

Sent to: RivCo JUDICIARY

## 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 does not pertain to you, is for administrative or higher leadership, or “another department.”

These notices 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 every courthouse in Riverside County, which cited each judge assigned to the respective courthouse as a recipient. The Presiding Judge and Assistant Presiding Judge were included as recipients in each version.

To ensure removal of plausible deniability, the respective version of the documents will be CC'd to each courtroom and CC'd to each judicial officer's email across the Riverside County Courts and available for public access and DoJ investigation.

Recipients include judges who have assisted Sheriff Bianco during the alleged fraud and corruption, including his recent ballot investigation involving the CA Supreme Court.

# 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 Courts; judiciary (Bench), SJOs, officers of the Court,  
tribunal municipalities, and personnel in their personal and professional  
capacity, including Judges Jacqueline C. Jackson and Dean Benjamini  
9991 County Farm Road P.O. Box 1547 46-200 Oasis Street 4175 Main Street  
Riverside, CA 92503 Riverside, CA 92502 Indio, CA 92201 Riverside, CA 92501

Citizen's statement:

I, Grant MacKenzie, assert that the Riverside County Courts, in collaboration with its judiciary 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 ▶ March 1, 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 Grant MacKenzie 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

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**

**TO: HALL OF JUSTICE and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
4100 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501

ATTENTION:

**Nicholas Firetag**, Judiciary

**Jennifer Gerard**, Judiciary

**Samra Furbush**, Judiciary

Jason Armand, Judiciary

Jay Kiel, Judiciary

Valerie Navarro, Judiciary

Scott Williams, Judiciary

Melisa Hale, Judiciary

Matthew Perantoni, Judiciary

Emma Smith, Judiciary

Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge

Francisco Navarro, Judiciary

Timothy Hollenhorst, Judiciary

Laura Garcia, Judiciary

Gail O’Rane, Judiciary

Charles Koosed, Judiciary

Matthew Forsse, Judiciary

Gary Polk, Judiciary

Jerry Yang, Judiciary

Samah Shouka Judiciary

Joshlyn Pulliam, Judiciary

Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

SUBJECT:

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

---

## 2) Governing Authority (High-Level)

Temporary-judge authority is conditional and depends on rule-based safeguards intended to protect due process and meaningful consent, including:

- **Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21** (temporary judge by stipulation)
- **CCP § 259(d)** (conditional authority framework)
- **CRC 2.816–2.819** (mandatory notice, stipulation methods, and related safeguards)
- **CRC 2.818** (temporary-judge disqualification/waiver protections in specified contexts, including common family law and unlawful detainer settings in pro se vs attorney posture)
- **FAM § 4251** (Title IV-D child support commissioner proceedings; temporary judge posture advisements, objection, recommended order, judge review/de novo framework).

---

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

### Mechanism:

1. Mandatory advisements and notice predicates are not administered or are materially defective (CRC 2.816 and/or FAM § 4251).
2. No meaningful stipulation occurs (CRC 2.816(d)), and/or no meaningful ability to object and obtain judge review under § 4251.
3. The court record later recites “all parties stipulate” (or equivalent), retro-certifying consent and authority.
4. Objections and challenges are procedurally blocked or treated as waived/untimely.
5. The record recital is treated as an authority certificate to justify continuing orders and enforcement.
6. The process repeats at scale.

### Outcome:

A record-based “certification” can be used to justify authority over children, property, money, liberty interests, travel, fines, contempt, warrants, custody outcomes, evictions, and other coercive effects—despite the asserted absence of compliant predicates.

---

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

This section is intentionally focused and non-exhaustive. These are the pivotal predicates on which the system is lawful or defective:

### A) CRC 2.816 Notice Content Defects (Posting and Advisements)

Evidence indicates postings and/or advisements are materially incomplete, inconsistent by courtroom, or absent, including omissions that defeat informed consent—such as failure to clearly convey:

- The 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** (which also deprives litigants of knowing the State Bar complaint channel exists as a guardrail).

**B) CRC 2.816(b) Secondary Notice Methods Not Reliably Administered**

CRC 2.816 requires more than a wall posting. Defects in secondary disclosures (oral/written/video/on-the-record notice depending on method) prevent meaningful opportunity to object or refuse.

**C) CRC 2.816(d) Stipulation Methods Are Functionally Bypassed**

CRC 2.816(d) contemplates stipulation “after notice has been given.” Where notice predicates (a) and (b) are defective, stipulation is not lawfully established—yet minutes may still recite stipulation language.

