

Sent to: RivCo CPS/DPSS

FORMAL NOTICE — IMMEDIATE ATTENTION REQUIRED

CEASE and DESIST

READ THIS FIRST (PERSONAL WARNING)

This and the attached documents are formal advisement warning you that your office, role, or agency may be assisting in, or an extension of, a potentially unlawful machinery and practice posing significant repercussions.

Failing to carefully review and respond to this notice may increase **personal and institutional exposure** for you, your agency, and/or the entity you represent.

You should **personally read this notice in full**. Do not assume it is for someone else, higher leadership, or “only for lawyers.”

This notice describes misconduct risks and potential consequences. You should **consult legal counsel** or your agency’s **risk/compliance team immediately**.

If the described practices continue after receipt of this notice, your office and/or you personally may later be treated as having been informed—even if you did not read it carefully—which may be cited as evidence supporting findings of intentional ignorance, willful blindness, and reckless disregard.

Versions of these cease-and-desist documents were certified mailed to each Riverside County CPS/DPSS office, citing executive leadership and department heads as intended recipients.

To ensure removal of plausible deniability, and to provide supporting public record, emails with these documents attached were sent to DCSS and named DCSS attorneys.

Violation Warning
Denial of Rights Under Color of Law

Violation Warning—18 U.S.C. §242; 18 U.S.C. §245; 42 U.S.C. §1983

Name and address of Citizen

We The People of The United States and California
by agent and bearer of Constitutional rights and liberties,
Including Grant MacKenzie
29910 Murrieta HSR #323G, Murrieta CA 92563

Name and address of Notice Recipient

Individual Names Provided in Attached Documents
Riverside County DPSS Leadership and Staff
10281 Kidd St., Riverside, CA 92503

Citizen's statement: I, Grant MacKenzie, assert that the Riverside County Courts, in collaboration with the Riverside County DPSS and related departments and agents, are engaged in a systematic deprivation of civil rights and liberties protected by the U.S. Constitution, the California Constitution, and relevant statutes. These issues arise from a denial of due process and equal protection, as well as retribution stemming from the exercise of authority that exceeds what is permitted for the courts, law enforcement, and municipalities. Details illustrating these violations can be found in the attached cease-and-desist notice, which addresses the use of temporary judges in accordance with CA CRC, Rules 2.816-2.819 and FAM § 4251.

I certify that the forgoing information stated here is true and correct.

Citizen's signature

Grant MacKenzie, on behalf of We The People,
by agent and bearer of Constitutional Rights

[Handwritten signature of Grant MacKenzie]

Date February 28, 2026

Legal Notice and Warning

Federal law provides that it is a crime to violate the Constitutional Rights of a citizen under the Color of Law. You can be arrested for this crime and you can also be held personally liable for civil damages.

18 USC §241 Crimes and Criminal Procedure for conspiracy against rights. Attempting to coerce or deceive a citizen to surrender his Constitutional Rights is a Federal Crime. Federal Courts have found that your ignorance of the law is no excuse.

18 USC §242 provides that whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and if death results, or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

18 USC §245 provided that Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, intimidates or interferes with any person from participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States; [or] applying for or enjoying employment, or any perquisite thereof, by any agency of the United States; shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and if death results or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life or may be sentenced to death.

42 USC §1983 provides that every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

Warning: You may be in violation of Federal Law, and persisting with your demand or actions may lead to your arrest and/or civil damages. Also, understand that the law provides that you can be held personally responsible and liable, as well as your company or agency.

You are advised to desist with your demands or accessory and to seek personal legal counsel regarding this matter.

Notice of Service:

I, Grant MacKenzie certify that I personally delivered this notice to the above named recipient and address (or named and address provided in noted attachment) on [Handwritten signature] via certified mail.

CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

ATTENTION DPSS/CPS

JUSTICE-SYSTEM, TRIBUNAL, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES ADVERSARIAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY, LITIGANTS, ELECTORAL INTEGRITY, AND CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery
Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21, CCP § 259(d), CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM 4251 Disqualification Overlay and Immunity Exposure

TO: **Riverside County DPSS (Department of Social Services/DCFS/CPS/CWS/CSD/APS)**
10281 Kidd St., Riverside, CA 92503 / 4060 County Circle Dr., Riverside, CA 92503

ATTENTION:

Charity Douglas - DPSS Director

Todd Bellanca - DPSS Managing Director

Heather Hernandez - Civil Rights Coordinator

Bridgette Hernandez - Assistant Director - Children’s Services

Monica L. Bentley - Assistant Director - Finance & Forecasting

Carl Letamendi - Assistant Director, Administrative Services

Allison Gonzalez - Assistant Director - Self Sufficiency Division

Barry Dewing - Assistant Director - Adult Services Division

Lonetta Bryan or current - Deputy Director - Office of Health & Well-Being

DPSS/CSD Regional Managers and Staff

SUBJECT: Formal warning - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may be relying upon court records that falsely certify temporary-judge / commissioner consent and authority (CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM 4251) and/or proceed under a disqualified temporary-judge posture (CRC 2.818). After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 30, 2026

1) Why You Are Receiving This

This notice is directed to the Riverside County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) / Department of Social Services (DSS) / Child Protective Services (CPS) / Children’s Services Division (CSD) / and all DPSS/DSS departments (here forward collectively referred to as “**DPSS**”) because **DPSS** case processing and courtroom posture can become materially dependent on court outputs—minute orders, warrants, subpoenas, findings, orders, custody/placement determinations, child extraction, family displacement, restraining orders, visitation restrictions, and other enforcement—particularly in high-volume calendars involving self-represented parents, children, and vulnerable families.

DPSS is receiving this notice because DPSS personnel may:

- initiate or support court filings and recommendations,
- implement placement and removal actions dependent on court authority,
- rely on minute orders as the controlling legal instrument, and
- coordinate with **County Counsel** (as counsel of record for the agency) to advocate for enforcement and continuation of court orders.

If the underlying authority of the decision-maker is defectively established and then “certified” through record recitals (e.g., “all parties stipulate”), DPSS operational action can become part of the machinery’s downstream effect.

After credible notice of a systemic authority-certification defect, “we just enforce what the court says” becomes a materially weaker defense if the authority being enforced is itself alleged to have been unlawfully manufactured.

2) Core Legal Framework - California Rules of Court, Rules 2.810-2.819 and Family Code § 4251

Temporary-judge authority is conditional and depends on lawful notice and consent procedures, including:

- **Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21** and **CCP § 259(d)** (authority is conditionally conferred, not presumed)
- **CRC 2.816–2.819** (mandatory notice/advisements and stipulation methods)
- **CRC 2.818** (disqualification/waiver constraints in specified contexts, including common attorney vs self-represented posture issues)
- **FAM § 4251** (Federal Title IV-D directives and commissioner/temporary judges)

This document provides notice of legal authorities and defect patterns that require immediate compliance review and escalation.

3) The Machinery (Mechanism → Outcome) — The Core Loop

Mechanism:

1. CRC 2.816 notice and secondary advisements are missing or materially defective.
2. No authentic stipulation occurs “after notice” (CRC 2.816(d)).
3. The record later recites “all parties stipulate,” retro-certifying authority.
4. Challenges are blocked as waived/untimely or procedurally suppressed.
5. DPSS and County Counsel operationalize the record as lawful authority in planning, recommendations, implementation, court proceedings, and police and Sheriff enforcement.

Outcome:

A record-based “authority certification” used as a legal instrument can become the basis for coercive outcomes—removals, placements, visitation restrictions, supervised contact orders, compliance plans, funding, and enforcement actions—despite the asserted absence of lawful predicates.

4) Documented / Record-Based Defect Patterns (Tier 1 — Foundational)

This section is intentionally focused and non-exhaustive because it is the foundation of everything else.

