23 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO MARVA H CASTRO
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/ MARVA H CASTRO, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/02/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state

Public Notices

of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202603MT

FBN 20260008322
The following person is doing business as: THE NAIL LAB BOU-TIQUE. 10777 CIVIC CENTER DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730;[MAILING ADDRESS 10777 CIVIC CENTER DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO FREEMAN MCCOY INC. 9581 BUSINESS CNETER DRIVE SUITE F RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4598032.
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/ EULONDA FREEMAN, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/09/2026
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 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202604MT

FBN 20260008315
The following person is doing business as: BRAVE CARS. 1443 N. E ST SUITE 8 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405;[MAILING ADDRESS 6400 E WASHINGTON BLVD COMMERCE CA 90040]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO BRAVELAND SURVEYING 6400 E WASHINGTON BLVD COMMERCE CA 90040 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEP 09, 2026
By signing, I declare that all in-

Public Notices

formation 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/ JUAN MANUEL BRAVO GUZMAN, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/09/2026
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 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202605MT

FBN 20260008183
The following person is doing business as: CASA CULICHI. 10050 ROSE DR OAK HILLS, CA 92344;[MAILING ADDRESS 10050 ROSE DR OAK HILLS, CA 92344]; COUNTYOFSANBERNARDINO LUZ M OSUNA MEDINA; EDGAR RUIZ
The business is conducted by: COPARTNERS.
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/ EDGAR RUIZ, GENERAL PARTNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/04/2026
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/11/2026, 09/18/2026, 09/25/2026, 10/02/2026 CNBB37202606MT

custody for possession of narcotics, two for possession of drug paraphernalia, three arrested on outstanding warrants, two arrested for trespassing and one for violations of the Apple Valley Municipal Code.

Three of the 68 said they would accept offers of available resources and supportive services, although authorities did not describe what those sources or services consisted of.

Deputies also administered Narcan during a drug-related medical emergency and recovered a stolen flatbed trailer.

It was made clear to the 54 homeless who were not arrested and did not accept assistance in the form of transportation out of Apple Valley, that there continued presence in the town was not appreciated. A few got the message and said they would be moving on.

Apple Valley Homeless Roust-Up from front page

by its acronym InnROADS, officers with the San Bernardino County Probation Department, the sheriff’s department’s Town of Apple Valley Gang Team and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation conducted a “Quality of Life” operation throughout the Town of Apple Valley Wednesday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

According to the sheriff’s department, “The operation was designed to address community safety concerns while providing outreach and connecting subjects with available community resources, including mental health treatment and supportive services.”

Teams contacted 68 individuals throughout the town. Eleven of those 68 were arrested, with three individuals taken into

As Patriarchal Redland’s PD’s Token Distaff Command Officer, Tolber Proved The Primary Beneficiary Of The Correction Imposed On Departmental Leadership When The Culture She Coexisted With For A Quarter Century Imploded In Scandal
from page 3

she would be nearing her 55th birthday, making the chance that she would grasp the brass ring more remote.

Paradoxically, it would be the testosterone-laden culture of the department that had for so long held women down, that created the circumstance by which Tolber vaulted over her rivals.

In 2018, Catren promoted Reiss to deputy chief. Reiss was closely identified with Catren. Some people thought they might be brothers. On occasion, at public events in Redlands, some members of the public confused them, thinking Reiss was the police chief. Word was that Catren was grooming Reiss to succeed him.

Others thought that Martinez, who was the grandson and grandnephew of the first two Latino members of the Redlands City Council, was the heir apparent as police chief.

By 2021, things were starting to fall apart. That year Police Officer Laurel Falconieri and Leslie Martinez sued the City of Redlands, alleging a culture of pervasive sexual favoritism and harassment involving Reiss in his former role as lieutenant and later role as deputy chief, and Officer Eddie Herrera. The city settled this case for \$1.7 million in June 2023. Geneva Holzer filed a claim against the city and then followed that up with a lawsuit detailing harass-

ment by Reiss and other officers with the department assisting him, after she obtained evidence, including semen stains on a chair leftover from a sexual encounter between Reiss and one of the department’s community service worker/evidence technician Julie Alvarado-Salcido that took place in an office at police headquarters. Holzer maintained she had been directed to destroy that evidence by Sergeant Kyle Alexander and that Stephen Crane, who by that point had promoted to commander, was complicit in the effort to conceal the evidence against Reiss, as well. After Alvarado-Salcido and another department employee who Holzer alleged had been intimate with Reiss and other male members of the department left their positions with Redlands PD, she became the object of Reiss’s sexual harassment, in which he began to pressure her to

engage in a physical relationship with him. Holzer’s claim/lawsuit against the department/city was settled for \$475,000 in June of this year. Alvarado-Salcido in 2022 filed a suit against the city, alleging she had been coerced into performing becoming sexual acts by Reiss and then subjected to workplace retaliation by Reiss when she discontinued having sexual relations with him. The city settled the lawsuit brought by Alvarado-Salcido for \$1.2 million.

