



ATTENTION

Probate cases on this calendar are currently under review by the probate examiners. Review of some probate cases may not be completed and therefore have not been posted.

If your probate case has not been posted please check back again later.

Thank you for your patience.

Jesus Gonzalez Rodriguez, age 9		JESUS N. GONZALEZ, Father, is Petitioner.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: Continued from 6-11-13, 7-30-13, 9-10-13, 10-8-13. See following pages. Minute Order 9-10-13 states: Ms. Valdivinos is sworn and interprets for Maria Ibarra. Maria Ibarra objects to the petition. Counsel is directed to facilitate counseling between father and child. Matter continued to 10/8/13. Minute Order 10-8-13: Ms. Ibarra is being assisted by an interpreter. Mr. Gonzalez informs the Court that he has an appointment with the counselor today. The Court indicates to the parties that it is not changing the visitation time and they are to mutually agree on a location for visitation to take place during the winter months. The Court orders that Jesus and his father participate in conjoint counseling with a licensed clinical therapist for the purpose of facilitating unsupervised visits. In the event that a licensed therapist is not available in Firebaugh, arrangements are to be made elsewhere with a licensed therapist. Ms. Aguilar is ordered to notify the therapist that the Court will be expecting a report as to how conjoint counseling is progressing. Continued to 12/3/13. As of 11-22-13, nothing further has been filed.
Cont. from 061113, 073013, 091013, 100813		MARIA IBARRA, Maternal Grandmother, was appointed Guardian on 6-26-08. - served by mail 5-27-13	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Sub.Wit.	Mother: Patricia Rodriguez (Deceased)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Verified	Paternal Grandfather: Jose Gonzalez	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Inventory	Paternal Grandmother: Josefina Gonzalez	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PTC	Maternal Grandfather: Lorenzo Rodriguez	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not.Cred.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Notice of Hrg		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Mail	w/o	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Pub.	Petitioner requests to have custody of his son and to have his case reviewed. Petitioner sees no reason for his son to be with his grandmother when he is fully capable and willing to be fully responsible for his son. Petitioner doesn't feel the visitation that he is allowed is sufficient to fully bond with his son, especially now that he will be having a sibling. Petitioner believes it is in his son's best interest to be closer to his little brother and father than the 2 hours a week that is currently allowed (sometimes less because the grandmother arrives late).	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sp.Ntc.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pers.Serv.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conf. Screen		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Letters		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Duties/Supp		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Objections		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Video Receipt		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CI Report	Petitioner believes his son needs a father figure and he and his wife are able to provide a stable house for his son. Petitioner states there is no need for his son to continue living with his grandmother when he has a loving father who wants to be a part of his life.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	9202		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Order		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff. Posting		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Status Rpt		
<input type="checkbox"/>	UCCJEA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Citation		
<input type="checkbox"/>	FTB Notice		
SEE ADDITIONAL PAGES			
Reviewed by: skc			
Reviewed on: 11-22-13			
Updates:			
Recommendation:			
File 1 – Rodriguez			

Page 2

Court Investigator Jennifer Young filed a report on 7-26-13.

Minute Order 7-30-13: Also present in the courtroom is Jesus Rodriguez. Rosie Valdivinos is sworn and interprets for Maria Ibarra. Ms. Ibarra objects to the petition. Visitation between father and the minor is ordered as follows: visitation shall be every Sunday from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at a place mutually agreed upon by the parties. Father is ordered not to expose the minor to any horror movies or encourage any horse play with other children that may be uncomfortable for the minor. **The Court orders the court investigator to contact the Carmen Meza Center regarding the minor's therapy. Parties enter into a waiver of confidentiality for said purpose.** Continued to 9/10/13.

Court Investigator Jennifer Young filed a report on 9-3-13.

Guardian Maria Ibarra filed a declaration on 9-6-13. Ms. Ibarra states Jesus has always been in her custody since the death of his mother on 10-31-05. Jesus' mother was murdered with a kitchen knife. Her throat was cut open and Jesus was found on top of his mother's dead body covered in blood (at age 1½). The police turned him over to Ms. Ibarra that day. Shortly after the murder, Ms. Ibarra spoke with Mr. Gonzalez, who stated she could keep Jesus as long as he could use his SSN for his taxes. He did not participate in Jesus' life. When Jesus was two years old, Ms. Ibarra allowed overnight visits. During the visits, Jesus slept on pillows on the floor with the family dog. Mr. Gonzalez never returned him on time and she always had to pick him up. On one occasion, he wasn't even present, and Jesus was running around unsupervised with the grandfather getting drunk with his friends. A police report was made. In 2008, Jesus came home with a burn on his hand. Jesus told her that his aunt Karina was mad at him and grabbed his hand and burned it. A police report was made. Also, Jesus was always starving upon return from his visits.

Of great concern to Ms. Ibarra is the fact that Mr. Gonzalez was inconsiderate of what happened to Jesus. He had him watch the movie "Chucky" where a doll is murdering people with a knife. Mr. Gonzalez should have been more conscious of the fact that Jesus' mother was killed with a knife. Jesus was traumatized.

