

Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker)
C/o 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251
Temecula, California

non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

Secured Party, Fiduciary, Executor, and
Authorized Representative, For the Plaintiffs/Secured Parties,
™WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST©,
™WG EXPRESS© TRUST

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

**WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST,
WG EXPRESS TRUST,**

*Plaintiffs/Real Parties In Interest/
Secured Parties,*

vs.

**MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC; and ALL
PERSONS UNKNOWN CLAIMING
ANY LEGAL OR EQUITABLE RIGHT,
TITLE, ESTATE, LIEN, OR INTEREST
IN THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN
THIS COMPLAINT ADVERSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' TITLE, OR ANY CLOUD
UPON PLAINTIFFS' TITLE THERETO,**

Defendants,

Case No. CVME2504043

**VERIFIED RESPONSE, REBUTTAL, AND
MOTION AND DEMAND FOR
SANCTIONS AGAINST FALSE
ALLEGATIONS OF UNAUTHORIZED
PRACTICE OF LAW, AND
AFFIRMATION OF PRIVATE CAPACITY
STANDING**

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE —
EQUITY JURISDICTION PRESERVED)

COMES NOW, Plaintiffs, ™WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST© and ™WG
EXPRESS© TRUST (hereinafter "Plaintiffs," "Secured Parties," and/or "Real Parties
in Interest"), by *Special Limited Appearance*, **not** generally, by and through their
duly appointed *Fiduciary, Executor, and Authorized Representative*, Kevin:
Realworldfare. Kevin: Realworldfare, **specially** appears in **private capacity only**,
not pro se, and expressly without waiver of any rights, immunities, or protections.
This *Special Limited Appearance* is made exclusively in **equity**, in the capacity of
Secured Party, Holder in Due Course, Executor, Master Beneficiary, and Fiduciary

of the above-referenced Trust Estates, as lawfully established and perfected on the public *and* commercial record.

I. REBUTTAL TO FALSE ALLEGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW (UPL)

1. Personal Right to Represent One's Own Interests

It is well-settled law that any individual has the right to appear in court and file documents in **propria persona** *or* in **private capacity** to represent their **own interests**, including those of **private irrevocable trusts** *or* estates where they serve as **trustee, fiduciary, executor, or beneficiary**.

"The right to self-representation is protected by the due process clauses of both the federal and state Constitutions." – Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)

2. Private Fiduciary Capacity Is Not UPL

When acting as a **fiduciary** or **authorized representative** of one's own trust, estate, *or* private contractual entity (not a third party or the public), one does **not** engage in the unauthorized practice of law.

"A nonlawyer may represent a trust or estate if they are acting in their own interest and not on behalf of a separate person or entity." – Ziegler v. Nickel, 64 Cal. App. 4th 545 (1998)

"California courts have affirmed that even beneficiaries or interested parties may appear pro per in probate or estate matters when asserting their own interests. See Estate of Sanchez, 62 Cal. App. 4th 460 (1998)."

3. Federal Preemption and Jurisdictional Supremacy

Federal equity courts and Article III tribunals are not governed by state licensing statutes when adjudicating private, commercial, or equity-based matters.

Fiduciary representation in trust or secured party matters — especially in federal forums — is protected under the **Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2) and 28 U.S.C. § 1654**. States **may not** interfere with the exercise of federal rights by improperly weaponizing unauthorized practice claims

Federal courts of equity, and any action proceeding under federal jurisdiction – including quiet title and trust enforcement – are not bound by state bar licensing rules. This is constitutionally preempted under **Article VI, Clause 2** (the Supremacy Clause).

*“When a federal right is asserted under original jurisdiction, **no state may impose additional requirements** that obstruct or chill access to justice.” – Tafflin v.*

Levitt, 493 U.S. 455 (1990).

4. Federal Right to Appear Personally – 28 U.S.C. § 1654

Federal law expressly permits any individual to appear and prosecute their own case in any U.S. court without a licensed attorney.

“In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel...” – 28 U.S.C. § 1654

This applies equally when asserting claims tied to one’s own estate, secured interests, or trust property. The statute makes no distinction between natural and contractual roles – so long as the party is **not** representing an unrelated third party.