The vast majority of the department’s members, as the revelations in Falconieri’s, Leslie Martinez’s, Holzer’s and Alvarado-Salcido’s legal actions came out in dribs and drabs, believing, at the beginning stages anyway, that the story would contain itself, made calculated decisions, in keeping with the culture long inculcated into the department’s members, to stand by the department and deny

that there was any pervasive problem and wait it out until things blew over. This left Tolber in a somewhat delicate and uncomfortable spot, as any hope she had that her ambition to get to the top of her profession would be fulfilled was riding on her embodying the department’s macho culture, such that joining in with her oppressed sisters would greatly jeopardize her prospect for advancement. Meanwhile, Assistant Chief Travis Martinez was one of the department’s few male members, along with Sergeant Patrick Leivas, and the only member of the department’s command echelon who came forward to stand by and assist Falconieri, Leslie Martinez and Holzer. When the scandals that were unleashed by Falconieri’s, Leslie Martinez’s, Holzer’s and Alvarado-Salcido’s mushroomed beyond control, Reiss and then Catren were history.

It looked, for a brief time, that Travis Martinez was to assume the position of police chief. But before that promotion was made, other members of the department and then City Manager Charles Duggan learned that Assistant Chief Martinez, had played a key role in supporting three of the four women whose legal challenges resulting in the trashing of the department’s public image with a wide cross section of the public and cost the city what has now proven to be more than \$3.3 million, ending any possibility he could be placed in charge of the department.

The candidates to replace Catren as police chief at that point came down to Goff, Flynn, Valenzuela, Crane and Tolber. Cranes involvement in the matter involving Reiss, at least as alleged by Holzer, greatly compromised his prospect of becoming

Continued on Page 16

Companies Unable To Sell The Notion Undergrounding Power Lines Is Unnecessary
from page 5

were granted.

City staff, however, drew the line with regard to a waiver of Chapter 13.32 of the Chino Municipal Code, which requires that “[a]ll existing and proposed cable television, electrical, telephone and other energy or communication devices such as lines, poles, transformers and related devices shall be placed underground.”

On June 17, the Chino Planning Commission approved the applicant Warmington Residential’s proposal to construct the 100 residential units but recommended against waiving the utility undergrounding requirement. Warmington Homes appealed the ruling to the city council, which considered the appeal at its September 1 meeting. Warmington maintained that undergrounding the electrical lines would be prohibitively expensive and that the State Density Bonus Law gave it an absolute

right to the waiver.

To persuade the city that it should drop the requirement that it underground the electrical lines, it called upon the law firm of Cox, Castle & Nicholson to its talking for it in a language the city could understand, i.e., threatening litigations. On June 29, 2026, Linda C. Klein, an attorney with the law firm of Cox, Castle & Nicholson, dashed off a letter to the California Department of Housing and Community Development, calling upon it to issue a notice of violation of the State Density Bonus Law to the City of Chino. That letter was a ploy to force the city to rescind its requirement that the electrical lines that currently span the property from utility poles along the property frontage be placed underground.

According to Klein “the city lacks an objective standard requiring underground utility lines and violated the housing accountability act by insisting on underground utilities.” Klein acknowledges that Municipal Code Section 13.32.030 is part of the

Chino City Code but insisted that “There are exceptions to this requirement and municipal code section 13.32.050.b gives the city engineer unlimited discretion to identify which utilities ‘shall be placed underground for each development or improvement and which utility devices may be exempted.’”

Klein said the city had “no direct or quantifiable safety concerns” about the electrical lines on the property and that “None of the city’s findings are sufficient to show that the underground utility concession would have a specific, adverse impact upon public health or safety and there is no feasible way to minimize that impact other than denying the underground utility concession.”

The city council, however, chose to disregard the threat Warmington Homes was vectoring its way through Klein, the firm of Cox, Castle & Nicholson and the California Department of Housing and Community Development, and provided a resolution in taking its action to reject the waiver on September 1. That

resolution states, “Undergrounding utilities is necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare by reducing risks to life and property during emergencies such as earthquakes, fires, and severe weather events, reducing hazards associated with downed or damaged utility lines, and maintaining safe visibility and access within the public right-of-way for pedestrians, motorists, and emergency responders. Traffic collision data indicates there have been 23 traffic accidents within Chino City Limits involving a vehicle collision with a Southern California Edison power pole resulting in damage to the pole. The undergrounding requirement constitutes a fundamental public safety standard rather than a discretionary or primarily aesthetic requirement. Based upon the legislative findings contained in Chapter 13.32, the requested concession or waiver would potentially create specific adverse impacts on public health and safety that cannot be mitigated without requiring compliance with the undergrounding requirement.”

During the same

June 17 Chino Planning Commission meeting at which Warmington was given go-ahead for its 100-unit project subject to the eight waivers and some conditions, including the undergrounding of the electrical lines, slightly to the east and across the street, at the northwest corner of Riverside Drive and Mountain Avenue, a proposal by the BCT Development Acquisition Company to construct a 210-unit residential rental community consisting of 25 two- and three-story residential buildings and a recreation building on 7.9 adjusted gross acres of land at a density of 26.6 dwelling units per acre had been considered. BCT used a similar ploy as Warmington, having agreed to reserve ten percent of the 210 units – i.e., 21 units for sale or rent to low or very low income buyers or renters. BCT had asked for seven waivers, including reductions in the setbacks and the virtual elimination of yards for the structures on the minuscule lots, along with the same elimination of the requirement that it underground the exist-

ing electrical utilities on the land.