Ms. Ibarra states that even now, he continues to have little regard for Jesus' needs, and Mr. Gonzalez lacks maturity when it comes to Jesus' care. Recently he forced horseplay (fight) with Jesus' cousins, and tried to block Ms. Ibarra from seeing with a chair.

Further traumatizing Jesus, Mr. Gonzalez had Ms. Ibarra served with court papers in front of Jesus. The person was rude and disrespectful, demanding to see photo identification or verification of her address. She felt forced to show her PGE bill. Jesus was scared that he was going to be removed from her home.

Ms. Ibarra states she regularly attends church on Sunday afternoons. Jesus enjoys this because that is when his friends go to service too. Mr. Gonzalez refuses to change the visitation schedule so Jesus can attend. Ms. Ibarra would like visits to be Sundays 9-12.

Ms. Ibarra is not opposed to the court ordering Mr. Gonzalez to attend therapeutic visits with Jesus and his counselor. She has attended some sessions, and believes he should also.

Mr. Gonzalez pays only \$128/month child support. Ms. Ibarra pays \$60-70/week in child care. Mr. Gonzalez takes no interest in helping pay for school supplies, uniforms, medical bills, and **refuses to provide her with his insurance card or a letter stating he is not covered. The providers will not accept Medi-Cal because their system shows he has an insurance provider.** Jesus suffers from asthma and this is creating a hardship. Ms. Ibarra cannot afford these bills. All she needs from him is the insurance card.

SEE ADDITIONAL PAGES

Page 3

Minute Order 9-10-13 states: Ms. Valdivinos is sworn and interprets for Maria Ibarra. Maria Ibarra objects to the petition. Counsel is directed to facilitate counseling between father and child. Matter continued to 10/8/13.

Declaration of Jesus N. Gonzalez filed 10/03/2013 disputes the claims of the guardian, Maria Ibarra. Mr. Gonzalez is seeking to increase his visitation with the minor child to include overnight visits in order for him to become more familiar with his family and become a stronger part of their lives. Mr. Rodriguez states that both he and the guardian shared custody of Jesus, the minor child, without a structured agreement and transportation of the child was done by both parties as well as the father's sister. The father states that when the child would visit his family he always had a comfortable place to sleep, not on the floor. He states the child was with him one time while watching movie clips on You-Tube and there were a few clips from the movie "Chucky" as well as other comedies, cartoons and other genres. The father states the child did not seem disturbed by any of the movie clips. Mr. Gonzalez states that the safety of his son is always held in high regards. He says that Jesus is a normal 10 year old who regularly plays with all of his cousins. Mr. Gonzalez states that he has always been and is willing to help with the child's needs. He states he has purchased shoes, clothing and other items outside of the dollar amount taken for child support. He states that the guardian makes it difficult to bring gifts from family members since she is an active Jehovah's Witness and has gotten upset with Mr. Gonzalez's mother for taking a birthday cake to celebrate with the child during one of the visits. Mr. Gonzalez states that he has provided the guardian with a letter for the child's medical coverage.

Attached to the declaration are pictures of the child with the father in response to the allegations that the child does not want to visit with the father.

Confidential Supplemental Investigator's Report was filed 10-1-13 by Court Investigator Jennifer Young.

Minute Order 10-8-13: Ms. Ibarra is being assisted by an interpreter. Mr. Gonzalez informs the Court that he has an appointment with the counselor today. The Court indicates to the parties that it is not changing the visitation time and they are to mutually agree on a location for visitation to take place during the winter months. The Court orders that Jesus and his father participate in conjoint counseling with a licensed clinical therapist for the purpose of facilitating unsupervised visits. In the event that a licensed therapist is not available in Firebaugh, arrangements are to be made elsewhere with a licensed therapist. Ms. Aguilar is ordered to notify the therapist that the Court will be expecting a report as to how conjoint counseling is progressing. Continued to 12/3/13.

As of 11-22-13, nothing further has been filed.

Verified Petition for Removal of Trustee, Accounting, Surcharge, and Approval of Attorney Fees

DOD: 03/13/11	JAMIE STARR HAMILTON , beneficiary, is Petitioner.		<p>NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:</p> <p><u>CONTINUED FROM 10/22/13</u></p> <p>Minute order from 10/22/13 states: Ms. James is appearing via CourtCall. Mr. Motsenbocker is appearing as counsel for Wade Hamilton. Ms. Nuttall requests a continuance. Matter is continued to 12/03/13. The Court directs that the accounting be set for 12/03/13 upon filing.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> As of 11/22/13, an Accounting has not been filed.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Status Report filed 10-18-13 by Attorney Natalie Nuttall states that when Respondent brought her what he believed to be the accounting on 9-19-13, she discovered that it was not an accounting, but rather was the Trust's 2012 income tax return. Ms. Nuttall immediately notified opposing counsel of this mistake and contacted the accountant Bill Fanucchi to prepare the accounting. Because of the recent 10-15-13 tax filing deadline, the accounting is not completed, but is expected by the end of the month.</p> <p>1. Need Order.</p> <p>Reviewed by: JF</p> <p>Reviewed on: 11/22/13</p> <p>Updates:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>File 6 – Hamilton</p>
Cont. from 071813, 091713, 102213			
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Sub.Wit.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verified			
<input type="checkbox"/> Inventory			
<input type="checkbox"/> PTC			
<input type="checkbox"/> Not.Cred.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Hrg			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aff.Mail	w/		
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Pub.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Sp.Ntc.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pers.Serv.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Conf. Screen			
<input type="checkbox"/> Letters			
<input type="checkbox"/> Duties/Supp			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Objections			
<input type="checkbox"/> Video Receipt			
<input type="checkbox"/> CI Report			
<input type="checkbox"/> 9202			
<input type="checkbox"/> Order	x		
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff. Posting			
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Rpt			
<input type="checkbox"/> UCCJEA			
<input type="checkbox"/> Citation			
<input type="checkbox"/> FTB Notice			