**D) CRC 2.818 Disqualification / Waiver Posture Not Properly Addressed**

In specified contexts where pro se vs attorney posture exists, CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver handling becomes an independent authority barrier. Where not surfaced, handled, or verified, authority certification is further compromised.

**E) Objection Suppression Creates a Closed-Loop Record Trap**

When litigants later object to the mismatch between what occurred and what the record certifies, challenges are frequently treated as waived/untimely or deflected procedurally, hardening the defective certification.

---

**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 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.

---

## **6) Cross-lane contamination: Convoluting proceedings and cross-lane due process error**

Modern areas of law, including family-law matters, frequently involve multiple, overlapping procedural lanes (e.g., dissolution, custody, Title IV-D support under Fam. Code § 4251, domestic violence restraining orders, unlawful detainer, division of assets/debts, contempt/warrant enforcement, and criminal violations). California utilizes commissioners and other subordinate judicial officers—often operating under a temporary-judge posture—to handle many of these matters, which may be transferred between departments and judicial officers as issues overlap.

Each lane carries distinct authority predicates, advisements, disqualification limits, and judge-review pathways. When predicates are assumed, substituted, or ‘papered over’ across lanes—such as treating ‘stipulation/no objection’ language from one lane as satisfying consent, waiver, disqualification, objection/de novo, or review requirements in another—the result can be compounded due-process error and defectively certified outputs that are later enforced as if valid. The following minimum actions are therefore required pending audit.

In high-volume calendars, ‘routine’ procedural processing can drift into dispositive determinations imposing legal consequences, without lane-specific predicates being satisfied; the record is then used to certify consent/waiver and to justify enforcement.

---

## **7) Why This Is Not a Minor Procedural Issue (Scale and Enforcement)**

If confirmed, the asserted defect patterns are structural, scalable, and capable of producing mass void or voidable outputs across venues over protracted time. The harm compounds when:

- Enforcement mechanisms (bailiffs, sheriff operations, civil enforcement, CPS and custody actions, warrants, contempt, etc.) act or are imposed on the record-certified authority, and
- Agencies and attorneys rely on the record as the “truth instrument,” further embedding the defect into downstream government and private party actions.

---

## **8) Public-Money / Program Funding Lane**

This section is included because DCSS and other government agencies and facilitators operate within state and federal program structures, accounting, and reporting regimes that assume lawful adjudication, valid authority, and enforceable orders, and because institutional incentives and benefits may be coupled—directly or indirectly—to continued operation and outputs of these calendars.

If defective authority is being manufactured at scale and then treated as valid, predictable exposure lanes include but are not limited to:

- Support enforcement actions and administrative activity premised on void/voidable orders;
- Program performance metrics and operational reporting built on defective, skewed outputs;
- Downstream cost footprints (hearings, staffing, facilitation, enforcement coordination);
- Reimbursement structures or funding allocations that assume lawful case processing, valid judicial authority, and enforceable adjudication; and
- Compensation, benefits, assignments, contracts, or other value-linked incentives that may be influenced by throughput, enforcement leverage, or institutional and political process.

---

## 9) 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 deprivation and prior restraint of rights and liberties;
- Retribution against exercised 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.

See (non-exhaustive): Bane Act (**CIV § 52.1(b)** and (n), **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983**).

---

## 10) Post-Notice Ratification and Ultra Vires / Nonjudicial Conduct Exposure (Immunity & Reverberation Lane)

Where a judicial officer knows or reasonably should know—through objections, filings, notices, or internal awareness—that the authority predicates were not satisfied, or that CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver requirements or FAM § 4251 advisement/objection/judge review safeguards

were 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.

