

# **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE**

**Bench Officers and Court Staff Evidence Knowledge of  
Mandatory Litigant Advisement Omission & Systemic Ultra Vires Proceedings**

**Whistleblower's Records and Account**

## **Court Staff Exposed the Evidence — Then the Court Allegedly Hid It**

Public-facing courtroom practices, posted signage, and court records in Riverside County appear to tell litigants that few, if any, meaningful advisements are required before a commissioner or temporary judge may exercise authority over their case. Many minute orders appear to reflect the same assumption.

A whistleblower litigant in a family law matter aggressively challenged that alleged practice in two separate proceedings: the primary family-law case and a related child-support hearing before a commissioner. After those challenges escalated, an attorney sitting as a temporary judge in the primary case and a commissioner in the child-support matter each administered advisements under California Rules of Court, rule 2.816, and Family Code § 4251(b).

Those advisements mattered. They showed that court actors understood litigants had to be informed of their rights before valid temporary-judge authority could be established. Yet despite the litigant's objection to temporary-judge authority, judicial officers allegedly denied the litigant's right to judge review, including the review protections required in the child-support proceeding.

After those proceedings, the litigant and other witnesses reportedly did not observe the same commissioner, or other judicial officers, consistently administer the required advisements to other litigants.

The significance is that court staff recorded the two administered advisements in the official minute orders. Those entries preserved evidence that the Court and judicial officers knew the procedures required to obtain valid litigant consent to temporary-judge authority. The whistleblower continued pointing to those records as evidence of the alleged unlawful practice. Shortly thereafter, Riverside County allegedly changed its minute-order format from a summary of what occurred in a proceeding to a shorter entry identifying only the purpose of the hearing.

The following minute-order excerpts come from records archived before that format change. They provide samples from a larger body of alleged evidence showing that Riverside County court personnel knew, or should have known, that required advisements and valid stipulations were not being consistently obtained. They also support the whistleblower's allegation that court records were used to create or preserve the appearance of lawful temporary-judge authority where no valid authority had been secured.

The problem is not merely technical. The record in this case does not clearly show that the litigants ever agreed to a commissioner acting as a temporary judge. Instead, the record reportedly states only that the "parties stipulate to Commissioner." That phrase is legally inadequate or, at minimum, dangerously ambiguous. A litigant does not "stipulate to a commissioner" in the abstract. The legally significant question is whether the litigant knowingly and validly stipulated to that commissioner acting as a temporary judge with authority to make binding rulings.

## **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE**

**Attorney Temporary Judge Demonstrates Court's Knowledge of  
Mandatory Litigant Advisement Omissions & Systemic Ultra Vires Proceedings**

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

---

Date	Action
10/24/2023	Minute Order: Trial Setting Conference
10/24/2023	<p>Trial Setting Conference at 8:30 AM in Department H5 Honorable Marina Dini, Judge Pro Tem T. Admire, Courtroom Assistant A. Fulper, Court Reporter</p> <p>APPEARANCES: BRIDGET MACKENZIE is present Telephonically, represented by PRO PER GRANT MACKENZIE is present Telephonically, represented by PRO PER <u>Parties advised of the right to have matter heard before a commissioner or judge by posted and verbal notice. Parties are deemed to have stipulated to temporary judge pursuant to CRC rule 2.816.</u> Parties sworn en masse. At 09:52 AM the following proceedings were heard: Issues discussed with the Court. On Court's own motion: Hearing continued to 12/12/23 at 08:30 AM in Department H5 (Hearing held). Notice to be given by clerk. Minute entry completed.</p>
10/24/2023	Minute Order: Hearing re: Request for Order re: Discovery: Request for Hearing Date for Motion to Compel Discovery Production - Set #1. filed on 08/22/2023

Lawyer Marina Dini served on the calendar day as a temporary judge, substituting for the assigned presiding judge, Kristi Kirk. Grant MacKenzie presented and argued the case's ongoing issues. Dini continued the case without making substantive rulings.

Still, she evidenced the required administration of Rule 2.816.