A) CRC 2.816 notice content defects (posting and advisements)

Observed posting/advisement variations include omissions and convoluted notices that defeat informed consent, including but not limited to failing to clearly convey:

- temporary-judge posture as such (not merely or obscured focus on “commissioner”),
- the litigant’s **right to have the matter heard by a judge**,
- and, that the temporary judge is a **qualified member of the State Bar** (shielding temporary judges from litigant’s awareness of their bar accountability).

B) CRC 2.816(b) secondary advisements not reliably administered

CRC 2.816 requires defined consent and secondary disclosure methods. When not actually administered, litigants are kept in the dark about their right to refuse and request a judge.

C) CRC 2.816(d) stipulation bypassed; “stipulation” certified anyway

CRC 2.816(d) contemplates stipulation only after notice has been given. If predicates are defective, stipulation is not lawfully established—yet minutes may still recite it.

D) CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver posture not surfaced or handled

Where attorney vs self-represented posture triggers CRC 2.818 protections, continuing under temporary-judge posture without valid signed waiver creates an independent authority defect lane.

E) Objections suppressed; waiver narratives used to harden the record

Litigants who object after discovering the mismatch often encounter waiver/untimeliness arguments, procedural barriers, and retribution that prevent review of the predicates.

5) Legal Framework – California Family Code § 4251 (Title IV-D)

Fam. Code § 4251 “Closed-Loop” Concern (Initiating Notice → Hearing Advisement → Objection(s) → Recommended Order → Judge Ratification / Trial De Novo → Enforcement)

Fam. Code § 4251(b) requires two distinct advisements delivered through two media and at two points in time: **(i)** a Judicial Council–developed notice included on all forms and pleadings used to initiate a child support action or proceeding advising parties of their right to review by a superior court judge and how to exercise that right, and **(ii)** an advisement by the court prior to the commencement of the hearing that the matter is being heard by a commissioner who will act as a temporary judge unless any party objects to the commissioner acting as a temporary judge. Where these mandatory advisements are not administered, are materially defective, or are obscured, parties may be deprived of meaningful opportunity to object and to access judge review.

When the two distinct advisements are properly administered and a party objects to the commissioner acting as a temporary judge, the commissioner may still hear the matter and issue findings and a recommended order, which then requires judicial review before it becomes enforceable. Within 10 court days, a judge shall ratify the recommended order unless either party timely objects to the recommended order or the recommended order is in error; if a party objects, the matter proceeds to trial de novo before a judge.

The due-process risk is materially aggravated when a party timely invokes these safeguards, but objections (or defects) are disregarded, procedurally suppressed, or later contradicted by record-making that implies “stipulation,” “no objection,” or “untimeliness” despite timely notice. This creates a closed loop in which defective advisements prevent informed exercise of objection and meaningful access to judge review, and subsequent record certifications foreclose the very review mechanism § 4251 is designed to preserve—rendering resulting orders potentially void or voidable depending on the record and controlling law.

The due-process and record-integrity risk is materially aggravated when a party is not properly advised and/or invokes these safeguards, but objections are disregarded, procedurally suppressed, or later contradicted by record-making that implies “stipulation,” “no objection,” or “untimeliness” despite timely notice—and/or when a recommended order that is “in error” is nonetheless ratified.

This creates a closed loop in which defective advisements and record certifications foreclose the very review mechanism § 4251 is designed to preserve—hardening defective outputs into enforceable orders and rendering resulting orders potentially void or voidable depending on the record and controlling law.

6) DPSS Risk Node: Operational Reliance + County Counsel Advocacy

DPSS exposure expands where agency action depends on the “certified” record without verification of predicate compliance, including where:

- case plans, removals, placements, and visitation restrictions rely on minute orders reciting authority/consent that is credibly disputed;
- DPSS personnel treat contested authority certifications as conclusive rather than escalated;
- **County Counsel**, as counsel of record, advocates for continuation/enforcement using waiver/untimeliness frames without verifying CRC predicate compliance;
- DPSS/County Counsel function as repeat players in the same calendars, creating predictable notice/scienter inferences if defects are substantiated and continued.