The planning commission had split evenly, 3-to-3 on the project, meaning it remained in limbo, not having been turned down, but not approved either.

BCT, asserting it was being nickled-and-dimed to death by the city’s requirements to provide infrastructure to offset the impacts of the project or contribute toward defraying the cost of that infrastructure such as utility undergrounding and traffic improvements to the Riverside Avenue/Mountain Avenue intersection which it had not anticipated, appealed that decision to the city council, including with it the original application for a waiver of the utility undergrounding requirement. While the city council did approve the project, it insisted the BCT carry out the undergrounding of the electrical line as well as the relocation of an existing utility, consisting of a high-pressure gas line at the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Riverside Drive.

-Mark Gutglueck

Ortiz's Trial Featured Intensive Effort By The Prosecutor To Discredit The Defendant & Her Witnesses *from page 6*

enforcement network data base and what they had openly disclosed to Ortiz two years ago, he ran head on into the roadblocks the motions of limine had strewn in his path, as DiCesare sounded objections to his questions and those objections were repeatedly sustained by Judge Rodriguez.

Both Goodman and Loera testified that the recording Ortiz made of their conversations with her in 2024 and which were marked as exhibits and played for the jurors were true and accurate reproductions of their exchanges with her.

McDermott testified that in his interviews with Ortiz in 2024, she had acknowledged making the recordings and claimed she had obtained both Loera's and Goodman's consent before doing so. McDermott testified that when he spoke to Loera and Goodman about those conversations, they informed him that they were unaware, at the time, that Ortiz was recording them, and they stated that they had not given their consent to be recorded.

Schlueter called both Beard and Calvin as defense witnesses. Beard testified that he had been involved in multiple campaigns and political issues in San Bernardino going back some time and that he had supported Ortiz during the 2024 campaign. He testified that he had concerns about the attack tactics utilized in the campaign extending to the misuse of government or police assets by the police union and that he accompanied Ortiz to the August 29, 2024 meeting with Goodman with the understanding that was to be topic of discussion. He testified that he had previous contact with Goodman.

Beard corroborated Goodman's testimony about the seating arrangements during the August 29, 2024 meeting in the conference room on the second floor

of police headquarters in which Goodman was seated at the head of the table and he was seated in the first chair on the side of the table to Goodman's right and that Ortiz was seated to Beard's right. He testified, again corroborating Goodman, that all three of them had their phones on the table in front of them. Beard contradicted Goodman on the key point relating to Ortiz's open rather than secretive recording of the conversation, saying that she deliberately placed her cellphone, which showed the lit indication that its recording function was enabled, one the table in front of her, tilting it so it was clearly visible to the police chief just as she was setting it face up onto the table. Beard testified that the phone was within Goodman's clear field of vision and that he had looked at it. Beard also testified, as did Calvin, McDermott and ultimately Ortiz, that the display on the phone's display screen featured what was variously referred to as a red button or red dot and a moving waveform across the screen.

In an effort to undercut Beard's credibility with the jury, DiCesare during his cross examination of him dwelt less on the specifics of the meeting but engaged him in questions with regard to his political differences with the prevailing political establishment in San Bernardino while seeking to elicit from him that he held the San Bernardino Police Officers Association, which has thrown its support behind many prominent members of that establishment, in low regard. DiCesare's questions were framed in a way to suggest that Beard harbored some animus toward the police department in general, including Goodman, and that this had colored his testimony. DiCesare further layered into his questions the innuendo that Beard was hedging his answers

in favor of Ortiz because he was one of her benefactors and her holding of a position on the city council was favorable to him. Beard testified that Ortiz had not overtly informed Goodman that the conversation was being recorded nor had she directly requested his consent to be recorded, but that the recording was evident to all participating in the conversation as a consequence of Ortiz's body language in placing the cellphone on the table and the phone's prominent presence in front of all three participants during the nearly hour-and-a-half conversation.

Calvin's testimony identified a moment relatively early in the recording of the August 15, 2024 meeting at which, contrary to the prosecution's narrative of events, Ortiz gave an indication to Loera that the conversation was being recorded. At that point, shortly after Loera and Ortiz had arrived at the DJ Coffee Shop and had been seated in a booth, Calvin arrived. As Ortiz scooted over to allow Calvin to seat herself opposite the police sergeant, Ortiz can be heard saying, "Just so we make sure, everything we say to each other, so whatever we talk about, you know what I say, I know what you say." Thereafter, Loera can be heard saying, "I'm in." Calvin testified that as Ortiz was saying "Just so we make sure, everything we say to each other, so whatever we talk about, you know what I say, I know what you say," she was holding he Samsung Galaxy in her hand, which was palm up, and the face of the phone, displaying its audio recording graphics including the red dot and the moving waveform, was visible to everyone at the table.