# **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE**

**Commissioner Demonstrates Court's Knowledge of  
Mandatory Litigant Advisement Omissions & Systemic Ultra Vires Proceedings**

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

The hearing was remote. Commissioner Newstrom also read the courtroom posted sign, which cited Cal Const. Art. 6, § 21, CCP § 259, and CRC 2.816

Date	Action
11/09/2023	<p>Hearing re: <b>Notice of Motion (DCSS)</b> re: Other: Determine and set payment on arrears filed on 03/25/2022 at 1:30 PM in Department H4 Honorable <b>Gareit Newstrom, Commissioner</b> M. Plasencia, Courtroom Assistant E. Mesa, Court Reporter APPEARANCES: BRIDGET MACKENZIE is present Telephonically, represented by PRO PER <b>DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES is present In Person, Samantha Larkin</b> Other Appearance Notes: <b>Grant Mackenzie present via Telephonic stating his appearance is in special appearance</b> At 01:52 PM the following proceedings were heard: <sup>[Commissioner Newstrom]</sup> <b>Court gives an oral advisement regarding status of as Judge Pro Tem and recites the Court's posting to the public on the record.</b> <b>Bridget Mackenzie stipulates to Commissioner Gareit Newstrom.</b> <b>Grant Mackenzie does not stipulate to Commissioner Gareit Newstrom.</b> <b>Parties sworn en masse.</b> Issues discussed with the Court. Court finds and Orders. Court has read and considered all documents filed for today's hearing. On 12/14/22 Commissioner Gareit Newstrom is appointed pursuant to FC 4251. <b>The Court will not be making findings nor rulings today and will submit recommendations to Presiding Judge.</b> Argument presented by Samantha Larkin. <b>Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie</b> Argument presented by Bridget Mackenzie Matter is placed on second call. Matter is recalled at 03:18 pm. All parties previously present are again present. Further issues discussed. Court and parties confer regarding Jurisdiction. <b>Jurisdiction objection made by Grant Mackenzie is overruled.</b> Bridget Mackenzie gives testimony. Grant Mackenzie informs the Court he will not participate further in the proceedings as he states his appearance is by "special appearance" but remains via Zoom throughout the entire proceedings. DCSS to complete an updated audit. DCSS to serve and file further briefing based on the testimony given</p>

The Court confirmed the required due process, per CRC 2.816 but the commissioner evaded addressing the systemic past omissions of the process, which threatened to expose the void jurisdiction in past hearings and renderings, not only in the immediate case but countless others she presided over.

"finding" without stipulation

Commissioner Newstrom refused to address the material issues and evidence of the Court's practice of omitting advisements required by Rule 2.816 and FC 4251 in all other proceedings and subsequent fraudulent entries of litigant stipulations. Instead, she acted as final arbiter and summarily overruled the challenge.

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

Date	Action
11/09/2023	today, agreements for credit for payments made by Bridget Mackenzie, and DCSS's position, to be filed within 30 days . Once DCSS has submitted their further briefing, the Court will issue written recommended orders. <u>Court advises parties of their right to object to the recommended order in accordance with FC 4251.</u> Minute entry completed.
11/27/2023	170.1/170.3 CCP Against Commissioner Newstrom Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
11/28/2023	Certificate of Mailing on Dissolutio filed by BRIDGET MACKENIE
11/28/2023	Minute Order: Trial Setting Conferen
11/28/2023	Trial Setting Conference at 8:30 AM Kristi Kirk, Judge L. Hendrix, Courtroom Assistant Court Reporter: None APPEARANCES: No Appearances <u>Due to the Court's unavailability, the Trial Setting Conference set for 12/12/23 is ordered continued to 01/23/24 at 08:30 AM in Department H5.</u> Notice to be given by Clerk. Clerk's Certificate of Mailing of minute order dated 11/28/23. Minute entry completed.
11/28/2023	Minute Order: Hearing re: Request for Order re: Discovery: Request for Hearing Date for Motion to Compel Discovery Production - Set #1. filed on 08/22/2023

Filed after the DCSS hearing, this motion challenged Commissioner Newstrom for ongoing systemic violations of rights in multiple cases, allegedly in conspiracy with her fellow judiciary members, DCSS, and tribunal officials who are exercising ultra vires authority under the guise of legal authority.

The content and evidence presented in the motion may have prompted concern for Judge Kirk and her colleagues, requiring time to reconsider implications and their responsive strategies.