7) Immunity / Ultra Vires Exposure and Record-Hardening

Where a judicial officer or government actor knows or reasonably should know—through objections, filings, notices, or internal awareness—that the authority predicates were not satisfied or that disqualification/waiver posture was implicated, and nonetheless directs, permits, relies on, or ratifies record-making that certifies consent/authority that did not occur, such conduct may later be evaluated (depending on facts) as nonjudicial administrative action, ultra vires conduct, and/or knowing participation in falsified legal-instrument creation, which can materially affect immunity defenses and institutional liability.

DPSS + County Counsel “record-hardening” application:

Where DPSS personnel and **County Counsel (as counsel of record for the agency)**—after credible notice—continue to **participate in, rely upon, advocate from, or operationalize** contested authority-certification recitals without verifying predicate compliance and correcting the record where warranted, such conduct may be treated (depending on facts) as **hardening** a defective certification into ongoing agency action (placements, removals, visitation restrictions, service plans, enforcement requests), thereby expanding exposure across both **agency operations** and **legal advocacy lanes**.

Staff reliance / qualified-immunity notation (case managers, social workers, supervisors):

If DPSS case managers, social workers, supervisors, or investigators—after notice—continue to implement or enforce actions materially dependent on contested authority certifications without escalation, verification, or corrective reporting, their reliance on routine immunity defenses may be materially weakened depending on the facts established, including where continued conduct is characterized as **knowing participation, reckless disregard, or administrative ratification** of defectively certified authority.

Reverberation beyond the immediate calendar:

If the record-certification fabricating is knowingly continued after notice, it can have broader consequences, including ethics/fitness scrutiny, recusal/disqualification pressures, credibility and impeachment exposure, and integrity challenges that may spill into other proceedings where the same actors serve as adjudicators, affiants, witnesses, or enforcement authorities.

8) Public-Money / Program Funding Lane

This section is included because dependency operations create significant public cost footprints, and program structures may assume lawful adjudication and valid orders.

If defective authority is being manufactured at scale and then treated as valid, predictable exposure lanes include:

- operational and placement cost footprints tied to orders later deemed void/voidable;
- program reporting and case metrics built on outputs later deemed defective;
- downstream costs linked to repeat hearings and enforcement actions that would not exist absent the defective authority posture;
- any reimbursements, allocations, or grant-linked activities that assume lawful case processing and valid judicial authority.

Even where DPSS does not create the court record, continued reliance on and operationalization of defectively certified authority can materially support downstream representations and cost burdens tied to those outputs.

9) Required Response: Cease / Preserve / Audit (Minimum Adequate Actions)

A) Cease (pending audit):

1. Cease treating minute-order “stipulation” recitals as self-proving where predicates are disputed.
2. In any temporary-judge posture matter, require verification that CRC 2.816 predicates were satisfied and accurately recorded before implementing agency action dependent on those orders.
3. Require verification of CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver posture where attorney vs SRL configuration exists.

B) Preserve immediately:

- DPSS internal communications regarding temporary-judge posture, objections, “waiver” arguments, and record corrections;
- case notes reflecting objections or notice to staff regarding authority defects;
- communications with County Counsel and court personnel about minute orders, “corrections,” or predicate compliance;
- training materials governing reliance on minute orders and authority disputes.

C) Audit:

Implement a sampling review of calendars/cases where:

- SRL litigants were present,
- minute orders recite “stipulation,”
- objections were raised and treated as waived/untimely,
- DPSS actions were implemented dependent on the contested certification.

10) Use of Law Enforcement

Use of Armed Law Enforcement After Notice (Escalation, Coercion, and Civil-Rights Exposure)

This notice expressly warns that, once credible defects in the authority-certification machinery have been raised, the use of armed law enforcement (Sheriff, bailiffs, deputies, police, or any sworn officer) to implement, threaten, or compel compliance with actions or legal instruments materially dependent on the contested authority certification is not a neutral administrative step—it is a force multiplier.