Petitioner states:

1. She is an heir of James O. Hamilton ("Decedent") and a beneficiary of the JAMES O. HAMILTON LIVING TRUST (the "Trust"). Gary C. Hamilton ("Respondent") is the trustee of the Trust.
2. Decedent created the Trust on 04/16/03 and amended the Trust on 12/20/07. The Trust named Gary C. Hamilton as the successor trustee upon the death of James O. Hamilton.
3. The dispositive terms of the Trust set out in Article Five of the Trust as amended on 12/20/07 state in relevant part: "Upon the death of the settlor, \$1.00 shall be paid to Gary K (sic) Hamilton and \$1.00 shall be paid to Terry Lee Hamilton as they are already provided for elsewhere. The balance of the trust assets shall be divided into four (4) shares and allocated as follows: 25% to Wade Hamilton, 25% to Jamie Star Hamilton Thomas, 25% to Cynthia Ann Thomas, and 22% to Allen Richard Thomas. Each share of these beneficiaries shall remain in this trust until the particular beneficiary attains the age of 60 at which time the trustee shall distribute the share in 200 monthly installments. The monthly payments shall be \$1,000 per month unless the trustee must adjust the amounts depending on the trust assets. It is anticipated that by the time the first beneficiary attains the age of 60, all assets of this trust will be liquid. *If the trust does not contain assets that are liquid, the trustee shall use his or her best efforts to liquidate those assets (emphasis added).*"

Continued on Page 2

4. Decedent died more than 2 years ago and Respondent has failed to liquidate the assets, make a single distribution to Petitioner or provide an accounting of the trust assets.
5. At the time of Decedent's death, Petitioner was over the age of 60 (DOB: 07/10/46) and entitled to immediate distributions. Despite several requests, no accounting or distributions have been made. Petitioner believes that there was a fair amount of cash in the Trust at the time of Decedent's death and income has been received since Decedent's death.
6. In addition to the failure to account and properly distribute trust assets, Respondent has failed to liquidate trust assets.
7. The most obvious breach of trust that requires immediate removal and surcharge, is the self-dealing and conflict of interest Respondent has with regard to money owed the Trust. A big reason Respondent has not liquidated the assets of the Trust is that several of the assets are promissory notes secured by deeds of trust on properties owned by Respondent. Respondent owes the Trust in excess of \$400,000 for two separate promissory notes secured by deeds of trust on properties owned by Respondent.
8. Petitioner is informed and believes that Respondent is not and has not made payments to the Trust for the promissory notes.
9. Respondent has also failed to act impartially in violation of Probate Code § 16003. Wade Hamilton, who has just attained the age of distribution has been receiving monies from Respondent. Petitioner is informed and believes that Wade Hamilton has received monies from the Trust even before reaching the age of distribution for so called "management" of the Trust. Respondent is clearly favoring Wade Hamilton over the other beneficiaries and improperly delegating trustee duties.
10. Respondent has failed in every duty required by him and has acted in a self-serving manner since the death of the Decedent. These conflicts and breaches of trust require his immediate removal as trustee.
11. The Trust states that Wade Hamilton is next in line to serve as successor trustee and if he is unwilling or unable to serve that Petitioner would serve. Based on the collusion between Respondent and Wade Hamilton, Wade Hamilton should be barred from serving as trustee. Petitioner would decline to act in favor of a disinterested third party trustee and believes that a third party trustee is the only appropriate remedy to impartially and properly administer the Trust.
12. Respondent has failed to provide an annual accounting as required by Probate Code § 16062. The Trust does not waive the requirement of an accounting. Petitioner requests the Court order Respondent to file an accounting detailing his actions as trustee within 30 days.
13. Respondent is chargeable and responsible for the breaches, self-dealing, mismanagement and misconduct as trustee of the Trust and subject to surcharges. Respondent has breached his fiduciary duties in every way and therefore Petitioner requests the Court surcharge Respondent for his abuse of office, self-dealing, and failure to use ordinary care and diligence in managing the Trust estate in an amount no less than \$50,000.
14. Petitioner believes that compensation in the amount of \$3,000 is reasonable for her attorney's fees for this Petition plus filing fee in the amount of \$435.

