- 1. Please review and follow the Tentative Ruling Instructions which can be found on the Court's website using the following link: https://sf.courts.ca.gov/divisions/unified-family-court/ufc-tentative-rulings.
- 2. If you wish to make an objection to the Tentative Ruling in your case, you must notify the other party (unless there is a restraining order in place) and the Court Clerk in the Department where the hearing is scheduled of your objection by 4:00 PM the Court day prior to the hearing date. Court days do not include Court holidays, Saturdays, or Sundays. The Court's Holiday Schedule can be found on the Court's website using the following link: https://sf.courts.ca.gov/general-information/holiday-schedules.
- 3. To contact the Court Clerk in Dept. 403 to make an objection to the Tentative Ruling in your case, please call (415) 551–3741 or send an email to Department403@sftc.org.
- 4. To contact the Court Clerk in Dept. 404 to make an objection to the Tentative Ruling in your case, please call (415) 551–3744 or send an email to Department404@sftc.org.
- 5. When you contact the Court Clerk to make an objection to the Tentative Ruling in your case, please specify the paragraph(s) and / or line number(s) of the Tentative Ruling which contains the language to which you object.
- 6. You may appear at your hearing either (a) in-person; (b) by video; or (c) by phone. Pursuant to SFLR 11.7(D)(4), if you choose to appear by video or phone, you must be continuously connected to Zoom from 8:50 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. or until your hearing is concluded. If you fail to appear in-person, by video, or phone, the Court may proceed with the hearing in your absence. The Court is not required to contact you before your hearing.
- 7. If you choose to appear by video or by phone, you must comply with the Notice and Instructions for Remote Appearances in San Francisco Family Court set forth below.

SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT UNIFIED FAMILY COURT NOTICE AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR REMOTE APPEARANCES

You may appear at your court hearing either (1) in-person or (2) remotely by video or telephone. If you fail to appear in-person or remotely by video or telephone, the court may proceed with the hearing in your absence. *The clerk will NOT contact you*. Remote appearances by video or telephone can be made utilizing the ZOOM platform, **effective January 2, 2024**:

- If you are *joining by video*, go to www.zoom.com/join and follow the instructions below:
 - o Type in the Meeting ID (see below for department Meeting IDs and Passcodes) and click "Join".
 - O Click "Launch Meeting" then "Open zoom.us".
 - O Zoom will launch and you will be asked for the Meeting Passcode. Enter the passcode for your Meeting ID for the respective department for your court hearing.
 - Enable your camera and click "Join".
 - Once you join, a prompt to use computer audio will appear, click "Join with Computer Audio".
 - o Enter your full first and last name TO IDENTIFY YOURSELF TO THE COURT.
 - o Using headphones may help you hear more clearly.
- If you are *joining by phone*, dial 1-(669)254-5252 or 1-(669)216-1590 and enter the Meeting ID and Passcode as described below.

Department 403

Meeting ID: 161 463 0304

Passcode: 114482

You can also log into your hearing **directly** using the link below:

https://sftc-org.zoomgov.com/j/1614630304?pwd=OTZ1cVZaQlRYWXpFQ2hTaEFuZnhIZz09

Department 404

Meeting ID: 161 305 3325

Passcode: 282709

You can also log into your hearing **directly** using the link below:

https://sftc-org.zoomgov.com/j/1613053325?pwd=SkdXWGVkQkowckJSNnJwSSttYkR6dz09

When you join the hearing on Zoom:

- 1. You are to mute your audio when you are not speaking.
- 2. State your name before you speak for proper identification to the court and for all the parties in your case. Only one person MUST speak at a time.