Under intensive cross examination by DiCesare in which the prosecutor pressed the now-former Councilwoman on whether Ortiz had used the terms record or any of its variant forms including recorded or recording during the con-

versation, Calvin said those words had not been used but contended that it had been conveyed to Loera and to her by Ortiz's gesture with the phone and her reference to those present knowing what was being said that the recording was taking place. As he had with Beard, DiCesera in his cross examination of Calvin sought to establish that they were friends political allies and professional associates, recapitulating what she had previously testified to during directed examination by Schlueter, that Ortiz had worked as a volunteer precinct walker during Calvin's successful 2020 election campaign for city council, that Calvin had employed Ortiz as a grant writer and human resources director with her nonprofit youth education and training organization and that they had campaigned together and endorsed one another in their 2024 re-electoral and electoral efforts. DiCesera forcefully questioned Calvin about the "daily or every-other-day" contact she had with Ortiz and delved into how many times they had discussed her upcoming testimony at the trial in the days, weeks and months prior to the trial, implying that Calvin was lying under oath during her testimony in an effort to assist Ortiz that was coordinated in advance with the defense. This prompted Schlueter, in his last question to Calvin during re-re-direct examination to ask, "Would you commit perjury for my client?" Calvin uttered, "Absolutely not," at which point DiCesare sounded an objection Judge Rodriguez sustained. DiCesare motioned to strike Calvin's response from the record, and Judge Rodriguez granted the request.

Schlueter recalled McDermott to the stand as part of the defenses case-in-chief. Having to wade through objections liberally registered by DiCesare and irregularly sustained by Judge Rodriguez, sought to aggressively cross ex-

amine McDermott, zeroing in on his claim that as an investigator he favored he utilizing open-ended questions rather than hard-edged probing ones. This opened two issues unfavorable to the prosecution. One of those was that in McDermott's questioning of Goodman and Loera, which at least ostensibly had as its precept the investigation into Desrochers' illegal use of the law enforcement data bases available to the department, he had been diverted from the subject at hand by the police chief and the union president redirecting him onto the unauthorized recording issue.

"There is not a suspect in the world who wouldn't want to" be subjected to inexact and softball questions, instead of "probing questions" that would cut to the heart of the matter under investigation, Schlueter said.

The second problematic area for the prosecution in Schlueter's cross examination of McDermott was the inexactitude in the investigator's inquiry with regard to the manner in which Ortiz had informed the police chief and the sergeant that their conversations with her were being recorded. In response to Schlueter's questions, what was brought out was that McDermott had not focused in any real depth in his questioning of Ortiz, Goodman or Loera as to how her phone was positioned on either of the two tables.

An area Schlueter sought to explore with McDermott on cross examination and Ortiz on direct examination ran to the willingness Ortiz evinced in handing over to a prosecutorial agency – the district attorney's office – the primary evidence of the electronic eavesdropping crime alleged against her, those being the recordings themselves. It was Schlueter's contention that if Ortiz, a sophisticated and educated individual who is both an elected official and a college professor with a doctorate, would not

have provided evidence of an illegally-made recording to the district attorney's office. It was Schlueter's legal theory that Ortiz considered the recordings to have been legitimately obtained as a consequence of the deliberate and open manner in which she had displayed the cellphone to Loera and Goodman and the prominent place on the table before them that she had placed the device face up with its activated transducer feature clearly visible on the phone's screen. If she had surreptitiously recorded the conversations, she would not have posted their contents to her social media account, he reasoned, nor would she have turned the recordings over to a law enforcement agency, in particular the law enforcement agency with prosecutorial authority in the jurisdiction in which the recordings were made.

DiCesare fought, through the lodging of multiple objections, virtually all of which were sustained by Judge Rodriguez, to prevent Schlueter from airing that theory to the jury.

"At the time that [Ortiz's provision of the recording to the district attorney's office and her attempts to discuss its contents with McDermott and Chavez] was going on or immediately thereafter, were you given any idea you were being investigated for unlawful recording?" Schlueter asked.

"Objection," DiCesare intoned.

"Sustained," said Judge Rodriguez.

Persisting, Schlueter asked his client, "During that conversation with investigator McDermott, did he specifically ask you how you got permission to record chief Goodman?"

DiCesare interjected, "Objection, vague."

"Overruled," said Judge Rodriguez.

"No," said Ortiz.

"If you knew it was illegal to surreptitiously record and you had surreptitiously recorded, would you have given..."

Continued on Page 14

Jury Pronounces Ortiz Guilty Of Surreptitiously Recording Goodman But Finds She Gave Leora Sufficient Warning His Exchanges With Her Were Being Captured *from page 3*

Schlueter started, but was stopped before he could complete the questions by DiCesare's sustained objection.

"Did anyone at the DA's office offer you or did you ask anyone for some type of amnesty to provide surreptitious recordings?" Schlueter asked.

"Objection," DiCesare said.

"Sustained," Judge Rodriguez ruled and then granted DiCesare's request that the question be removed from the court record.