Petitioner requests that:

1. Respondent be removed as Trustee of the Trust and appoint an independent 3rd party as successor Trustee;
2. The Court order Respondent to file an accounting with the Court within 30 days detailing his actions as Trustee;
3. The Court surcharge Respondent in an amount deemed reasonable by this Court for his breaches of Trust
4. The Court authorize and direct the Trustee to pay Petitioner's attorney's fees and costs.

Continued on Page 3

Response of Gary Hamilton filed 07/12/13 admits and denies certain allegations in the Petition and states:

1. Respondent has only acted in good faith with respect to the Trust and his duties as Trustee. Respondent provided his version of an accounting in October 2012 with a document titled "Assets" that was sent via certified mail to each Trust beneficiary. In this document Respondent listed what he believes are the Trust assets. Respondent has not been contacted by any beneficiary about the accounting document. Currently Respondent is preparing a subsequent accounting which he will file with the Court and distribute to the beneficiaries. Respondent has been unable to make a distribution to Petitioner because there is not enough cash in the Trust to make beneficiary distributions. Currently there is \$1,500.00 cash in the Trust. While Respondent has not liquidated any trust assets, this is not due to lack of effort on his part, as he has used his best efforts to liquidate Trust assets. Respondent has been attempting to sell certain Trust real property – 638.88 acres of farmland in Choctaw County, Oklahoma (the "Oklahoma Property") in order to make the distributions to the beneficiaries. This farmland is an original asset of the Trust and was appraised at \$863,000 in May 2012. Respondent believes he has an Oklahoma buyer for the Oklahoma Property and is hopeful that the sale will take place within 45 to 60 days. Once this property is sold, Respondent will be able to make distributions to the beneficiaries.
2. Respondent purchased real property from Decedent and a \$100,000.00 promissory note was executed. The real property is located in Tollhouse (the "Tollhouse Property") and is subject to a Deed of Trust dated 03/29/07. Pursuant to the terms of the Promissory Note, Respondent would pay Decedent \$500.00 per month. Respondent is current with the payments and he has not missed one payment on the note. The other alleged Promissory Note was secured by a Deed of Trust dated 02/05/07 for approximately 20 acres of real property in Fresno (the "Fresno Property"). The Fresno Property is currently an asset of the Trust. Originally Respondent purchased the Fresno Property from Decedent but because Respondent was unable to make payments on the property, Respondent transferred the property back into the Trust. Respondent is currently seeking to sell the Fresno Property. Therefore Petitioner's allegation that Respondent owes the Trust in excess of \$400,000.00 is false. Respondent is making the mandatory payments on the Tollhouse Property and he has deeded the Fresno Property back to the Trust. Petitioner's allegations that Respondent's self-dealing and conflict of interest with money owed to the Trust are baseless.
3. Respondent admits the Joel Wade Hamilton is a Trust beneficiary, however, the money that Wade has received was primarily money Wade lent to Respondent to initially fund the Trust. Respondent denies any assertion that he has favored Wade over the other beneficiaries.
4. Respondent denies that he has failed in fulfilling his fiduciary duties as Trustee of the Trust and denies he has acted in a self-serving manner, he further denies that any of his actions with respect to the Trust warrant his removal as Trustee.
5. Neither Respondent nor Wade should be barred from serving as Trustee of the Trust. If anything, respondent and Wade have acted in only the best interest of the Trust, the Trust assets, and the beneficiaries. Respondent has been making true efforts to liquidate the Trust properties.
6. Respondent denies that he should be charged for Petitioner's attorney's fees and costs.

Respondent prays for an Order denying the Petition.

DOD: 04/19/2013	DARLA SUE PARTIDA , friend, is petitioner.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
	40 days since DOD	
	Proceedings have commenced in El Paso County, Colorado.	
Cont. from 091913, 102213	I&A - \$65,000.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Sub.Wit.	Will dated: 04/11/2013	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verified	Petitioner requests Court determination that decedent's 100% interest in real property located at 37515 Squaw Valley Road, Squaw Valley, Ca. pass to Darla Sue Partida pursuant to decedent's will.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inventory		
<input type="checkbox"/> PTC		
<input type="checkbox"/> Not.Cred.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Hrg		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aff.Mail	w/	
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Pub.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Sp.Ntc.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Pers.Serv.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Conf. Screen		
<input type="checkbox"/> Letters		
<input type="checkbox"/> Duties/Supp		
<input type="checkbox"/> Objections		
<input type="checkbox"/> Video Receipt		
<input type="checkbox"/> CI Report		
<input type="checkbox"/> 9202		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order		
<input type="checkbox"/> Aff. Posting		
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Rpt		
<input type="checkbox"/> UCCJEA		
<input type="checkbox"/> Citation		
<input type="checkbox"/> FTB Notice		
		Reviewed by: LV
		Reviewed on: 11/21/2013
		Updates:
		Recommendation: Submitted
		File 8 - McIver

Petition for to Determine the Validity of the Trust Modifying the Trust, Removing Trustees, Appointing Trustees Instructing the Trustee, Compelling Redress of Breach of Trust, and Preliminary Injunction Prohibition Further Distributions to Mick Loeffler