PROHIBITION ON RECORDING: Do not record the hearing in any way. Any recording of a court proceeding, *including screen shots*, *other visual or audio copying* of the hearing, is **prohibited.** Any violation is punishable to the fullest extent under the law, including but not limited to monetary sanctions up to \$1,000, restricted entry to future hearings, or other sanctions deemed appropriate by the court. For more information

1

3

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

2425

26

27 28

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 UNIFIED FAMILY COURT 4 5 6 EMANUEL VALLE, Case Number: FMS-23-387480 7 Petitioner Hearing Date: April 4, 2024 8 VS. Hearing Time: 9:00 AM 9 DEANA CURRAN, Department: 403 10 Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA Respondent 11 12 REQUEST FOR ORDER OF NOTICE OF HEARING CHILD CUSTODY 13 TENTATIVE RULING Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the 14 Court makes the following findings and orders: 15

1. On November 27, 2023 Father filed his Petition for Custody and Support and his Request for child custody requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of Michael (DOB: 10.16.22). He requests that Mother have a reasonable right to visitation, with visitation to be supervised based upon prior substance abuse. He requests that visitation be supervised until Mother can show six months of clean drug

testing at least twice a week.

2. On February 20, 2024 Respondent Mother filed her response to the Petition for Custody and Support. She states she and Father signed a voluntary declaration of parentage. She requests joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor child. The minor child has lived with his paternal grandmother from the time of birth.

3. Mother also filed on February 20, 2024 a responsive declaration to the Request for Custody filed by Father. She again requests joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor child.

4. On March 20, 2024 the parties filed a Child Custody and Visitation Stipulation and Order regarding the minor child, Michael Anthony Valle (DOB: 10.16.22). The Stipulation and Order does not

29

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

address custody but establishes a visitation schedule commencing 3.23.24 with anticipated step up in visitation after the first two months of supervised visitation.

- 5. On March 22, 2024 Mother filed a supplemental declaration attaching documentation confirming she entered substance abuse rehabilitation and moved to Sacramento where she lives in a sober-living community. After completing rehab she trained and became certified as a Substance Use Disorder Registered Counselor on February 27, 2024 and works as a counselor. She attaches her Certification. She is tested regularly and states her results are negative. She attaches copies of some of her drug test results.
- 6. Mother states she believes Father has abused drugs and wants him tested as well. She also questions whether Father lives in San Francisco as he allegedly works in Seattle and she wonders if her son actually lives with his Mother in San Mateo County. Consistent with the parties' stipulation and order Mother agrees to continued supervised visitation supervised by Sylvia Valle at her home in Montero Beach. She requests confirmation of where her son is living.
- 7. On March 29, 2024 Father filed his supplemental declaration. Father states that he currently lives at 422 Edinburgh Street, San Francisco, CA and lives with his aunt, uncle, cousin, and son Michael. He states he moved into the home in November 2023 and has lived there since then. Father states that he completed rehab on November 18, 2022. Prior to rehab he had been living with his Mother in San Mateo County. He became the primary caregiver for Michael on November 10, 2023. He states Petitioner (sic) Mother had never seen the child, Michael, since his birth in October 2022.
- 8. Father indicates that he has had sole legal custody of Michael since April 17, 2023 pursuant to his agreement with CPS of San Mateo County. Since November 10, 2023 has had sole physical custody of Michael.
- 9. Father states that until he filed this petition Mother has never sought visitation or taken an interest in Michael's custody.
- 10. Father requests sole legal and physical custody of the minor child.
- 11. Father is awarded temporary sole legal and temporary sole physical custody of the minor child and the parties are to abide by their Child Custody and Visitation Stipulation and Order filed on March 20, 2024.
- 12. The Court will order Family Court Services to interview CPS of San Mateo County for its reports concerning the history of this matter.

13. The matter will be continued for a review hearing on August 6, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. to review potential modification of the temporary custody and visitation orders. Both parties are to serve and file update declarations regarding the foregoing ten days before the hearing. Neither parent is to disparage the other parent or allow others to disparage the other parent in front of the minor child. All prior orders not inconsistent with this order shall remain in full force and effect. 15. 16. The Court shall prepare the order.