“The federal courts have consistently upheld the right of individuals to appear pro se under 28 U.S.C. § 1654 so long as they are not representing others.” – Herrera-Venegas v. Sanchez-Rivera, 681 F.2d 41 (1st Cir. 1982)

*“Parties may conduct their own cases personally... This **includes** individuals acting on behalf of their own interests, estates, or trusts where they hold direct fiduciary capacity.” – Stoner v. Santa Clara Cty. Office of Educ., 502 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2007)*

5. Private Trusts and Estates Are Contractual Entities – Not Separate “Third Parties” Like Corporations

Under California **Business & Professions Code §§ 6125–6126**, it is unlawful to **practice law on behalf of another person or entity** without a license. But courts have repeatedly held that:

- If a person is **acting in their own interest**, including as **trustee, executor, or secured party** of a **non-statutory trust** they control, manage, or created — they are **not acting as an attorney for someone else**.
- A **private trust** is fundamentally a **contractual arrangement**, not a government-created legal entity like a **corporation or LLC**.

This distinction matters: you're not "practicing law" — you're exercising rights **under private contract law, trust law, and equity**, in matters where you have **standing and authority**.

*"A nonlawyer **may** represent a trust or estate if they are acting in their own interest and not on behalf of a separate person or entity."*

— Ziegler v. Nickel, 64 Cal. App. 4th 545 (1998)

"Where a person represents their own trust as sole trustee and beneficiary, they are not violating UPL rules."

— C.E. Pope Equity Trust v. United States, 818 F.2d 696 (9th Cir. 1987)

6. UPL Statutes Do Not Apply to Fiduciaries Representing Their Own Private Interests

California's Business and Professions Code § 6125 prohibits unlicensed representation of **other persons' legal matters**. It does **not** bar individuals from asserting **their own rights** or appearing as authorized agents of **private property** interests.

*"The practice of law includes representation of **others**, **not** self." — Drake v. Superior Court, 21 Cal. App. 3d 252 (1971)*

7. Acting in a Fiduciary Role Is Not UPL When Representing One's Own Interests

Courts have distinguished between **representing another party** (which may constitute UPL) and **representing one's own direct interest**, such as in the role of **trustee, executor, or beneficiary** of a private trust.

1 *"A person acting in their own capacity, including as trustee or representative*
2 *of their own interests in a trust or estate, is **not** engaged in unauthorized*
3 *practice of law."*

4 — *Rowland v. California Men's Colony*, 506 U.S. 194 (1993)

5 (recognizing that only natural persons may appear pro se, but noting
6 exceptions when appearing in fiduciary capacity *for one's own interests*)

7 *"An individual who is the sole trustee and beneficiary of a trust **may***
8 *represent that trust without it being UPL."*

9 — *C.E. Pope Equity Trust v. United States*, 818 F.2d 696, 697–98 (9th Cir. 1987)

10 **8. Courts Recognize Representation of One's Own Trust as Lawful**

11 *"A person who is both the trustee and sole beneficiary of a trust **has standing***
12 *to represent the trust without counsel."*

13 — *United States v. Lyllea*, 2008 WL 5101930 (E.D. Cal. 2008)

14 (Recognizing self-representation when the party's interests are fully aligned
15 with the trust)

16 *"Trustees appearing pro se to protect personal interests in the trust are **not***
17 *engaged in UPL."*

18 — *Norton v. Commissioner*, 2021 WL 1663646 (Tax Ct. 2021)

19 (U.S. Tax Court acknowledging pro se filings by individual trustees acting on
20 their own behalf)

21 **9. Private Trusts and Estates Are Not "Third Parties" in the Conventional Sense**

22 When you are the **grantor, executor, or secured party**, courts recognize that you
23 are **not representing a separate legal person**, but rather managing **your own**
24 **estate.**

25 *"A party representing their own trust property and interests is **not***
26 *representing a separate legal entity in the sense of corporate representation*

27 *— therefore UPL does **not** apply."*

28 — *Knapp v. State Bar of California*, 272 Cal. Rptr. 72 (Cal. Ct. App. 1990)

1 **10.U.S. Constitution — Due Process Right of Self-Representation**

2 *"The Constitution guarantees the right of self-representation, even if the*
3 *party chooses to exercise it in a nontraditional or unconventional manner."*

4 *— McKaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168 (1984)*

5 **11. All Filings Were Made as Real Parties in Interest, in private capacity**

6 The Plaintiffs have consistently appeared **not pro se**, but **in private capacity**,
7 invoking common law and equity jurisdiction. They have executed all filings as
8 *authorized representatives, secured parties, and beneficiaries*, supported by verified
9 affidavits and lawful filings (e.g., UCC-1s, Grant Deeds, Security Agreements).