In discussions with Judge Rodriguez involving the prosecution and the defense outside the presence of the jury with regard to what ground could be covered during closing arguments Schlueter made a final effort to see if he could explicitly present to the jury what had been presented to them in the raw during the playing of the recordings but which had not been straightforwardly dealt with during any of the testimony at trial, that being the issue that had prompted Ortiz to record the conversations – the illegal use of information gleaned from law enforcement network data bases against her. His effort was aimed at demonstrating to the judge that at least some of the information that had been withheld from the jurors throughout the trial cut to the credibility of the two primary witnesses against his client – Loera and Goodman.

"Goodman and Loera made admissions [that the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System had been accessed to obtain information used against Ortiz in her city council campaign] and then they got on the witness stand and categorically denied

they made those statements," Schlueter said. "That is why that is relevant."

This brought a rebuke from Judge Rodriguez.

"All quotes from those conversations and anything related to the illegal CLETS runs [are issues] which I have absolutely ruled are not relevant to this trial," Judge Rodriguez said.

Backing up to regroup, Schlueter asked that if he was to be prevented from making reference to that issue, that the court at least prevent the prosecution from "taking advantage" of the lack of context the jury was being given as for the reason Ortiz had made the recordings.

Judge Rodriguez shot that request down.

"I'm not going to get into telling the People what they can say and not say," she said.

As is customary, the prosecution gave its closing argument first, followed by the defense. Thereafter the prosecution, because it theoretically has the burden of proof, was allowed a rebuttal of the defense's closing statement.

"This was a secret recording," DiCesare stated.

DiCesare said the operative fact was, just as Goodman and Loera had testified, they did not know they were being recorded and they did not consent to being recorded. Ortiz admitted she had not asked for their consent, he said.

He called the defense's assertion that Ortiz gesturing with the phone in her hand as she placed in on the table was a charade made up after the fact.

DiCesare argued that witnesses being present are irrelevant to the act of recording without consent under the state's privacy law.

The prosecutor was dismissive of the testimony provided by Beard and Calvin, calling them "incredibly biased" in favor Ortiz, which was demonstrated by Beard being Ortiz's primary political supporter and Calvin's political alliance with her.

He insinuated that their testimony with regard to the "red button" visible on Ortiz's Samsung Galaxy when the recordings were made was tantamount to perjury.

He mentioned Beard's testimony that he had opened the door to the conference room on the second floor of police headquarters where Goodman, Ortiz and Beard had met on August 29, 2024, suggesting that too was perjury, as the door to the room is locked and can be opened only by means of keycards, which are entrusted only to department personnel.

"These are witnesses trying to assist their friend protégé and ally," DiCesare said.

DiCesare invited the jury to contrast the character and believability of his witnesses to those of the defense, the implication being that the players on his team put those playing Schlueter to shame. He came close but did not quite explicitly remark on Ortiz's having not adhered to Judge Rodriguez's in limine rulings.

Of Ortiz, Schlueter said, the jury should consider "how forthrightly she answered questions, how she volunteered additional information. Compare that with Chief Goodman. Compare that to Sergeant Loera."

That Ortiz was meeting with law enforcement officers to report to them about and exchange information regarding criminal activity by which she believed she had been victimized and to which she was a witness, Schlueter asserted combined with having witnesses present when the conversations took place eliminated any reasonable expectation of privacy Loera or Goodman might have had.

Privacy is different from confidentiality, Schlueter said.

"Consent can be expressed or implied," he said. "It doesn't require a 'Yes.'"

"Why would Dr. Ortiz ever make a secret recording and then give

it to law enforcement investigators?" Schlueter challenged the jury. If she had surreptitiously recorded conversations with two law enforcement officers, she would never have turned the recordings over to a law enforcement agency.

Moreover, Schlueter stated, for her own purposes, which would be to put the information obtained in the conversations to use in a legal or procedural forum, "There's no reason for her to make a secret recording."

With DiCesare having savaged his client and his witnesses, Schlueter, provoking objections from DiCesare and the ire of Judge Rodriguez, who sustained them, responded in kind. He insinuated that it was Goodman and Loera who had perjured themselves because their admissions during the discussions they had with Ortiz in August of 2024 that a member or members of their department had acted illegally by misusing the law enforcement network data base available through the department had created a controversy and circumstance that had complicated their existences and the only way open for them to undo what they had done was to lie, reverse course, say it never happened and then discredit and demonize Ortiz.

"You heard those discussions," Schlueter said, referencing the recordings. "The [issue covered in] the meetings was damaging to them. They were trying to get out in front of it."

Following DiCesare's and Schlueter's closing remarks and DiCesare's rebuttal and final instructions from Judge Rodriguez, the 12 members of the jury were separated from the two alternates on the jury panel and were ushered into a conference room on the south side of the building behind the courtroom on the sixth floor, where they began deliberations at just before 2 p.m. on September 9.

With the jury seques-

tered, and the strict admonition against any discussion of the case taking place around the jurors no longer in force on the sixth floor hallway, a report began circulating in among the members of the public waiting there that the prosecution had managed to place a ringer on the jury in the personage of Juror 11, who was said to be the spouse of a law enforcement officer.