## **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE**

### **Supervising Judge Demonstrates Assisting In Systemic Denial of Litigant Right and Judicial Review**

**(Click to hear voicemail from DCSS attorney affirming the Denied Due Process)**

Referenced below on pages 11-12

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

---

Date	Action
11/28/2023	Hearing re: Request for Order re: Discovery: Request for Hearing Date for Motion to Compel Discovery Production - Set #1. filed on 08/22/2023 at 8:30 AM in Department H5 Honorable Kristi Kirk, Judge L. Hendrix, Courtroom Assistant Court Reporter: None APPEARANCES: No Appearances Due to the Court's unavailability, the Hearing re: Request for Order re: Discovery: Request for Hearing Date for Motion to Compel Discovery Production - Set #1. filed on 08/22/2023 set for 12/12/23 is ordered continued to 01/23/24 at 08:30 AM in Department H5. Notice to be given by Clerk. Clerk's Certificate of Mailing of minute order dated 11/28/23. Minute entry completed.
11/29/2023	Omnibus Challenge for Cause Disqualify Commissioner Gareit Frances Newstrom and POS Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
11/29/2023	Four days after filing a Motion to Disqualify Commissioner Newstrom, MacKenzie filed a Motion to Disqualify Judge Sean Lafferty, who had been the longstanding supervising judge over Newstrom and other general and Title IV-D commissioners.
11/29/2023	MacKenzie had continually placed Lafferty on notice of the court-wide due process violations, including the omission of CRC 2.816 and FC 4251 advisements from proceedings and the falsification of litigant stipulations entered into the court record.
12/01/2023	He evaded any responses or investigation. The asserted disqualification was for his conspiracy and accessory involvement in the systemic violation of rights in concert with commissioners and DCSS, and for furthering and aiding in the imposition of ultra vires authority under color of law.
12/01/2023	Omnibus Challenge for Cause Disqualify Judge Sean Patrick Lafferty Per C.C. P 170.1 (a) (6) (A) (iii) and 170.1 (a) (6) (B) Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
12/04/2023	Proof of Personal Service on Dissolution of Marriage With Child(ren) filed by BRIDGET CHLOREE MACKENZIE Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

Date	Action
12/04/2023	Newstrom bypassed supervisor review, conducted a self-determination of her disqualification, and struck down the motion. She cited defects in the filing and dismissed her accountability to the allegations and evidence, as well as any requirement to report the matter to higher authorities by claiming she was no longer over the case. Thus, she also shielded colleges and supervisors from exposure risk.
12/06/2023	Order Striking Respondent's Motion to Disqualify Commissioner Gareit Newstrom and Verified Answer
12/06/2023	Court on its Own Motion at 4:35 PM in Department H5
12/08/2023	Order Striking Respondent's Motion to Disqualify Judge Sean Lafferty and Verified Answer on Dissolution of Marriage With Child(ren) filed by BRIDGET MACKENIE
12/08/2023	Lafferty followed suit with Newstrom (or as she was guided); he conducted a self-review of his disqualification, using the same excuses to evade self-reporting, investigation, and exposure for colleges, other culpable parties, and municipalities.
12/11/2023	Request for Order Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
12/11/2023	Request for Order for Change re: Attorney Fees and Cost, Child Support, Property Control, Spousal or Partner Support, Other: Judicial Notices of citings material to these matter (see Item 8, page 4); 1. IRS & State Filing Guidelines (RC 7703, FAM771; 2. Credit Report Access Guidelines (FCRA) 3. Elements of ID theft (CIV, Section 1798.201) 4. Family Law Evaluator Guidelines (FAM 20014, 20015); 5. Entries in Minute Order Record Attachment 8.; 6. CRC 2.816. 2.818, and 2.819 requirements.; 7. Request for Admissions Filing and Adequacy; 8. JFiled Notice of Delinquency (FAM 4727); 9. Right to Argue Filed Motions. filed on 12/11/2023 on Dissolution of Marriage With Child(ren) filed by BRIDGET MACKENIE Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE

MacKenzie filed this motion in response to further evidence of intentional misconduct by the commissioners and judges involved in his case and numerous others. He also anticipated their obstruction of his planned objection to Commissioner Newstrom's recommended orders, as provided under FC 4251. The purpose of the motion was to systematically expose the denied due process, highlight decisions that were contrary to the law, and bring attention to established practices of falsifying authority concerning litigant stipulations, as well as the subsequent ultra vires actions carried out under the guise of legal authority. This motion would be heard before Judge Kristi Kirk, offering additional clarity on the expanded court's awareness and systemic participation in the scheme and its cover-up.

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Despite previously striking down the motion to disqualify against her, claiming she was no longer involved in the case, Newstrom then filed and imposed her recommended orders, after reviewing the issues and evidence presented in the motion to disqualify, further materially involving herself in the case.