Where government actors proceed after notice and leverage armed officers to (a) execute actions based on contested authority certifications, (b) compel compliance, or (c) suppress or obstruct objections, the conduct may later be characterized—depending on facts—as:

- threats, intimidation, or coercion used to interfere with protected rights (including speech/petition and due process rights);
- color-of-law deprivation where force-backed enforcement operationalizes defective authority into real-world seizure, restraint, removal, detention, chilling;
- aiding and abetting / accessory-after-notice participation in the maintenance and enforcement of a defectively certified authority posture;
- aggravating evidence of scienter (reckless disregard / intentional ignorance) where escalation occurs despite credible notice and available alternatives (verification, escalation to counsel, pause pending audit);
- Pretextual and prior restraint of rights and liberties;
- Retribution against the exercising of protected activity, government redress, or whistleblowing.

Common post-notice enforcement forms (non-exhaustive):

- threats of arrest, removal, detention, deprivation, or penalties used to silence objections, or force compliance or admissions;
- courtroom removal or intimidation of litigants, witnesses, observers, process servers, or press;
- execution or assistance in removals, placements, custody exchanges, eviction-related actions, warrants, restraints, transport, or enforcement operations driven by the contested authority output.

Consequence:

If the underlying authority certification is later proven defective or falsely recorded, then force-backed execution transforms a paper dispute into measurable constitutional and tort harm. Continued armed enforcement after notice substantially increases institutional and personal exposure because it evidences a choice to compel rather than verify and cure. See **Tom Bain Act** (CIV 52.1(a), (b), and (n))

11) Conspiracy / Aiding & Abetting / Accessory-After-Notice Exposure (Secondary Liability Lane)

If the described machinery is substantiated, then **continued participation, ratification, reliance, concealment, record-hardening, or force-backed enforcement after notice** may create exposure for **secondary liability**—including aiding and abetting, conspiracy-based liability, and accessory-after-the-fact theories—depending on facts and jurisdiction. Liability risk may attach even where an actor did not originate the predicate defect, if the actor **knowingly helps operationalize it, suppresses challenges, relies on defective authority certifications as self-proving, or escalates coercive enforcement despite credible notice and available verification/cure steps.**

Accordingly, continued conduct after notice may warrant review under broader civil/criminal exposure lanes (non-exhaustive) commonly associated with coordinated public-integrity schemes, including: **enterprise-pattern (RICO) theories; bribery/quid pro quo public corruption; honest-services fraud; mail and wire fraud; extortion/coercion; trafficking-related inquiries where coercion/benefit structures are proven; money-laundering/financial tracing; and unlawful detention/false-imprisonment exposure where force-backed enforcement is tied to defectively certified authority.**

12) Election Accountability Exposure / Public Integrity (Officeholder & Candidate Fitness Lane)

Because many implicated actors hold public office or positions requiring an oath—and some may be seeking election, reelection, promotion, or retention of office—continued concealment, record-hardening, retaliation, or force-backed suppression of objections after notice can create additional exposure beyond the underlying procedural defects. If the misconduct, machinery, and concealment described in this notice are substantiated, such conditions can impair **voter consideration** and the integrity of democratic processes by depriving **voters, oversight bodies, and the public** of accurate information relevant to evaluating **a candidate's character, performance, and fitness for office.**

Accordingly, post-notice continuation of constitutionally suspect practices described in this notice may warrant scrutiny as intentional public-integrity misconduct where official power is used to preserve or normalize defectively certified authority, suppress reporting, or chill protected speech/petition/press activity—particularly in the context of contemporaneous local, county, and statewide elections—including the ongoing California gubernatorial election cycle—where public trust in courts, law enforcement, and candidate integrity can materially influence voter decision-making and electoral outcomes.

13) Non-Retaliation Warning

Do not retaliate against any person for objecting, documenting, serving notices, observing proceedings, seeking records, or reporting concerns. Retaliation after notice increases exposure.