---

## **11) Required Response: Cease / Preserve / Audit (Minimum Adequate Actions)**

### **A) Cease and Correct (Pending Audit)**

1. CRC 2.816 lane (attorney temporary judge): Review and cease proceeding under an attorney temporary-judge posture unless CRC 2.816 predicates (required notice contents, required disclosure methods, and valid stipulation sequence) are fully satisfied and accurately recorded where required (e.g., in equitable renderings, dispositive determinations, etc.).
2. CRC 2.818 lane (limitation on service / waiver): In family law and unlawful detainer matters, review and cease proceeding under a court-appointed attorney temporary-judge posture where CRC 2.818(b)(3) applies unless a compliant presiding-judge good-cause waiver is executed and filed as the rule requires.
3. Fam. Code § 4251 lane (Title IV-D commissioner proceedings): Review and cease proceeding under commissioner temporary-judge posture unless Fam. Code § 4251(b) predicates are fully satisfied and verifiable, including the two mandatory advisements (initiating-forms notice of the right to superior-court judge review and how to exercise it; and pre-hearing advisement that the commissioner will act as temporary judge unless any party objects). Where objection is made, ensure the recommended-order → judge ratification framework is honored, including the 10-court-day ratification requirement and the statutory bar on ratification where a party objects or the recommended order is in error.
4. Cease recording or relying on minute-order litigant “stipulation” recitals as self-proving where predicate compliance is credibly disputed, not verifiable, or contradicted by the hearing record.
5. Cease recording or relying on minute-order recitals asserting “no objection,” “untimely objection,” or “waiver” as self-proving where required advisements, filing/receipt, or timeliness are credibly disputed, or where record-making conflicts with filed objections.
6. Cross-lane integrity (conflicted predicates / outputs): Review and cease cross-lane processing that treats predicate satisfaction, waiver, or “stipulation/no objection” in one temporary-judge lane as satisfying predicates in another. Do not use outputs from one lane (e.g., dissolution/custody, IV-D support under §4251, DVRO, unlawful detainer, contempt/warrants) as enforcement predicates in another without verifying that the lane-specific consent/disqualification/advisement requirements and judge-review safeguards were satisfied and accurately recorded.

## **B) Preserve Immediately (Litigation Hold)**

Preserve all related records, including:

- Signage/posting policies and proof of posting (by department and timeframe)
- Scripts/training used for secondary advisements
- Minute-order templates/macros and authority-recital language sources
- Assignment records for commissioners/temporary judges
- Waiver forms, filings, and handling procedures (incl. Rule 2.818)
- Communications about objections, “corrections,” and workflow
- Remote access policies/protocols, retention logs, and transcript access controls

## **C) Audit (Targeted, Sample-Based; Independent Verification Required)**

Because the asserted defect includes record-making that may retro-certify stipulation, waiver, or objection status, the audit must not treat minute-order recitals as self-authenticating proof. At a minimum, implement a sampling audit that compares what the record claims against independent verification sources, including:

- Courtroom advisement proof (audio/video recordings where available; transcript excerpts; clerk/bailiff advisement scripts and checklists; signage versions with date verification);
- Docket and filing verification (file-stamped objections, timestamped e-filings, clerk intake logs, routing logs, rejection notices, and metadata showing receipt/processing history);
- Template and correction controls (minute-order macros, auto-text, user audit trails showing who inserted “stipulation/no objection/waiver” language and when, including nunc pro tunc or “correction” activity);
- Disqualification/waiver proof (CRC 2.818 written waiver requirements or any presiding-judge good-cause waiver where applicable; Fam. Code § 4251 advisement proof and recommended-order/ratification timeline integrity); and
- Notice/scienter indicators (prior warnings, objections, oral motions, requests for judicial notice, disqualification motions (CCP §§ 170.1/170.3), writs/appeals, or void/vacatur motions (e.g., CCP § 473(d))—and whether they were acknowledged, docketed, and ruled upon in a manner consistent with the verified record).

---

## **12) 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.

---

## **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.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**

**TO: Riverside County Superior Court Judicial Officers (Bench) and SJOs (Commissioners)**  
P.O. Box 1547, Riverside, CA 92502

**ATTENTION:**

**Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge,**  
**Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge,**  
Judith C. Clark, Judge and former Presiding Judge,  
John M. Monterosso, Judge and former Presiding Judge,  
John W. Vineyard, Judge and former Presiding Judge,

**SUBJECT:**

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: MENIFEE JUSTICE CENTER and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
27401 Menifee Center Drive Menifee, CA 92584



**ATTENTION:**  
**Sean Lafferty**, Judiciary  
**Michele Mathis**, Judiciary  
**Belinda Handy**, Judiciary  
**Kelly Moran**, Judiciary  
Jason Stone, Judiciary  
Marie Wood, Judiciary  
Amy Nett, Judiciary  
Stephen Gallon, Judiciary  
Raquel Marquez, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**  
**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: LARSON JUSTICE CENTER and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
46-200 Oasis Street Indio, CA 92201



**ATTENTION:**

- Kristi Kirk**, Judiciary
- Emily Benjamini**, Judiciary
- Jennifer Amato, Judiciary
- Otis Sterling, Judiciary
- Anthony Villalobos, Judiciary
- Natalie Keller, Judiciary
- James Hodgkins, Judiciary
- Susanne Cho, Judiciary
- Elizabeth Tucker, Judiciary
- Mickie Reed, Judiciary
- Kristi Hester, Judiciary
- Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge
- Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge**