By 5 p.m. the jury had not reached a verdict and its members were excused for the evening. They returned the following morning at 8:30 a.m. Thursday, September 10 to resume deliberations. At around 11 a.m. it was announced the jury had reached a verdict.

Court reconvened at 1:30 p.m. at which time Juror 11, who had been chosen as the forewoman, was called forward to provide the verdict sheet to Judge Rodriguez. Judge Rodriguez provided the verdict sheet to her judicial assistant, Lisa Taylor, who read the jury's determination. "The jury finds the defendant not guilty as to Count 1, PC632(A)-M: Eavesdropping."

This provoked a loud cry from Calvin, who was in the courtroom. Judge Rodriguez sternly warned members of the public to engage in no disturbances of the court proceedings.

Taylor then read, "The jury finds defendant guilty as to Count 2, PC632(A)-M: Eavesdropping."

Shortly after the verdict was read and the jury was still seated in the courtroom, Judge Rodriguez sealed the jury roster, telling its members that in the event of a motion to unseal the list, which would reveal the jurors' identities, the jurors would be given notice of the motion and would be given an opportunity to oppose the unsealing.

Sentencing was set for October 14, calculated to be sufficient time for the county's probation department to prove the court with a sentencing recommendation. A sin-

gle PC632(A)-M charge carries with it a maximum of a year in jail and a \$2,500 fine.

Schlueter said he understood the jury's verdict and said he believed that the finding of guilt was "logical," given the lack of contextual information relating to the entirety of the circumstance its members was provided as a consequence of the court's granting of the motions in limine, which restricted him from making a "full and adequate" defense of his client. He said he intended to appeal the verdict.

Minutes after the verdict was read, DiCesare told the Sentinel, "We thank the jury for their service. Our office takes violations of the privacy rights of our citizens very seriously. We will always seek to enforce those rights."

According to Juror 6, whom the *Sentinel* spoke with less than an hour after the verdict came in, the jury originally was split 7-to-5, in his words "60-40" in favor of conviction on both counts.

"A few wanted to find her not guilty," he said.

As the deliberations progressed, he indicated, the split in perspectives of guilt and innocence across both cases shifted to balancing the distribution of sufficient evidence to uphold the prosecution to one case and routing the sentiment toward exoneration to the other. He said the jury gravitated toward considering the relative strength of the prosecution's narrative in support of each of the two charges, with a consensus forming that there was a "lack of evidence" of guilt in the matter pertaining to Loera, but a sufficient marshaling of facts to uphold the electronic eavesdropping count relating to the conversation with Goodman.

In the former case, he said the consideration that the conversation took place in a setting in which those participating were surrounded, in relatively close proximity, by other patrons of

Continued on Page 12

San Bernardino County Coroner Reports

Coroner's Case #702605131: On Wednesday, 07/29/2026, at 07:42 a.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to Etiwanda Avenue and E. Airport Drive in Ontario for a traffic collision. Pedestrian Dan Erpelding, a 61-year-old resident of Pioneertown, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 08/16/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605113: On Tuesday, 07/28/2026, at 12:06 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to Southbound Interstate 15 north of Harvard Road for a traffic collision. Driver Artin Missakian, an 85-year-old resident of Glendale, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 08/16/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605098: On Monday, 07/27/2026, at 11:20 p.m., the Montclair Police Department responded to the 9600 block of Monte Vista Avenue in Montclair. Walter Hodgson, a 60-year-old resident of Anaheim was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Montclair Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 08/16/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605082: On Sunday, 07/26/2026, at 09:54 p.m., the Redlands Police department responded to the Metrolink railroad tracks near Texas Street and W Redlands Boulevard in Redlands. A male, name is withheld pending identification and notification to next of kin, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Redlands Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/27/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605085: On Monday, 07/27/2026, at 01:28 a.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the intersection of Sequoia Street and Arroyo Avenue in Hesperia for a traffic collision. Reginald Matthews, a 39-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, 07/27/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605090: On Monday, 07/27/2026, at 11:10 a.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Westbound Interstate 210 Freeway east of Day Creek Boulevard in Rancho Cucamonga for a traffic collision. Passenger Theresa Evans, a 77-year-old resident of Alta Loma, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/27/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605054: On Saturday, 07/25/2026, at 11:30 a.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded the 1600 block of Pumalo Street in San Bernardino. Bryan Walker, a 38-year-old resident of San Bernardino, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the San Bernardino Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/26/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605050: On Saturday, 07/25/2026, at 10:11 a.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the 900 block of Front Street in Needles. Kye Shutts, a 44-year-old resident of Needles, was pronounced dead at the scene. For further information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/26/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605043: On Saturday, 07/25/2026, at 12:06 a.m., the Rialto Police Department responded to S. Riverside Avenue and the Interstate 10 Freeway in Rialto. Darci Turner, a 45-year-old homeless resident of Rialto, was pronounced dead on scene. For additional information contact the Rialto Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/26/2026)