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 UNIFIED FAMILY COURT 4 5 6 GRACE WOO, Case Number: FLD-22-396996 7 Petitioner Hearing Date: April 4, 2024 8 VS. Hearing Time: 9:00 AM 9 ANDREW SONG, Department: 403 10 Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA Respondent 11 12 REQUEST FOR ORDER FOR CHANGE OF CHILD CUSTODY 13 TENTATIVE RULING Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the 14 Court makes the following findings and orders: 15 16 1. This matter is on calendar for review of the Findings and Orders filed on November 13, 2023. 17 Father was granted sole legal and sole physical custody of the two minor children, Andrew (DOB 18 11.3.18) and Arthur (DOB 11.21.19) following his Request for order filed on June 12, 2023. 19 2. Mother was ordered at the last hearing to file an update declaration providing written 20 proof that she is compliant with the Final Judgment Custody Order filed November 10, 2022 including 21 confirmation by her parents that she is residing with her parents, providing the Court with the identity and 22 contact information of her treating psychiatrist, and the confirmation the Mother is complaint with her 23 psychiatrist's medication recommendations. 24 3. The Court has received no update declarations. 25 4. Father shall continue to have sole legal and sole physical custody. Mother shall have no 26 visitation pending further order of this Court. 27 5. This matter is ordered off calendar.

28

29

6.

The Court shall prepare the order.

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
3	UNIFIED FAMILY COURT	
4		
5		
6	JOHN HOFMEYER,	Case Number: FDI-18-790640
7	Petitioner	Hearing Date: April 4, 2024
8	VS.	Hearing Time: 9:00 AM
9	GABRIELA HOFMEYER,	Department: 403
10	Respondent	Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA
11		
12	REQUEST FOR ORDER RE: DETERMINATION OF EPSTEIN CREDITS	
13	TENTATIVE RULING	
14	Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the	
15	Court makes the following findings and orders:	
16	A. Procedural History	
17	1. The matter is continued from 1/12/2024.	
18	B. Findings and Orders	
19	1. The Court reserves jurisdiction over Epstein credits for trial.	
20	2. The Court will prepare the order.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 UNIFIED FAMILY COURT 4 5 6 SHAREETHA MARIE ADAMS, Case Number: FDI-20-793004 7 Petitioner Hearing Date: April 4, 2024 8 VS. Hearing Time: 9:00 AM 9 ANTHONY ADAMS JR, Department: 403 10 Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA Respondent 11 12 OTHER REVIEW HEARING 13 TENTATIVE RULING 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Appearances required. The parties may appear in-person, by video, or by phone. If a party chooses to appear by video or by phone, that party must abide by the Notice and Instructions for Remote Appearances in San Francisco Family Court set forth above.

- 1. This matter is on for review of the status of visitation and potential step up in visitation as ordered at the hearing on December 28, 2023. Mother has sole legal and physical custody of the minor children, Antonio (DOB: 10.17.17) and Antonia (DOV: 9.21.18) following the domestic violence order filed on June 6, 2018. The domestic violence restraining order provided for no visitation and expires on June 6, 2024.
- 2. On August 31, 2023 the Court ordered visitation for Father at one hour per week through Rally supervised visitation. See FOAH filed September 26, 2023.
- 3. On December 1, 2023 Father attached records of his attendance at 21 of 22 sessions in the Community Works ManAlive program. He also attached a letter from Heather Zahiri N.P. dated August 31, 2023 confirming his participation in psychotherapy and medication management at South of Market Mental Health Services since October 26, 2022.
- 4. The Rally Status report dated December 12, 2023 confirmed Rally is unable to accommodate the family as Mother requests visits on weekends.

- 5. On December 28, 2023 Father was awarded visitation every other Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. supervised by his mother. The drop off times were specific. See the FOAH filed on 2.1.24.
- 6. On March 3, 2024 Father filed an update declaration. Mother did not file an update declaration. Father states the visitation as ordered at the hearing on December 28, 2023 has not occurred because his own mother decided she did not want to supervise the visits. He only had two January visits. Father now requests non-supervised visitation. He requests exchanges at a police station convenient to the parties.
- 7. Father further requests a DNA test to determine whether or not the children are his biological children, and if so, he requests joint legal and joint physical custody. This request is beyond the scope of this review hearing and is denied without prejudice to the filing of a new Request for Order.
- 5. Mother has not filed an update declaration.
- 5. The parties' appearances are required to address the status of visitation and Father's request for unsupervised visitation.