Date

- 01/03/2024 Court on its Own Motion at 3:02 PM in Department H5 Honorable Gareit Newstrom, Commissioner  
M. Plasencia, Courtroom Assistant  
Court Reporter: None  
APPEARANCES:  
No Appearances  
Court subsequently rules on matter taken under submission on 11/09/23 as follows: Hearing re: Notice of Motion (DCSS) re: Other: Determine and set payment on arrears filed on 03/25/22. Having considered the submitted matter the court rules as follows: Court's ruling attached to Minute Order and incorporated herein by reference.  
Court's ruling sent to BRIDGET CHLOREE MACKENZIE; COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE; GRANT WILLIAM MACKENZIE by mail on 01/03/24.  
Minute entry completed.
- 01/11/2024 Notice of Objection (Findings and Recommendation of Commissioner). (FL-666)  
Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
- 01/11/2024 Proof of Service re: Notice of Objection- Determine and Set Payment Arrears  
Service Type: Electronic Service  
Date Served: 01/11/2024  
Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE  
Against / As To: BRIDGET MACKENZIE
- 01/16/2024 FL-157 Spousal or Domestic Partner Support Declaration Attachment  
FL-158 Request for Attorney Fees & Costs Attachment  
Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
- 01/16/2024 Proof of Service re: FL-157 Spousal or Domestic Partner Support Declaration Attachment FL-158 Request for Attorney Fees & Costs Attachment  
Service Type: Electronic Service  
Date Served: 01/13/2024  
Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE  
Against / As To: BRIDGET MACKENZIE
- 01/18/2024 Violation Warning- Denial of Rights Under Color of Law Form COL  
Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE

Timely objection filed within 10 days (filed in 8 days), and served to the opposing party. The Court is then required to set a trial de novo within 10 days of the filing of the objection, per FC 4521(c), as the record shows Newstrom previously advised.

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

Date	Action
01/18/2024	Violation Warning- Denial of Rights Under Color of Law Form COL Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE
01/18/2024	Review of Commissioner's Findings of Fact and Recommendation
01/19/2024	Violation Warning- Denial of Right Under Color of Law- form COL Fair Notice- Intent to pursue Civil rights violation litigation Filed By: GRANT MACKENZIE

MacKenzie sent warning and cease-and-desist notices to these judicial officers, the involved DCSS attorneys, and the opposing party. All recipients disregarded them.

Supervising Judge Lafferty again mirrored Newstrom, despite earlier dismissing the motion to disqualify him on the ground that he was not assigned to the case. Yet he reinserted himself into the matter, demonstrating that he was in fact assigned to direct Newstrom and supervise the case from the outset.

Despite reviewing the issues and evidence presented in the motion to disqualify against him, which directly addressed the CRC 2.816 and FC 4521 advisement omissions and fraudulent stipulation record, implicated the proceedings, Newstrom, and her renderings, Lafferty disregarded MacKenzie's denial of stipulation to Newstrom acting as temporary judge and denied his timely and properly filed objection to the commissioner's recommended orders under FC 4251(c). Then, despite express errors and defects, he ratified Newstrom's orders and denied MacKenzie the mandatory trial de novo to which he was entitled.

That denial of due process shielded Lafferty from having to preside personally over the matter and face direct accountability for the arguments and evidence MacKenzie was prepared to present. That evasion allowed the alleged corruption Lafferty was culpable for leading and aiding to be furthered through deliberate concealment.

01/23/2024	Certificate of Mailing on Dissolution of Marriage With Child(ren) filed by BRIDGET CHLOREE MACKENZIE
01/23/2024	Certificate of Mailing on Department of Child Support Services COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
01/23/2024	Payment: \$2.00, BRIDGET MACKENZIE, for MACKENZIE, BRIDGET, Receipt: 20240123-00007
01/23/2024	Payment: \$2.00, BRIDGET MACKENZIE, for MACKENZIE, BRIDGET, Receipt: 20240123-00044

## **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE**

**Presiding Judge Demonstrates Assisting Obstruction of  
Whistleblower Record, Further Denial of Litigant Right and Judicial Review**

Date	Action
02/26/2024	Minute Order: Hearing re: <b>Request for Order</b> Change re: <b>Attorney Fees and Cost, Child Support, Property Control, Spousal or Partner Support</b> , Other: <b>Judicial Notices of citings material to these matter</b> (see Item 8, page 4); 1. <b>IRS &amp; State Filing Guidelines (RC 7703, FAM771)</b> ; 2. <b>Credit Report Access Guidelines (FCRA)</b> 3. <b>Elements of ID theft (CIV, Section 1798.201)</b> 4. <b>Family Law Evaluator Guidelines (FAM 20014, 20015)</b> ; 5. <b>Entries in Minute Order Record Attachment 8.</b> ; 6. <b>CRC 2.816, 2.818, and 2.819 requirements.</b> ; 7. <b>Request for Admissions Filing and Adequacy</b> ; 8. <b>JFiled Notice of Delinquency (FAM 4727)</b> ; 9. <b>Right to Argue Filed Motions.</b> filed on 12/11/2023