14) Legal Counsel Advisements

Recipients of these notices and warnings are encouraged to seek competent legal counsel regarding the content of these documents, the potential implications, and the relevance to them personally.

15) Reservation of Rights

All rights reserved. This notice is not exhaustive. Additional substantiating materials may be provided to authorized investigators, oversight entities, or courts through appropriate channels.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

ATTENTION DCSS

JUSTICE-SYSTEM, TRIBUNAL, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES ADVERSARIAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY, LITIGANTS, AND CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery
CRC 2.816–2.819 + CRC 2.818 Disqualification Overlay and Immunity Exposure
Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b)

TO: Riverside County DCSS office at 260 N. Broadway, Blythe, CA 92225

ATTENTION:

Blythe DCSS Office Director, Leadership, Deputy Attorneys, Staff and, Nicole Windom-Hurd – Director Riverside County DCSS,
Kim Britt - Former Director DCSS/ Current Assistant County Executive Officer,
Elizabeth McCall Lawrence - Chief DCSS Attorney, Bar #312494,
Hirbod Rashidi - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #204332,
Jeniffer Katie Rashidi - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #201612,
Samantha Carras Larkin - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #312494

SUBJECT:

Formal warning - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may be relying upon court records that falsely certify temporary-judge consent and authority (CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM 4251) and/or proceed under a disqualified temporary-judge posture (CRC 2.818). After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

February 27, 2026

1) Why You Are Receiving This

This notice is directed to DCSS because DCSS is not a passive bystander in support calendars. DCSS attorneys and staff frequently:

- Appear in high-volume Title IV-D matters,
- Advocate for enforcement, adoption, or ratification of orders,
- Oppose objections or procedural challenges, and
- Rely on court records and minute orders as authoritative.

If the underlying temporary-judge authority is being defectively established and then “certified” through record recitals (e.g., “all parties stipulate”), DCSS advocacy can become a material link in the machinery—particularly where DCSS attorneys argue waiver/untimeliness or otherwise support outcomes that depend on the contested certification.

This notice is intended to remove plausible deniability, impose a duty to investigate, and preserve evidence.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

ATTENTION DCSS

JUSTICE-SYSTEM, TRIBUNAL, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES ADVERSARIAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY, LITIGANTS, AND CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

**Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery
CRC 2.816–2.819 + CRC 2.818 Disqualification Overlay and Immunity Exposure
Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b)**

TO: **Riverside County DCSS office at 47-950 Arabia Street, Indio, CA 92201**

ATTENTION:

Indio DCSS Office Director, Leadership, Deputy Attorneys, Staff and, Nicole Windom-Hurd – Director Riverside County DCSS,
Kim Britt - Former Director DCSS/ Current Assistant County Executive Officer,
Elizabeth McCall Lawrence - Chief DCSS Attorney, Bar #312494,
Hirbod Rashidi - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #204332,
Jeniffer Katie Rashidi - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #201612,
Samantha Carras Larkin - Deputy Child Support Attorney, Bar #312494

SUBJECT:

Formal warning - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may be relying upon court records that falsely certify temporary-judge consent and authority (CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM 4251) and/or proceed under a disqualified temporary-judge posture (CRC 2.818). After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

February 27, 2026

1) Why You Are Receiving This

This notice is directed to DCSS because DCSS is not a passive bystander in support calendars. DCSS attorneys and staff frequently:

- Appear in high-volume Title IV-D matters,
- Advocate for enforcement, adoption, or ratification of orders,
- Oppose objections or procedural challenges, and
- Rely on court records and minute orders as authoritative.

If the underlying temporary-judge authority is being defectively established and then “certified” through record recitals (e.g., “all parties stipulate”), DCSS advocacy can become a material link in the machinery—particularly where DCSS attorneys argue waiver/untimeliness or otherwise support outcomes that depend on the contested certification.

This notice is intended to remove plausible deniability, impose a duty to investigate, and preserve evidence.