Coroner's Case #702605023: On Friday, 07/24/2026, at 8:16 a.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the 600 block of E. Third Street in San Bernardino. Raul David Lara, a 57-year-old resident of San Bernardino was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/26/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604975: On Wednesday, 07/22/2026, at 02:12 a.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to the 300 block of N. Shore Drive in Fawnskin. Steven Alt, a 56-year-old resident of San Diego, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/24/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604916: On Sunday, 07/19/2026, at 05:28 a.m., the Rialto Police Department responded to the 100 block of San Bernardino Avenue. Jose Arriaga Loza, a 63-year-old resident of Rialto, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the Rialto Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/20/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604912: On Sunday, 07/19/2026, at 04:56 a.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Westbound Interstate 10 Freeway at Sierra Avenue for a traffic collision. Driver George Garcia, a 45-year-old resident of Pomona, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/20/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604908: On Saturday, 07/18/2026, at 6:58 p.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded to the Metrolink Pepper Avenue Railroad Crossing in San Bernardino. Ryan De Los Rios, a 20-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, 07/20/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604899: On Saturday, 07/18/2026, at 10:16 a.m., the San Bernardino Police Department responded to the 1300 block of S. E Street. David McKinney, a 36-year-old resident of Apple Valley, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/20/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604861: On Thursday, 07/16/2026, at 12:27 p.m., the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responded to an unnamed road between Plato Street and Rao Del Sol Drive the city of Adelanto. Julie Goforth, a 63-year-old resident of Long Beach, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/18/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604846: On Wednesday, 07/15/2026, at 10:09 p.m., the Ontario Police Department responded to the 1600 Block of Milliken Avenue. Maria Franco, a 63-year-old resident of Riverside, was pronounced dead on scene. For additional information contact the Ontario Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/18/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604836: On Wednesday, 07/15/2026, at 01:51 p.m., the California Highway Patrol responded to the Southbound Interstate 15 Freeway north of Kenwood Avenue in Devore. Passenger Jheney Harris, a 20-year-old resident of Victorville, was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact California Highway Patrol. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/18/2026)

Coroner's Case #702604830: On Wednesday, 07/15/2026, at 10:27a.m., the Montclair Police Department responded to the intersection of Monte Vista Avenue and Moreno Street for a traffic collision. Driver William Raya Sr., a 62-year-old resident of Pomona was pronounced dead at the scene. For additional information contact Montclair Police Department. (Supervising Deputy Coroner S. Hill, 07/17/2026)

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

**Fuel Cell Busses
Gradually Coming
On Line** *from page 3*

Linde. The buses are now moving from introduction to real-world operation.”

According to the authority, rather than placing all 13 buses into service simultaneously, it is phasing the vehicles into daily operations. During this period, the agency is collecting operational data, evaluating performance under real-world conditions, and conducting additional testing as the buses operate

throughout the authority’s diverse service area, approximately 950 square miles, expanded from 425 square miles in 2015.

“Today marks more than the launch of hydrogen buses; it represents another major step forward in how we serve our communities,” said VicVTA Chief Maintenance Officer Dustin Strandberg. “Putting hydrogen fuel cell technology into daily passenger service allows us to see these buses perform in the real world while providing

our passengers with a cleaner and quieter ride. We’re gathering valuable data today that will help shape how VVTA operates tomorrow, as hydrogen becomes the backbone of our fleet for years to come.”

Hydrogen fuel cell technology is particularly significant for the Victor Valley Transit Authority because of the size and diversity of the agency’s service area. The Victor Valley Transit Authority operates urban, rural, and long-distance commuter

routes across the High Desert and beyond, requiring vehicles capable of traveling significant distances while maintaining the flexibility needed for daily transit operations.

“For our residents, this is about much more

than putting new buses on the road,” said Victor Valley Transit Authority Board Chairwoman and Victorville Mayor Liz Becerra. “It is about investing in the future of our region. Every time one of these buses goes into service, we are dem-

onstrating that the High Desert can be a leader in innovation, sustainability and modern public transportation while continuing to connect people with jobs, education, healthcare and opportunity.”



**Crawford Caught
In Adelanto** *from page 3*

M section count of driving under the influence and a misdemeanor Vehicle Code 23152(B)-M violation of driving un-

der the influence with a blood alcohol content of 0.08 percent or higher.

He is also being sued for divorce by Vanessa Crawford and is simultaneously a party in a governmental complaint to establish child sup-

port and health insurance brought against Wynell Zayla Hodges by the County of San Bernardino.

Crawford is being held in lieu of \$1,000,100 bail.



**Tolber, Willing To Accept Attainment Of
Chief Status As Her Defining Accomplish-
ment, Opts For Retirement After 3 Years** *from page 12*

ing police chief. While it was the consensus of the command echelon that Tolber’s depth of experience did not match that of the others, for Duggan her selection as police chief represented an excellent way of getting out front of the sex abuse scandal that Reiss’s ac-

tions had engendered. By appointing Tolber police chief, Duggan believed the public would see City Hall as taking a proactive initiative by installing a woman as police and that would address the criticisms that were being leveled at the department and the men,

who were being characterized as troglodytes, who ran it.