Since he had previously challenged Judge Kristi Kirk, she understood MacKenzie would continue his efforts to expose violations of rights, denial of due process, void jurisdiction, and judicial misconduct. She knew she would be possioned to addres the evidence of omissions of Rule 2.816 and FC 4251 advisements, as well as falsified stipulation entries placed in Court records for years. Judge Kirk knew MacKenzie had substantiated those claims in this case, which included the dismissal of his denial of stipulation, the subversion of his timely objection to Commissioner Newstrom's recommended orders, and Judge Lafferty's denial of his right to a mandatory trial de novo.

At a prior proceeding on 1/23/2024 to hear this motion, Judge Kirk imposed a pretextual prior-restraint sanction of \$500 to discredit and intimidate MacKenzie when he attempted to argue and expose the cover-up of the unlawful court machinery. When MacKenzie made clear he would not be intimidated by the sanction and would continue whistleblowing, Judge Kirk appeared at a loss, halted the hearing, and trailed the matter to another date to buy time and regroup under a different obstruction strategy.

Kirk then coupled the matter with a Trial Setting Conference on 2/26/2024 in an effort to rush the case to final judgment. MacKenzie's motion sought to demonstrate in the record that he had filed a timely objection to the commissioner's recommended order but was denied a trial de novo. He further sought to identify the matters requiring review, including request for attorney fees required to address these issues which involved the Petitioner's obstruction and delay of discovery and required disclosures, substancial issues affecting child support, property control, and spousal support. He also sought to establish and preserve the ongoing pattern of whistleblower retaliation, abuse of office, and misrepresentations of law used to impose unlawful renderings through judicial notice of legal citations.

Judge Kirk took notice of his request for judicial notice of the requirements of CRC rules 2.816, 2.818, and 2.819, and knew the implications if the court affirmed his legal premises, including the invalidity of Judge Lafferty's ratification order and denial of trial de novo.

The next **SIX** pages exemplify the conspiratorial and exhaustive efforts Judge Kirk, the judiciary, court staff, and Sheriff's bailiffs undertake to obstruct, discredit, and conceal the alleged corruption within the Riverside County justice system and its related municipalities. **JUDGE KIRK OBSTRUCTED AND PREVENTED MACKENZIE FROM MEANINGFULLY PRESENTING ANY FACTS OR ARGUING ANY ISSUE IN HIS MOTION, AS MACKENZIE THREATENED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT ALL ISSUES STEMMED FROM AND WERE THE POISONED FRUIT OF KNOWN FRAUDULENT STIPULATIONS.**

Same hearing/  
motion

Judge Kirk used three court dates to carry out a hostile effort to obstruct justice and suppress exposure of what has amounted to a racketeering and trafficking machinery. She resorted to word-salad legal arguments, prepackaged citations, muting MacKenzie's remote microphone, further threats of contempt, misinformation, mischaracterizations, falsehoods, delays, omissions, selective excerpts and manipulation to misrepresent MacKenzie's arguments.

BUT, AS THE RECORD SHOWS, IN EVERY INSTANCE SHE COMPLETELY EVADED ACKNOWLEDGING, ADDRESSING, OR ALLOWING INTO THE FINAL RECORD THE CRUX OF THE ISSUE, LEGAL ARGUMENTS, AND EVIDENCE CONCERNING THE ALLEGED SYSTEMIC INFIRMITIES AND JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT INVOLVING RULES 2.816 THROUGH 2.819, FAMILY CODE SECTION 4251, MACKENZIES SUBVERTED OBJECTION, AND DENIED TRIAL DE NOVO.