		DIANE HUERTA and LINDA PLITT , daughters, are Petitioners.	<p>NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:</p> <p><u>CONTINUED TO 01/14/14</u> Per Stipulation of the Parties</p> <p>Note: The temporary conservatorship expired on 08/29/13 and was not extended, therefore Petitioners are no longer temporary conservators of the Person. Bruce Bickel is the current acting temporary conservator of the estate for both Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler.</p> <p>The Petitions for general conservatorship have been set for trial at 9:00 am on 02/24/14 in Dept. 502 before Judge Black. The conservatorship matters are schedule for a settlement conference with Judge Oliver in Dept. 303 on 11/07/13 at 1:30pm.</p> <p>1. The Petition does not state the names of the persons entitled to notice of as required Pursuant to Probate Code § 17201. Note: Fred and Kathleen Loeffler were personally served with the Notice of Hearing and a copy of the Petition and several other people were served by mail. The Examiner is unable to determine whether everyone entitled to notice has received notice due to that information not being stated in the petition.</p> <p>2. Need Order.</p>
		Petitioners state:	
		1. Dr. Fred Otto Loeffler and Kathleen Loeffler are the Trustor's of THE LOEFFLER FAMILY TRUST.	
Cont. from 102213		2. Petitioners were appointed as temporary conservators of the Person of their parents, Dr. Fred Otto Loeffler and Kathleen Loeffler.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Sub.Wit.	3. Bruce Bickel is the currently acting temporary conservator of the estates of both Dr. Fred Otto Loeffler and Kathleen Loeffler.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Verified	4. The principal place of administration of the Trust is Fresno County.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Inventory	5. Petitioners allege that Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler (hereinafter "the Loefflers") lack capacity to resist undue influence and to protect their assets for their own benefit. This case and the conservatorship cases are inextricably linked and Petitioners request that the Court take Judicial Notice of the Conservatorship proceedings and all of the filings in those matters.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PTC	6. The Loefflers have 4 children, Petitioners, Diane Huerta and Linda Plitt and Samuel Loeffler (hereinafter "Sam") and Michael Loeffler (hereinafter "Mick"). Linda and Diane are also successor trustee and beneficiaries under all of the various trusts which have been created by the Trustors over the years and therefore having standing to bring this action before the Court.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not.Cred.	7. Petitioners believe that many trusts have been made and revised by the Loefflers.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Notice of Hrg	Continued on Page 2	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Mail		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff.Pub.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sp.Ntc.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pers.Serv.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conf. Screen		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Letters		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Duties/Supp		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Objections		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Video Receipt		
<input type="checkbox"/>	CI Report		
<input type="checkbox"/>	9202		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Order		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aff. Posting		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Status Rpt		
<input type="checkbox"/>	UCCJEA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Citation		
<input type="checkbox"/>	FTB Notice		

8. The first Declaration of Trust was dated 08/01/72 and amended on 05/12/82 and again on 05/21/91. The trust was then restated on 02/04/01. In the restated trust, the successor disability trustees were the spouse, then Diane, then Sam and the successor death trustee were the spouse, then Sam. The 2001 trust was amended in 2003 to replace Sam with Mick as successor disability and death trustee.
9. On 12/21/06, the trust was entirely restated once again. In this restatement, under the disability provisions of the trust, a co-trustee position was established with the non-incapacitated spouse serving with a co-trustee during any period of incapacity by one of the trustors. The succession of those to serve as both successor disability and successor death trustees was Diane, then Mick, then Linda, then Sam. If the remaining spouse was unable to service, the co-trustee would serve alone.
10. Subsequently, another attorney was contacted and yet another trust was created by attorney Kevin Gunner. Mediation was held and pursuant to a mediated agreement, all trustees stepped down and Bruce Bickel, a professional fiduciary, was appointed as trustee of yet another revised trust. The trust created by Kevin Gunner was titled "The Second Amendment and Full Restatement of the Loeffler Family Trust dated 08/01/72" was signed October 18, 2011.
11. Finally, yet another trust amendment entitled "The First Amendment to the Second Amendment and Full Restatement of the Loeffler Family Trust" was signed on 03/01/12.
12. On 05/15/12, Bruce Bickel stepped down as trustee of the trust at the request of Mrs. Loeffler who admitted to him that she did not want him to step down but was asking him step down at her son, Mick's insistence;

Background Leading to Current Claims for Relief:

1. On or about March 2008, Mick was evicted from the home he shared with his girlfriend and moved into the Loeffler's home purportedly to stay for a short time until he could procure employment allowing him to move out of the Loeffler's home.
2. In approximately July 2011, Dr. Loeffler fell and required in-home care. Mick reduced the caregiver hours to the point of being useless and insisted Dr. Loeffler rely solely on Mick, further isolating the couple. With Dr. Loeffler unable to assist himself, much less others, this left Mrs. Loeffler to rely solely on Mick. When asked if they could help, the other three children were told she "didn't think it was a good idea". Towards the end of July 2011, Dr. Loeffler was moved to a skilled nursing home by Diane Huerta to protect him from Mick's unpredictable verbal tirades and to provide the necessary care that was not being provided at home.
3. In approximately October 2011, Mick had all of the locks changed on their parents' home and refused to give any copies of the keys to any of the other children. Prior to this time, all of the children had been free to come and go in their parents' home.
4. From this point on, Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler were in an atmosphere which best could be described as a siege. When the other children were admitted to the home, they witnessed significant verbal abuse, hording, and evidence of substantial use of pain killers by Mick Loeffler. Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler were subjected to ongoing rants replete with obscenities, were taken from professional to professional in an attempt to persuade Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler to change their estate plan, ultimately giving Mick Loeffler complete control over their funds, healthcare and changing the Testator's ultimate gifting plan during life and after death.
5. Knowing Mick had a history of violent behavior and a previous domestic abuse restraining order had been filed against him, the other children were concerned any action to protect their parents might result in harm to their parents or themselves. Hence, they chose to mediate what had, at this point, become seen to be a crisis. This resulted in the drafting of yet another trust.

Continued on Page 3

6. In February 2012, Mrs. Loeffler chose to move out of the home to an independent living apartment adjoining Dr. Loeffler's skilled nursing placement.
7. This did not end Mick's ongoing attempts to control his parents. Mick attempted to convince the facility he was the only one to make decisions for Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler's healthcare decisions, when in fact, Diane, held the power of attorney for healthcare.
8. Mick also went from attorney to attorney attempting to get the healthcare power of attorney, durable power of attorney, and the trust changed to put him in control of each instrument.
9. In the meantime, Mick was living rent free in the Loeffler's home and convinced Mrs. Loeffler she could only rely on him (Mick) for food, transportation, advice, safety, etc. and that all of the other family members, friends, advisors, etc. were not to be trusted.
10. Although mediation was attempted and although there appeared to be an agreement, the last amendment represents evidence that the mediation has failed and of further undue influence exerted on the Loefflers.

First Claim for Relief – Determining the Validity of the Trust or Modifying the Trust

1. Petitioners request the Court find that with the establishment of the conservatorships of the Loefflers, any Durable Power of Attorney which may exist is now void and there is to be no amendment or modification of the trust without prior court approval.
2. In the alternative, Petitioners request to modify Article II(B)(2) of the Trust to state, upon the finding that the Trustor lacks capacity, Article II(B)(2) is void. Petitioner submit that it is reasonably necessary for the protection of the interests of the trustee or beneficiary to insure no additional revisions are made to this trust and the trust assets are protected removing the possibility the trust might be revised to allow gifting of trust assets prior to the death of both Trustors. As indicated in this Petition, there have been an extraordinary number of changes to this trust and it is reasonable to believe that at least the last two revisions were more likely than not made as a result of the exertion of undue influence on the Trustors by Mick Loeffler.

Second Claim for Relief – Removing Trustees

1. Article II(E) of the Trust entitled Successor Trustee, provides in relevant part: "Upon the death, resignation, removal or inability to act of Bruce D. Bickel, then in such event, Fred O. Loeffler and Kathleen Loeffler shall become Co-Trustees of said trust. Upon the death, resignation, removal or inability to act of Fred O. Loeffler or Kathleen D. Loeffler, then in such event, the remaining individual shall become sole trustee hereunder. Upon the death, resignation, removal or inability to act of Fred O. Loeffler and Kathleen D. Loeffler, then in such event, a Professional Licensed Fiduciary, to be appointed by Trustors' son, Mick G. Loeffler, shall serve in this capacity. In the event Mick G. Loeffler is unable or unwilling to appoint a professional licensed fiduciary to serve in this capacity, then in such event, the adult children of Trustors, by majority vote, shall so select a professional licensed fiduciary to serve in this capacity."
2. Petitioners request that the Court remove Fred O. Loeffler and Kathleen D. Loeffler as trustees as they are no longer able to serve in that capacity as they are now conserved under a temporary conservatorship. Petitioners believe both of them lack capacity to act in their own best interest and are subject to undue influence. **Examiners Note: The temporary conservatorship of the Person of both Fred and Kathleen expired on 08/29/13. Bruce Bickel was re-appointed as temporary conservator of the estate of both Fred and Kathleen on 09/25/13 and is the currently acting temporary conservator of the estate.**
3. Petitioners also ask that Mick Loeffler be removed from any position in which he may choose a professional fiduciary or to act as trustee or personal representative. Mick has demonstrated a history of abusing any power left in his hands and it is in the interest of Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler for their estate plan to remain unchanged and to have a professional fiduciary named without Mick's attempt to control that process to his benefit.

Continued on Page 4

Third Claim for Relief – Appointing Trustees

1. With the removal of the Loefflers as trustees, a trustee will be required and will need to be appointed in order to appoint a professional fiduciary to act as the Trustee of the Trust. Given the indications of undue influence exerted on the prior trustees, Court supervision is needed to protect the trust assets and those serving as trustees or conservators.
2. Petitioners request the Court appoint both of them in conjunction with Samuel Loeffler, Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler's remaining children, to fulfill the successor trustee provision to appoint a professional fiduciary to administer the trust as provided under Article II(E) and designate that the professional fiduciary named will also serve as conservator of the estate should one be appointed.