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
3	UNIFIED FAMILY COURT		
4			
5			
6	JOHN ASENSO,	Case Number: FDI-21-795414	
7	Petitioner)	Hearing Date: April 4, 2024	
8	VS.	Hearing Time: 9:00 AM	
9	BRIDGET ASENSO,	Department: 403	
10	Respondent)	Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA	
11			
12	OTHER REVIEW HEARING		
13	TENTATIVE RULING		
14	Appearances required. The parties may appear in-person, by video, or by phone. If a party choose		
15	to appear by video or by phone, that party must abide by the Notice and Instructions for Remote		
16	Appearances in San Francisco	Family Court set forth above.	
17	1. On October 18, 2023 Petitioner Father filed hi	s Request for Child Custody and Visitation with the	
18	minor daughter, Jalina (DOB: 8.30.12) requesting joint legal custody and sole physical custody to		
19	Respondent Mother. Father requests visitation every other weekend from Saturday at 10:00 a.m. until		
20	Sunday at 9:00 a.m. He requests Mother to provide transportation.		
21	2. On November 21, 2023 Respondent Mother fi	led her responsive declaration. Mother requests sole	
22	legal and sole physical custody. She requests Father have visitation on Friday from 3:00 pm to 4 pm		
23	facilitated by Mother's son at Greer Park in Palo Alto. She states Father recorded the child support		
24	hearings and she is concerned he will record their communications.		
25	3. Father's visitation was interrupted by COVID	-19 and his Mother's illness and Father's role as her	
26	caretaker.		
27	4. A hearing was held on January 18, 2024. Mot	her was ordered to get the visitation and	
28	counseling/therapy in order within 60 days. She was ordered to answer Father's scheduled calls and		
29	Petitioner is to call at the correct times. The matter was set for mediation and this review hearing.		

5. On March 22, 2024 Respondent Mother filed her update declaration. Mother does not address her 1 efforts at obtaining counseling and therapy for Jalina to address the fear she may have to visitation. 2 Father did not file an update declaration as ordered. 6. 3 7. The parties are awarded joint legal custody and Mother is awarded sole physical custody. 4 8. The parties are to communicate peacefully and respectfully with the Talking Parents application 5 downloaded to their cell phones regarding visitation. 6 9. Neither party is to disparage the other party nor discuss these legal proceedings with the minor 7 child. 10. Neither Party shall record any court proceedings as it is strictly prohibited by law. Neither party 9 shall record the other party absent consent by the other party. 10 11 11. Mother is to encourage the minor child's relationship with her Father. 12. The parties are ordered to appear. Mother is to specifically address each step she has taken to 12 obtain counseling and therapy to address the minor child's concerns with visitation. Both parties shall be 13 prepared to address a proposed visitation plan along with a step up plan. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
3	UNIFIED FAMILY COURT	
4		
5		
6	NICHOLAS ALEXANDER PARKER-FOSTER,	Case Number: FDI-22-797312
7	Petitioner	Hearing Date: April 4, 2024
8	VS.	Hearing Time: 9:00 AM
9	MARIA FERNANDA PARKER-VIZCAINO,	Department: 403
10	Respondent	Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA
11))
12	REQUEST FOR ORDER [X] FINALIZE DISSOLUTION	
13	TENTATIVE RULING	
14	Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the	
15	Court makes the following findings and orders:	
16	A. Procedural History	
17	1. On for hearing is Respondent's 1/16/2024 Request for Order to "finalize dissolution."	
18	2. Petitioner was served on 1/17/2024 and he did not file a Responsive Declaration.	
19	B. Findings and Orders	
20	1. Petitioner's signature does not have to be no	tarized on the MSA. If Petitioner refuses to sign the
21	MSA, Respondent may bring a request to enter judgment under CCP 664.6.	
22	2. The Court will prepare the order.	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 UNIFIED FAMILY COURT 4 5 6 RICHARD A BLUFORD JR, Case Number: FDI-23-798222 7 Petitioner Hearing Date: April 4, 2024 8 VS. Hearing Time: 9:00 AM 9 NATINA B WATERS, Department: 403 10 Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA Respondent 11 12 OTHER REVIEW HEARING 13 TENTATIVE RULING Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the 14 Court makes the following findings and orders: 15 16 1. This matter is on calendar for review of the Findings and Orders filed on October 11, 2023 after 17 hearing on October 3, 2023. The matter had been set for review hearing on January 11, 2024. However, 18 the hearing was continued to April 4, 2024. 19 2. No update declarations were filed since the January hearing. 20 3. The Court previously ordered joint legal custody and sole physical custody to Mother. See the 21 FOAH filed October 11, 2023. 22 4. Aniyah shall continue to have discretion as to whether she wishes to have visitation with Father. 23 The court notes she will turn 18 years old on April 7, 2024. Mother shall encourage her as in her best 24 interest even as a young adult to have contact with her Father. 25 5. Quincy shall be encouraged likewise to visit with Father when Avont is visiting Father. 26 6. Based upon the update declaration filed by Father on December 28, 2023 and by Mother on 27 January 4 2024 visitation with Avont shall continue to be alternating Saturdays from 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 28 p.m. Father also shall have parenting time on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday after school until 6:00