**SUBJECT:**

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: HISTORIC COURTHOUSE and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
4050 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501



- ATTENTION:**
- Harold Hopp, Judiciary
  - Steven Counelis, Judiciary
  - Carol Greene, Judiciary
  - Daniel Ottolia, Judiciary
  - Sophia Choi, Judiciary
  - Eric Keen, Judiciary
  - O.G. Magno, Judiciary
  - Christopher Harmon, Judiciary
  - Dorothy McLaughlin, Judiciary
  - Ken Fernandez, Judiciary
  - Magdalena Cohen, Judiciary
  - Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge
  - Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

## COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK

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



TO: **SOUTHWEST JUSTICE CENTER and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
30755-D Auld Road Murrieta, CA 92563



- ATTENTION:
- Judith Clark**, Judiciary
  - John Monterosso**, Judiciary
  - Timothy Freer**, Judiciary
  - John Molloy**, Judiciary
  - Jeremiah Raxter**, Judiciary
  - Johnnetta Anderson, Judiciary
  - Joshua Knight, Judiciary
  - Michael Rushton, Judiciary
  - Crandell, Sean, Judiciary
  - JeKrey Zimel, Judiciary
  - Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge
  - Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

SUBJECT:

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

### 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

## COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK

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



TO: **SOUTHWEST JUVENILE COURT and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
30755-G Auld Road, Murrieta, CA 92563



ATTENTION:

**Mark Mandio**, Judiciary  
Kelly Hansen, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

SUBJECT:

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

### 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: RIVERSIDE JUVENILE COURT and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
9991 County Farm Road Riverside, CA 92503



**ATTENTION:**  
Mark Petersen, Judiciary  
Walter Kubelun, Judiciary  
Malvina Ovanezova, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**  
**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**

TO: **RIVERSIDE FAMILY LAW COURT and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
4175 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92501

ATTENTION:

- Gareit Newstrom**, Judiciary
- Cheryl Murphy, Judiciary
- Natalie Lough, Judiciary
- John Vineyard, Judiciary
- Sharunne Foster, Judiciary
- Mona Nemat, Judiciary
- Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge
- Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

SUBJECT:

**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: CORONA COURT and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
505 S. Buena Vista Corona, CA 92882



**ATTENTION:**  
**Tamara Wagner**, Judiciary  
**Stefanie Field**, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**  
**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: BLYTHE COURT and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
265 N. Broadway Blythe, CA 92225



**ATTENTION:**  
**Mickie Reed**, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**  
**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.

Sent to this address & recipients by separate certified mail

# CEASE AND DESIST WARNING NOTICE

JUDICIAL OFFICERS AND SJOs

**COURT PROCESS INTEGRITY AND ENFORCEMENT RISK: Temporary-Judge / Commissioner Authority “Consent-and-Certification” Machinery (CRC 2.816–2.819 / CRC 2.818 / Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21 / CCP § 259(d) / FAM § 4251(b))**



**TO: BANNING JUSTICE CENTER and Judicial Officers (Bench), SJOs, and Commissioners**  
311 E. Ramsey, Banning, CA 92220



**ATTENTION:**  
Luttrell, Sylwia, Judiciary  
Mark Singerton, Judiciary  
Samuel Diaz, Judiciary  
Jonathan Mendoza, Judiciary  
Jorge Hernandez, Judiciary  
Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge  
Dean Benjamini, Assistant Presiding Judge

**SUBJECT:**  
**Formal warning** - enforcement actions and courtroom control measures may have and may continue to manufacture and rely 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), which overlay into other proceedings and enforcement. After notice, continued participation or allowance may increase personal and institutional exposure.

March 1, 2026

---

## 1) Purpose of This Notice (Why You Are Receiving It)

This notice is provided to place the recipients on formal notice and remove plausible deniability as to knowledge of a structural and repeatable “machinery” alleged to be occurring in high-volume calendars where temporary-judge/commissioner authority is being treated as established without the mandatory notice/advisement predicates and valid stipulation required by CRC 2.816–2.819 and FAM § 4251, and where CRC 2.818 disqualification/waiver and FAM § 4251 posture may be implicated but not properly handled or safeguarded.

A duty is imposed to investigate, preserve evidence, and take corrective action commensurate with the seriousness and scalability of the asserted defects.