Fourth Claim for Relief – Instructing the Trustee and Compelling Redress of a Breach of Trust

1. Petitioners request the Court to either compel or instruct the trustee as allowed under Probate Code § 12700(b)(6) to hire a forensic accountant to audit the trust along with prior trusts and provide an accounting of the trust assets beginning January 1, 2008 to the present.
2. Petitioners assert trust funds have been diverted, gifted against the terms of the trust, and/or simply squandered. Mick Loeffler lives in the family home rent free and it is believed is paid for services either unrendered or overcharged. Petitioners believe and are prepared to show that social security checks which have previously been deposited directly into an account believed to be in the trust name are no longer being deposited to that account or any account they are aware of in the name of the Trust or the Trustors, individually.
3. Petitioners request that the court direct the trustee that upon any finding by the forensic accountant indicating funds have not been used for the benefit of the Trustors, the trustee be compelled to redress the breach, that the Court maintain jurisdiction over this case and case numbers 13CEPR00655 and 13CEPR00656, and that the Court maintain oversight of the administration of the trust.

Preliminary Injunction Prohibiting Further Disbursements to Mick Loeffler

1. Petitioners request that any person acting as trustee of the Trust or as the personal representative of Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler be enjoined from distributing any assets held in Trust to Mick Loeffler without further Court order.

Petitioners pray for an Order:

1. That the Court determine the validity of Article II(B)(2) of the Trust. Petitioners request the court find that with the establishment of the conservatorships any Durable General Power of Attorney which may exist is now void, and there is to be no amendment or modification of the trust without prior court approval, or in the alternative, that Article II(B)(2) be modified to state, upon the finding that either Trustor lacks capacity, Article II(B)(2) is void and the Trust may no longer be modified without prior court approval;
2. That the Court remove Fred O. Loeffler and Kathleen Loeffler and Mick Loeffler as Trustees of the Trust, remove Mick Loeffler from any position in which he may choose a professional fiduciary or to act as trustee or personal representative;
3. That the Court appoint Petitioners in conjunction with Samuel Loeffler to choose a professional fiduciary to act as the successor trustee of the trust as provide by the Trust;
4. That the Court designate that any trustee of the Trust which is appointed will also be named as the Conservator of the Estate if one is needed;
5. That the Court compel or instruct the trustee to hire a forensic accountant to audit the trust along with prior trusts and provide an accounting of the trust assets beginning with 01/01/08 to the present;
6. That the Court direct the trustee that upon any finding by the forensic accountant or any other party indicating funds have not been used for the benefit of the Trustors, the trustee be compelled to redress the breach;
7. That the Court maintain jurisdiction over this case and case numbers 13CEPR00655 and 13CEPR00656;
8. That the Court maintains oversight of the administration of the Trust; and
9. That the Court issue a preliminary injunction enjoining any person acting as trustee of the Trust or as the personal representative of Dr. and Mrs. Loeffler from distribution any assets held in the Trust to Mick Loeffler without further order of this Court.

(1) Report of Executor on Waiver of Account and Petition for Final Distribution and (2) Waiver of Compensation to Executor and (3) for Allowance of Compensation to Attorney for Ordinary Services

DOD: 6/26/2012		KEVIN CONLEY , son and Executor, is Petitioner.	<p>NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:</p> <p>Continued from 11/19/2013 [Judge Cardoza.]</p> <p>Note: <i>Petition</i> does not include specific information regarding the increment(s) or date(s) the preliminary distributions of \$86,936.00 were made by the Petitioner to himself. Petitioner's preliminary distributions appear not to have met the Probate Code § 10520(a) type of property (income received during administration), nor the 10520(c) type of property (cash to general pecuniary devisees under Decedent's Will.) In addition, Probate Code § 11623 provides a personal representative with full IAEA authority may petition the court for an order for preliminary distribution on notice. Despite the irregular preliminary distributions by Petitioner without Court authorization, it appears no loss or injury has been suffered by the estate, creditors, or any interested persons per Probate Code § 10520, based upon the assertions in the <i>Petition</i> as to creditors and upon the agreement between beneficiary Kemp Conley and the Petitioner.</p> <p>~Please see additional page~</p> <p>Reviewed by: LEG</p> <p>Reviewed on: 11/21/13</p> <p>Updates:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>File 18 – Conley</p>
		Accounting is waived.	
		I & A — \$676,133.06	
		POH — [\$470,678.00] (\$20,678.99 is cash)	
Cont. from 111913			
	Aff.Sub.Wit.	Executor waives (Waiver by Executor of Compensation filed 10/15/2013.)	
✓	Verified		
✓	Inventory	Attorney — \$16,522.66 (statutory)	
✓	PTC		
✓	Not.Cred.	Costs — \$900.00 (accountant fees to Monica Mata, estate accountant)	
✓	Notice of Hrg		
✓	Aff.Mail	Petitioner states:	
	Aff.Pub.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petitioner made a preliminary distribution of Decedents household furnishings, furniture, and personal effects, pursuant to an outside agreement between Petitioner and KEMP CONLEY, son and beneficiary, in which they divided the tangible personal property between them [consisting of furniture; vehicles]; 	
	Sp.Ntc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petitioner spent considerable time and personal expenses in refurbishing Decedent's home residence and acreage planted with pomegranates and persimmon trees, with total acreage of 11.65 acres in Sanger (Home Ranch); 	
	Pers.Serv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petitioner and Kemp Conley, sole estate beneficiaries, agree that the Home Ranch is worth in excess of \$450,000.00 notwithstanding the Probate Referee's appraisal of \$350,000.00; they have been in the process of selling the Home Ranch property but have not consummated a sale prior to filing this Petition; 	
	Conf. Screen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to not further delay the closing of this estate, Petitioner and Kemp Conley have agreed to sell the Home Ranch property after final distribution of the estate; 	
	Letters 090712	~Please see additional page~	
	Duties/Supp		
	Objections		
	Video Receipt		
	CI Report		
✓	9202		
✓	Order		
	Aff. Posting		
	Status Rpt		
	UCCJEA		
	Citation		
✓	FTB Notice		