Date

02/26/2024 Hearing re: Request for Order Change re: Attorney Fees and Cost, Child Support, Property Control, Spousal or Partner Support, Other: Judicial Notices of citings material to these matter (see Item 8, page 4); 1. IRS & State Filing Guidelines (RC 7703, FAM771; 2. Credit Report Access Guidelines (FCRA) 3. Elements of ID theft (CIV, Section 1798.201) 4. Family Law Evaluator Guidelines (FAM 20014, 20015); 5. Entries in Minute Order Record Attachment 8.; 6. CRC 2.816, 2.818, and 2.819 requirements.; 7. Request for Admissions Filing and Adequacy; 8. JFiled Notice of Delinquency (FAM 4727); 9. Right to Argue Filed Motions. filed on 12/11/2023 at 8:30 AM in Department H5 Honorable Kristi Kirk, Judge L. Hendrix, Courtroom Assistant J. Molinar, Court Reporter  
APPEARANCES:  
BRIDGET MACKENZIE is present In Person, represented by PRO PER GRANT MACKENZIE is present Telephonically, represented by PRO PER Parties sworn en masse.  
At 09:30 AM the following proceedings were heard:  
The Court calls the case and Grant Makenzie present on zoom is not responding.  
The Court places the matter on 2nd call.  
At 10:53am, the matter is recalled.  
Bridget Mackenzie is present at counsel table.  
Grant Mackenzie is present on zoom, specially appearing, challenging jurisdiction.  
Issues discussed as to the request for order filed on 12/11/23 not having the date and time on it.  
The Court finds that the respondent filed a proof of service.  
Court states that proof of service by mail has to be served 16 court days plus 5 calendar days before the court date in order to give the petitioner time to respond.  
The Court inquires of the petitioner as to when she received the proof of service.  
The petitioner states that she would need her laptop ,which is in the car.  
The Court places the matter on 2nd call for the petitioner to get her laptop.  
Grant Mackenzie continues to speak.  
The Court Orders Grant Mackenzie muted on zoom.  
At 10:53am, the matter is recalled.  
Bridget MacKenzie is present at counsel table.

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

---

Date	Action
	<p>Grant Mackenzie is present on zoom. The Court allow Miss Mackenzie to power up her laptop. At 11:05am, the Court goes on the record. Court inquires of Bridget Mackenzie as to when she received service of the request for order. Grant Mackenzie states at the last hearing on 1/23/24 he cited Marriage of Carlson and there is an error in the minute order that states Marriage of Carlton The Court Orders the minute order to be corrected. Grant Mackenzie state that he is specially appearing and challenging jurisdiction. The Court notes it on the record. Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie. The Court admonishes Mr. Mackenzie as to treating the Court with respect. Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie. The Court states that if Mr. Mackenzie continues to make snide and disrespectful comments to the Court, The Court will hold Mr. Mackenzie in direct contempt. The Court Orders Mr. McKenzie to state his first issue as to challenging jurisdiction. the Court finds that Mr. McKenzie filed a blank document and wrote on it filed under duress. The Court will not change its order. Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie that the Court sanctioned him and not the petitioner. The Court states that that issue is not in front of the Court, and he will need to file a request for order. The Court admonishes Grant Mackenzie to state his argument for jurisdiction. Mr. Mackenzie cites CCP 575.2. The Court states that it made its order previously. This case has been pending since 2019. Mr. Mackenzie has stated no legal or factual basis. The Court inquires if Mr. Mackenzie if he is ready with the request for order filed on 12/11/23. Mr. Mackenzie references affirmation of delinquency notice and balance of child support arrears payment. Court inquires of Miss Mackenzie, as to the issue of child support. Miss Mackenzie states that as to the child support arrears dispute it was recommended for her to pay a higher arrears amount.</p>

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

---

Date	Action
	<p>The Court inquires of Grant Mackenzie request to modify the 3/10/23 and 01/26/21 child support.</p> <p>the Court cites FC 3690-The court may, on any terms that may be just, relieve a party from a support order, or any part or parts thereof, after the six-month time limit.</p> <p>The Court cites 3691 A-C.</p> <p>The Court discusses 3691 a and b as to an action or motion based on fraud shall be brought within six months after the date on which the complaining party discovered or reasonably should have discovered the fraud.</p> <p>the Court cites the marriage of Tavares 2007 151 Cal.App.4th 620 at 637.</p> <p>The Court cites FC 3691 (C) a to the motion served within six months.</p> <p>The Court cites FC 3693 AND FC 3692, Base on the respondent's FC 3691.</p> <p>The Court Denies the order, as it was outside six months' time. Argument presented by Attorney Mackenzie.</p> <p>The Court states the delinquency was addressed in Department H4</p> <p>The Court orders to the respondent to point to authority as to the notice of delinquency.</p> <p>Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie.</p> <p>The Court cites EC 452(d) under evidence ode 452; and EC 452(e), the Court may take judicial notice of the Rules of Court of any California court, whether a court of record or not, and of any court of record of the United States or any other state. State includes any district, commonwealth, territory, or insular possession of the United States. That's Evidence Code Section 220.</p> <p>A party requesting judicial notice under Evidence Code Section 452 is required under Evidence Code Section 453(b) to give the Court sufficient information to enable it to take judicial notice of the matter. Trial courts may properly refuse to take judicial notice of matters in court files when the trial counsel has not adequately furnished information to support the request.</p> <p>The Court cites the Center for Biological Diversity bs Fish and Game, 2008, 166 C.A 4th 597, page number 605, note 11, denying judicial notice of certain federal court litigation orders because petitioner could not provide sufficient information.</p> <p>The Court states judicial notice may also be refused when its purpose is improper.</p> <p>The Court cites Cooper Cos. v. Transcontinental Insurance Company,</p>