29

p.m.

7. Father shall strictly adhere to the schedule as it is in Avont's best interest that there be stability and consistency in visitation.

8. The matter shall be set for a review hearing on August 6, 2024 in Dept 403 at 9:00 a.m. Both parties shall serve and file update declarations no later than ten days before the hearing. Failure to file an update declaration may result in the matter being ordered off calendar.

- 9. All prior orders not inconsistent with this order shall remain in full force and effect.
- 10. The Court will prepare the order.

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
3	UNIFIED FAMILY COURT	
4		
5		
6	GEORGE LUCAS MIGUEZ COUTINHO	Case Number: FDI-23-798982
7	TELLES,	Hearing Date: April 4, 2024
8	Petitioner	Hearing Time: 9:00 AM
9	VS.	Department: 403
10	RACHEL JOAN KNOLL TELLES,	Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA
11	Respondent)
12	REQUEST FOR ORDER ANNULMUENT OF MA	RRIAGE
13	TENTATIVE RULING	
14	The matter is ordered off calendar as there is no proof of service. Petitioner may choose to contact the	
15	ACCESS center for assistance.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
3	UNIFIED FAMILY COURT	
4		
5		
6	CHRISTOFFER STANFORD THYGESEN,	Case Number: FDV-19-814465
7	Petitioner)	Hearing Date: April 4, 2024
8	VS.	Hearing Time: 9:00 AM
9	KAILIN WANG,	Department: 403
10	Respondent)	Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA
11)	
12	REQUEST FOR ORDER CHANGE OF [X] MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE REPORTS BY J.	
13	REID MELOY, MOLLY AMMAN, STEPHANIE LEITE	
14	TENTATIVE RULING	
15	Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the	
16	Court makes the following findings and orders:	
17	A. Procedural History	
18	1. On for hearing is Respondent's 1/22/2024 Request for Order for motion in limine to exclude an	
19	and all evidence and hearsay evidence contained in the reports by reports by J. Reid Meloy, Molly	
20	Amman, and Stephanie Leite under CRC 5.220, CRC 5.235, Family Code section 3025.5, Evidence Cod	
21	1200, and People v. Sanchez (2016) 63 Cal.4th 665.	
22	2. On 3/21/2024 Petitioner filed a Responsive D	eclaration requesting the Court deny Respondent's
23	RFO because it is procedurally deficient as there is no box checked to indicate what type of order	
24	Respondent is requesting and because Respondent failed to identify any specific statements or evidence	
25	the reports that she seeks to exclude, or provided any basis to exclude "all" of the evidence.	
26	3. On 3/22/2024 Respondent filed a Reply decla	ration.
27	B. Findings and Orders	
28	1. SF Local Rule 11.13(A) provides that a trial means any hearing set by the Court as a long-cause	
29	hearing and when the trial is set by Department 403 as a long-cause hearing, the party that retains an	

expert must provide the name, business address, and summary of qualifications of that expert to the other party no later than thirty court days before trial, the written report of a testifying expert must be delivered to the other party no later than twenty court days before trial, and party seeking to rely upon expert testimony at trial must make that expert available for deposition by the other party at a mutually acceptable time at least ten court days prior to trial.

