

Sent to: RivCo DCSS

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 the attached notices in full**. Do not assume it is for someone else, higher leadership, or “only for lawyers.”

These notice describe 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 DCSS office, citing department heads and key attorneys alleged to be aiding and abetting, as supported by documentation.

To ensure removal of plausible deniability, several emails have been sent to the noted individuals, which may be available via public records request, and are among our evidence.

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

**Riverside County DCSS; municipality, leadership, staff,
and attorneys in their personal and professional capacity,
including Nicole Windom-Hurd and Elizabeth Lawrence**
2081 Iowa Ave. 260 N. Broadway 47-950 Arabia St.
Riverside, CA 92507 Blythe, CA 92225 Indio, CA 92201

Citizen's statement:

I, Grant MacKenzie, assert that the Riverside County Courts, in collaboration with California and Riverside County Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and related departments, municipalities, 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 from retribution stemming from the exercise of authority exceeding 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

Date ▶ February 26, 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 via certified mail.

California Civil Code - CIV § 52.1 The Tom Bane Act (b) If a person or persons, whether or not acting under color of law, interferes by threat, intimidation, or coercion, or attempts to interfere by threat, intimidation, or coercion, with the exercise or enjoyment by any individual or individuals of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or of the rights secured by the Constitution or laws of this state, the Attorney General, or any district attorney or city attorney may bring a civil action for injunctive and other appropriate equitable relief in the name of the people of the State of California in order to protect the peaceable exercise or enjoyment of the right or rights secured.

(C) Provides for individuals to prosecute for civil action damages. (n) bars state, peace officer, and agency immunity defenses.

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 2041 Iowa Ave, Riverside, CA 92507-2414

ATTENTION:

Riverside 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.

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

Temporary-judge authority and renderings are conditional safeguards, depend on lawful administration of notice to litigants, and subsequent consent procedures, subject to:

- **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)

In support-related calendars, these safeguards interact with the practical reality that many litigants are self-represented and therefore uniquely vulnerable to defective notice and coerced “paper consent.”

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. Orders are enforced and treated as valid—often with DCSS advocacy.

Outcome:

The court record becomes the authority certificate used to impose coercive support orders, enforcement actions, and downstream consequences—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 that defeat informed consent, such as failing to clearly convey:

- Temporary-judge posture as such (not merely “commissioner”),
- The litigant’s **right to have the matter heard by a judge**,
- And in some postings, that the temporary judge is a **qualified member of the State Bar** (shielding bar accountability).

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

CRC 2.816 requires defined content and secondary disclosure methods. When not actually administered, litigants are kept blind to the 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 waiver creates an independent authority defect lane—especially relevant in support calendars with high SRL rates.

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

Litigants who object after discovering the mismatch often encounter waiver/untimeliness arguments and procedural barriers 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) DCSS Risk Node: Advocacy That “Hardens” the Defect

DCSS is at elevated risk where its attorneys or staff:

- Affirmatively rely on minute-order “stipulation” recitals as conclusive,
- Oppose litigant challenges without verifying predicate compliance,
- Argue waiver/untimeliness to defeat review of record-integrity defects,
- Advocate for enforcement of orders rooted in contested temporary-judge authority
- Participate in proceedings where CRC 2.818 disqualification posture is implicated but ignored, or
- Participate in proceedings or affirmation of renderings where FAM 4251 two-part mandatory advisements are defective or disregarded, and or objection to recommended orders are obstructed or disregarded, or right to trial de novo is denied.

Because DCSS attorneys function as repeat players in the same calendars, continued participation after notice can be used to infer knowledge or reckless disregard if defects are substantiated.

7) Public-Money / Program Funding Lane

This section is included because DCSS operations are connected to state and federal program structures and reporting that assume lawful adjudication and valid orders.

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

- Support enforcement actions and administrative activity premised on void/voidable orders,
- Program performance metrics and operational reporting built on outputs later deemed defective,
- Downstream cost footprints (hearings, staffing, enforcement coordination), and
- Any reimbursement structures or funding allocations that assume lawful case processing and valid judicial authority.

Even where DCSS does not create the court record, continued reliance on and advocacy for enforcement of defectively certified authority can “cause” or materially support downstream representations and cost burdens tied to those outputs.

8) Immunity / Ultra Vires Exposure and Reverberation

Where a judicial officer or government actors 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.

Reverberation beyond the immediate calendar:

If the record-certification machinery is knowingly continued after notice, it can create 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.

DCSS-specific application:

Where DCSS attorneys, after credible notice, continue to advocate for, rely upon, or enforce outcomes that depend on contested authority-certification recitals—without verifying predicate compliance—such advocacy may be treated as “hardening” the defective certification and expanding institutional exposure, including professional responsibility and government-liability lanes, depending on the facts established.

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 advocating enforcement.
3. Require verification of CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver posture where attorney vs SRL configuration exists.

B) Preserve immediately:

- Internal DCSS communications regarding temporary-judge posture, objections, “waiver” arguments, and record corrections,
- Hearing notes and attorney appearance logs where objections were raised,
- Policies/training related to handling consent/authority disputes,
- Communications with court staff regarding minute orders or “corrections.”

C) Audit:

Implement a sampling review of commissioner-judge pro tempore calendars where:

- Pro Se litigants vs. counsel-represented parties (family law/unlawful detainer),
- Minute orders recite “stipulation” or waver filing per applicable subject matter/advisement,
- Objections were raised or filed and treated as waived/untimely,
- Enforcement actions were pursued or advocated by DCSS.

10) Use of Law Enforcement in and out of Proceedings

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 deprivation of income, coercive control, 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.

Also see **Tom Bane Act** (CIV 52.1(a), (b), and (n))

11) 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.

12) 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.

13) 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.

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.

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.