Petitioner states, continued:

- Petitioner has made certain preliminary distributions without prior authorization of the Court, and requests confirmation of these distributions in accordance with the agreement of the sole beneficiaries of the estate as follows: Petitioner and Kemp Conley are sole beneficiaries of the estate and have agreed that certain cash distributions could be made to Petitioner provided that Kemp Conley be credited with ½ of all such distributions on final distribution of the estate; Petitioner and Kemp Conley have agreed that the total amount of such cash distributions was **\$86,936.00**, and each has agreed that ½ or **\$43,492.00** is the sum to which Kemp Conley shall be entitled on distribution of the estate; **Petitioner requests and each of the beneficiaries agree** that on final distribution of the estate an order be issued confirming the execution by Petitioner Kevin Conley, as an individual, of a Promissory Note payable in the amount of **\$43,492.00** [*@ 6% interest*], and the Note shall be secured by a Deed of Trust on the Home Ranch [*Please refer to Amendment to Report of Executor filed 11/18/2013, containing attached Exhibit A – copy of **executed but undated** Promissory Note, and Exhibit B – copy of **unexecuted/incomplete** Deed of Trust*];
- On 5/12/2012, Decedent executed a promissory note to Wells Fargo Bank in the original amount of **\$134,000.00** secured by a Deed of Trust with respect to a real estate loan for the financing of a home residence located on South Avenue in Parlier (Parlier Loan) [*Note: this residence is not an estate asset*]; the loan was obtained for **DAWN KAPRIELIAN**, a friend of the Decedent, for her benefit; the Parlier Loan was obtained in Decedent's name alone as required by the lending company; Decedent then executed a Grant Deed on 5/21/2012 naming himself and Dawn Kaprelian as joint tenants with right of survivorship; upon recording of an *Affidavit of Death of Joint Tenant* following Decedent's death, title to this property is now solely in Dawn Kaprelian's name; however, the Parlier Loan remains in Decedent's name; Petitioner and Kemp Conley have agreed that Petitioner, who also resides at the said Parlier home residence, and Dawn Kaprelian, will assume and indemnify Kemp Conley and the estate for any liability and obligation arising out of the Parlier Loan; by an agreement approved by Kemp Conley, the Petitioner and Dawn Kaprelian have executed an assumption and indemnification agreement with respect to all Parlier Loan obligations. (*Please refer to Amendment to Report of Executor filed 11/18/2013, containing attached Exhibit C – copy of **executed** Indemnification Agreement*].

Petitioner requests:

1. Administration of the estate be closed without an accounting;
2. All acts and transactions of Petitioner as Executor be ratified, approved and confirmed;
3. The final distribution requested in the *Petition* be granted and the estate distributed as set forth: **Distribution pursuant to Decedent's Will is to:**
 - **KEVIN CONLEY – \$1,628.16 cash**, an undivided ½ interest in 6.58 acre parcel of real property, and an undivided ½ interest in 11.55 acre parcel of real property.
 - **KEMP CONLEY – \$1,628.16 cash**, an undivided ½ interest in 6.58 acre parcel of real property, and an undivided ½ interest in 11.55 acre parcel of real property.
4. Petitioner be authorized and directed to pay **\$16,522.66** in fees to K. Phillip Maroot as statutory compensation for services to Petitioner and to the estate;
5. Confirmation of the preliminary distributions to Kevin Conley and the corresponding execution of a promissory note payable to Kemp Conley to equalize such distributions, said promissory note to be secured by a deed of trust against the Home Ranch;
6. Confirmation of the agreement by Kevin Conley and Dawn Kaprelian to assume and indemnify the estate and Kemp Conley of any liability or obligation arising out of the "Parlier Loan;"
7. All other property of Decedent and of the estate not now known or discovered be distributed to Kevin Conley and Kemp Conley without further order of the Court.