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

---

Date	Action
	<p>1995, 31 CA 4th 1094, page 1105. Judicial notice of Supreme Court briefs rejected as an effort to ask Court to second guess Supreme Court opinions. In this case, Mr. Mackenzie has not provided any reason or furnished the Court with sufficient information to enable the Court to take judicial notice of the items that he simply listed in the request for order. And without more, the Court cannot take judicial notice. However, we will deny this without prejudice to allow Mr. Mackenzie to state why and how the Court should take judicial notice of that, the relevancy of that, and provide to petitioner. Due to it being the lunch hour, The Court continues all matters to 2/27/24 at 01:30pm. The Court Orders both parties to be personally present in court. Hearing continued to 02/27/24 at 01:30 PM in Department H5 (Matter not heard). Minute entry completed.</p>
02/26/2024	Minute Order: Nunc Pro Tunc Hearing
02/26/2024	<p>Nunc Pro Tunc Hearing at 1:37 PM in Department H5 Honorable Kristi Kirk, Judge L. Hendrix, Courtroom Assistant Court Reporter: None APPEARANCES: No Appearances The Court finds that the minute order dated 01/23/24 does not correctly/clearly reflect the Court order and orders it corrected Nunc Pro Tunc to reflect: Strike the following: Grant Mackenzie cites Marriage of Carlton Add: Grant Mackenzie cites Marriage of Carlson. Nunc Pro Tunc Hearing concluded. Notice to be given by Clerk. Minute entry completed.</p>
02/27/2024	Minute Order: Hearing re: Request for Order re: Other: Deem matters admitted-Request for Admissions Set &2 and provide requested relief. Counts 1 & 2 filed on 12/18/2023

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Register of Actions

www.riverside.courts.ca.gov

FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE

Family Law

Dissolution With Child(ren)

Menifee Justice Center Department M203

Status: Active

Date	Action
02/28/2024	<p>Hearing re: Request for Order Change re: Attorney Fees and Cost, Child Support, Property Control, Spousal or Partner Support, Other: Judicial Notices of citings material to these matter (see Item 8, page 4); 1. IRS &amp; State Filing Guidelines (RC 7703, FAM771; 2. Credit Report Access Guidelines (FCRA) 3. Elements of ID theft (CIV, Section 1798.201) 4. Family Law Evaluator Guidelines (FAM 20014, 20015); 5. Entries in Minute Order Record Attachment 8.; 6. <u>CRC 2.816. 2.818, and 2.819 requirements.</u>; 7. Request for Admissions Filing and Adequacy; 8. JFiled Notice of Delinquency (FAM 4727); 9. <u>Right to Argue Filed Motions.</u> filed on 12/11/2023 at 1:30 PM in Department H5 Honorable Kristi Kirk, Judge L. Hendrix, Courtroom Assistant J. Molinar, Court Reporter</p> <p>APPEARANCES: GRANT MACKENZIE is present In Person, represented by PRO PER, Specially Appearing BRIDGET CHLOREE MACKENZIE is present In Person, represented by PRO PER</p> <p>Parties sworn en masse. At 01:33 PM the following proceedings were heard: Court inquires of Grant Mckenzie ,who is making a special appearance. The Court directs Grant Mackenzie to state his argument for challenging jurisdiction. Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie.. The Court states Grant Mackenzie to state his argument for jurisdiction. Issues discussed with the Court. The Court finds that Grant Mackenzie has not filed a motion to quash on the submitted matter. The Court finds that Grant Mackenzie changed his appearance from specially appearing to general appearance. The Court cites the dates that he made a special appearance. The Court overrules the argument on jurisdiction. Argument presented by Grant Mackenzie. The Court refers Grant Mackenzie to the Court's transcripts. <u>Oral motion by Grant Mackenzie re: for the Court to recuse herself is called for hearing.</u> Grant Mackenzie cites 170.1. <u>The Court states that she is not recusing herself from the case, and Mr. McKenzie may file a 170.1.</u></p>