- 2. Here, Petitioner is allowed to obtain an expert witness and to present that expert's report to the Court, provided that the SF Local Rule is complied with.
- 3. The Court has not yet appointed an Evidence Code 730 expert and Petitioner has not claimed to have hired one. The Court will address this issue at the hearing on 4/25/2024.
- 4. Respondent failed to identify any specific instances of hearsay.

- 5. Respondent's RFO for motion in limine to exclude any and all evidence and hearsay evidence contained in the reports by reports by J. Reid Meloy, Molly Amman, and Stephanie Leite is denied without prejudice to specific objections at trial.
- 6. **Preparation of Order**: If you are directed by the court to prepare the order after hearing within 10 calendar days of the hearing you must either: (a) Serve the proposed order to the other party/counsel for approval, and follow the procedures set forth in CA Rules of Court, Rule 5.125(c), or (b) If the other party did not appear or the matter was uncontested, submit the proposed order after hearing directly to the court. Failure to submit the order after hearing within 10 days may allow the other party to prepare a proposed order and submit it to the court in accordance with CA Rules of Court, Rule 5.125(d).

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 UNIFIED FAMILY COURT 4 5 6 JENNIFER HAMMOND, Case Number: FDV-19-814830 7 Petitioner Hearing Date: April 4, 2024 8 VS. Hearing Time: 9:00 AM 9 PATRICK FULGHAM, Department: 403 10 Presiding: RUSSELL S. ROECA Respondent 11 12 PAYMENT FOR THERAPY FOR MINOR: REQUEST TO SEEK & OBTAIN INSURANCE -13 COVERED THERAPY AND TERMINATE THERAPY W/ CURRENT PROVIDER (DR. YAP) W. IN 14 30 CALENDAR DAYS 15 TENTATIVE RULING Having read and considered the pleadings, declarations, and other evidence submitted in this matter, the 16 17 Court makes the following findings and orders: 18 1. On February 28, 2024 Petitioner Mother filed her requests related to therapy being provided to 19 the minor daughter, Fatima (DOB: 8.27.14). Mother requests an order to allow termination of the 20 therapist, Dr. Yap, and an order requesting permission to obtain insurance covered therapy for Fatima. 21 Mother lost a substantial amount of her income resulting in her inability to continue to pay 50/50 for the 22 therapy. 23 2. Dr. Yap has confirmed the minor child is not in crisis but does recommend continued therapy. 24 Mother attempted to work with Father to identify alternative therapy that is financially feasible. Father 25 indicated in writing that he would be responsible for payment of Dr. Yap's services but continues to send 26 Mother requests for reimbursement. 27 3. The parties have a detailed Stipulation and Order regarding Custody and Visitation filed on July 28 13, 2022 giving both parents joint legal and joint physical custody of Fatima and it outlines parenting

29

time and holiday schedules among other things.

- 4. A Stipulation and Order was signed and filed on July 7, 2023 confirming the parties agreement to enroll Fatima in therapy resulting in her therapy with Dr Yap paid for 50/50 by the parents.
- 5. Father has not filed any responsive declaration.
- 6. Based upon the Mother's papers there appears to be a change in hwe financial circumstances. Termination by the parents of the minor child's therapy with Dr. Yap is unfortunate but compelled by Mother's financial circumstances and Father's failure to respond to her request. This does not preclude Father from paying the cost of therapy with Dr. Yap as it appears he agreed to do so based upon the documents provided by Mother.
- 7. The parties are ordered to meet and confer regarding obtaining insurance that would cover alternative therapy as it is in the child's best interest at this time to continue therapy.
- 8. The Parties are also ordered to return to mediation with Family Court Services to work out the therapy issue in the event the parties cannot agree after meeting and conferring. The parties are to contact Family Court Services within thirty days of this order in the event they cannot come to an agreement regarding alternative plans for Fatima's therapy.
- 9. Both parents shall download Talking parents and communicate regarding custody, visitation and therapy through the Talking Parents application.
- 10. The Court will prepare the order.