Travis Martinez, bypassed in the police chief selection process, filed a claim against the city alleging he had been passed over for promotion, stripped of responsibilities, and publicly undermined for reporting alleged misconduct by senior police officials and raising public safety concerns and thereaf-

ter pursued a lawsuit, which the city settled for \$871,956 without going to trial.

Tolber, whose three years as police chief has been characterized as a “caretaker” tenure marked by no major innovations or accomplishments, turns 50 this year, which is the youngest age at which a law enforcement officer can retire. While she had no earth-shattering accom-

plishments as a police officer, she did achieve the status of police chief and obtained a historical first as the first woman to serve in the capacity of Redlands police chief. Under her contract, as a law enforcement officer she is entitled to a pension equal to her highest salary – the current \$290,063.45 she is paid as police chief – times 3 percent times the number of years she has been

employed by Redlands. So, \$290,063.45 X .03 x 29 = an annual pension of \$252,355.20.

The city is now faced with the possibility that Crane, who for some, at least, is synonymous with the culture Reiss embodied, will become Redlands next police chief.

-Mark Gutglueck



Phill’s Philosophy *from page 5*

ued to flow into Israel to enable their internationally recognized genocide in Gaza, so there’s no giving him “a pass,” there, let alone most in his own party, and, predictably, the Republicans as well (with a handful of exceptions), so it must first be recognized that both of our major parties have engaged and are engaging in international

(and national) criminality if we’re to have any chance of moving forward.

And now, as we mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of 9/11, we find that the government of our current president is still continuing another totally illegal war under both national and international laws, and for those who seemingly still can’t (or won’t) recognized that fact, here’s one simple and understand-

able way to define why this is true: the laws say that one country cannot attack another country unless that country has first attacked them, or is about to. In other words: no pre-emptive wars.

Remarkably, some ten years ago, I even had to explain this principle to a local man running for Congress as a Republican who seemed to have not thought about it before. Of course, W’s administration did its

best to convince many Americans that this threat from Iraq was real (and did, astoundingly, succeed with many, including Hillary Clinton, which should have disqualified her from any presidential run) and had the capacity, from thousands and thousands of miles away, to attack the most militarily powerful country in the world—a country which could, in turn, wipe them off the map. It’s a contention that’s totally absurd on its face.

well); embrace the laws of the U.N. and other legal bodies (as well as our own in the Constitution) and elect only leaders who are prepared to do so.

At first it seemed that Trump would break with the past when he talked about the 2003 Iraq War as “stupid” when he was running the first time in 2016 and vowed to keep us out of anymore “stupid” wars, thereby clearing the debate stage of his Republican rivals (even I applauded that), but, of course, his second term with this war on Iran blew that promise completely out of the water—both figuratively and literally—and I’m sorry to say this, Don, but it looks like you’re just going to have to kiss that Nobel Peace Prize goodbye.

with self-described progressive Democrats, who inwardly see the reality of their party’s criminal policies, but outwardly remain “loyal,” while they continue to claim that they will eventually “change the party from within,” leave me somewhat skeptical about the future.

In other words: I’m not holding my breath. But, on the other hand, after working on all I’ve explained in this column and through all these years since 9/11, including a run for Congress myself in 2002, I’m not prepared to “throw in the towel,” and will never do so for as long as I can, and, if you haven’t yet, welcome all who want to join me. Our nation needs you.

Split Verdict *from page 14*

the restaurant and taking into account Ortiz’s utterance – just – which was followed by Loera’s “Oh, okay, I’m in,” threw the prosecution’s assertion that Loera did not know the recording was ongoing into doubt.

Insofar as the case relating to the conversation with Goodman, he said the meeting taking place in an enclosed area outside the earshot of the public was a deciding factor in the guilty verdict.

“It was pretty clear

they were sitting inside an office of a private institution where the doors were closed as the recording was taking place,” he said. Goodman’s assertion that he did not know of or consent to the recording was a factor, he indicated.

The case, which involved three days of jury selection followed by ten days of opening statements, presentation of evidence, testimony and closing statements, Monday through Thursday, with the exception of the Labor Day holiday, went roughly a week longer than was anticipated.

The Sentinel asked Juror 6 if the extension represented a hardship on the jury.

“I’m a federal employee, so for me it wasn’t an issue,” he said. “I think it might have been a problem for some of the others.”

Asked his general impression of the case, Juror 6 said, “I felt the prosecution came fully prepared and their case was clear and precise. The defense was, I wouldn’t say lazy, but too relaxed or not fully prepared.”

So, the question remains: in the next twenty-five years where do we go from here in the next twenty-five, since the last twenty-five have demonstrated beyond a doubt that 9/11’s dreadful events did not fundamentally change the criminal nature of our country’s foreign policy?

Well, the first badly needed step is for all Americans (or at least the vast majority) to recognize that our government consists of many international outlaws (along with, of course, many other nations as

Phill Courtney was a long-time high school English teacher and a Riverside County candidate for Congress with the Green party in 1998 and 2002. His email is: pjcourtney1311@gmail.com