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside  
Register of Actions  
www.riverside.courts.ca.gov  
FLHE1905452: MACKENZIE & MACKENZIE  
Family Law  
Dissolution With Child(ren)  
Menifee Justice Center Department M203  
Status: Active

Date Action

Court makes the following order(s):  
The Court Denies the request for order.  
Minute entry completed.

**ON ALL ISSUES AND  
JUDICIAL NOTICE**

02/28/2024 Minute Order: Trial Setting Conference

This narrow glimpse into this case reflects only a fraction of the evidentiary record available here and in many other related and unrelated cases. It highlights the conduct of the judiciary, the ongoing cover-up, and the continuing mass machinery exposing the Riverside County judicial system in concert with municipalities and certain government officials at severe risk.

Moreover, the damaging reverberations of these issues, and the downstream enforcement of defective and void orders issued in excess of office and jurisdiction, both inside and outside the justice system, often through armed sheriff enforcement, and the resulting fraud upon the public and state and federal governments through illicitly obtained funds, cannot be overstated.

Nor can the implications be understated where this matter overlaps with an alleged cover-up and misrepresentation involving Sheriff Bianco as a California gubernatorial candidate, bearing on the state election and Bianco's ballot investigation involving Riverside County judges, the California Attorney General, and the California Supreme Court.

## **Concealed Records:**

### **Court Action, Enforcement, and the Alleged Futility of Litigant Remedies**

#### **Pending Mailed Ruling**

The following account concerns an April 20, 2026 trial-call proceeding before Judge Michele Mathis. The litigant appeared in court, served Judge Mathis, courtroom staff, and Sheriff's bailiffs with individual cease-and-desist notices, and announced a special appearance for the limited purpose of challenging jurisdiction.

Before appearing, the litigant had also emailed the courtroom and Judge Mathis supporting evidence, legal authority, and cease-and-desist warnings. The litigant asserted that newly discovered evidence and Supreme Court authority supported a threshold challenge to the court's power to proceed.

According to the preserved record and available materials, Judge Mathis dismissed or bypassed the warnings and prevented the jurisdictional challenge from being meaningfully placed on the record. She allegedly threatened contempt, directed Sheriff's bailiffs toward the litigant, and treated the litigant's attempt to preserve a jurisdictional objection as disruptive conduct.

The litigant did not abandon his objection. He continued asserting his right to present the jurisdictional challenge, supporting case law, and evidence before trial began. Judge Mathis reportedly stated that she had reviewed the litigant's email, then overruled the jurisdictional issue before the litigant was allowed to fully present it. She also allegedly ruled that the litigant lacked standing or any right to challenge jurisdiction.

Judge Mathis then ordered Sheriff's bailiffs to remove the litigant from the courtroom. The bailiffs allegedly disregarded the cease-and-desist notices they had received and removed him under threat of arrest. The litigant complied under protest and under asserted duress.

Judge Mathis then proceeded with the trial in the litigant's absence, heard from the opposing party, issued final rulings, and completed the case.

#### **Legal Significance**

The available materials support the argument that the litigant's trial-call objection was not a spontaneous disruption. Rather, it was the culmination of a preserved jurisdictional challenge that had allegedly been repeatedly raised, obstructed, or left unresolved before trial.

That distinction matters. Courtroom control and decorum are legitimate judicial concerns, but they cannot be used as a pretext to prevent a litigant from raising a threshold jurisdictional objection before trial begins. Nor can a court bootstrap jurisdiction by declaring the issue resolved without giving the litigant a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

A court's label of "disruption" does not cure a jurisdictional defect unless the record shows specific, non-pretextual misconduct separate from the litigant's attempt to preserve a jurisdictional challenge. If the alleged disruption consisted primarily of insisting on that threshold issue, then removal from the courtroom and ex parte final rulings may raise serious due process concerns.

The practical consequence is severe. By removing the litigant before the jurisdictional challenge was placed on the record, the court allegedly impaired his ability to create a full record for appeal, seek vacatur, or pursue other remedies. That outcome supports the broader allegation that formal remedies were not merely denied, but made functionally futile.