10 There is no third-party representation taking place.

11 **WG EXPRESS TRUST and WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST are each a**
12 **Private Entity: Each are private, irrevocable, non-statutory trusts** formed under
13 contract law and governed by equity — not subject to public representation
14 mandates. There is **no legal or statutory requirement** that private trust
15 representatives retain "licensed" counsel when asserting **their own interests**. It
16 is **not** registered under any corporate or statutory framework, and therefore is
17 not subject to public representation restrictions imposed by the State Bar.
18 Representation of such a private trust by its trustee or executor does not
19 constitute the practice of law under California law or federal authority.
20 Federal equity jurisdiction is original and supreme under the Constitution. The
21 **Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const. art. VI**, bars any state-imposed barrier —
22 *including* attorney licensing requirements — when a **private party** asserts
23 **equitable rights** in trust or estate property. See also *Tafflin v. Levitt*, 493 U.S. 455
24 (1990) (state rules cannot obstruct federal claims). Therefore, state bar statutes
25 cannot interfere with equitable enforcement or federal quiet title actions.

26 **12. Estoppel Bars Any Claim of UPL**

27 Defendants are estopped from asserting unauthorized practice of law where:

- 28
 - o The filings were not on behalf of third parties;

- 1 ○ **No injury from such filings has been demonstrated:** It must be
2 emphasized that MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC has suffered no actual,
3 articulable injury from the filings or actions of Plaintiff(s). No damage,
4 no prejudice, and no deprivation of process has been asserted with
5 factual support. An allegation of unauthorized practice without
6 demonstrable harm is meritless and amounts to procedural
7 harassment.
- 8 ○ Under well-established legal principles, no party may invoke
9 regulatory violations without standing based on actual injury. As the
10 [U.S. Supreme Court](#) made clear in *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504
11 U.S. 555 (1992), “*an injury in fact is a constitutional minimum*” to
12 assert standing. **Alleging UPL without actual, demonstrable harm is**
13 **not a justiciable claim – it is harassment and retaliation;**
- 14 ○ [Plaintiffs acted in good faith, under verified contracts and affidavits.](#)

15 **13. Additional Authority Clarifying No Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL)**

16 It is well-established under California Probate Code and related
17 jurisprudence that trustees, executors, and fiduciaries may appear pro per
18 or in private capacity in matters where they are asserting rights as an
19 interested party to the estate or trust, rather than representing a separate
20 legal person or client.

21 Specifically, **California Probate Code § 10810** et seq. does **not** require
22 “licensed” attorney representation for **private trustees or executors**
23 **managing their own trust or estate interests**, particularly when no
24 adverse third-party representation is involved.

25 Furthermore, even if there were a procedural irregularity in the form or
26 structure of filings, such technical matters do not rise to the level of
27 unauthorized practice of law unless accompanied by evidence of intent to
28 represent an unrelated party for compensation. See:

1 *"The unauthorized practice of law requires more than a technical misstep; it*
2 *must involve the actual or attempted legal representation of another person or*
3 *entity in a professional capacity without licensure."*

4 – *Estate of Sanchez*, 62 Cal. App. 4th 460 (1998); see also *Jenkins v.*
5 *JPMorgan Chase Bank*, 216 Cal. App. 4th 497 (2013).

6 In the present matter, Plaintiff has acted solely in **private fiduciary**
7 **capacity** with verified documentary authority, asserting rights to trust and
8 estate property owned, managed, and secured under perfected commercial
9 claims. No third-party legal representation is involved, and thus **no valid UPL**
10 **allegation can be sustained** under law.

11 **14. State Law Acknowledges Trustee Standing**

12 The **California Probate Code** permits trustees, executors, and fiduciaries to act
13 on behalf of trusts and estates **when asserting their own interests**.

14 *"A trustee may appear on behalf of a trust when no third-party legal interests are*
15 *implicated."* – *Estate of Sanchez*, 62 Cal. App. 4th 460 (1998)

16 *"Even if a technical procedural defect occurred, such an act is not UPL unless done*
17 *on behalf of another for compensation."* – *In re Marriage of Caballero*, 27 Cal. App.
18 4th 1139 (1994)

19 **15. UPL Accusation Is Frivolous and Retaliatory**

20 The repeated claim of UPL is an attempt to chill, silence, intimidate, manipulate,
21 and obstruct redress of grievance — an act of **retaliation**, **not** a good-faith legal
22 position

23 **II. CONCLUSION AND FORMAL NOTICE OF FINAL DEFAULT,** 24 **DISHONOR, ESTOPPEL, AND COMMERCIAL LIABILITY**

25 The Defendants are attempting to use **false procedural allegations** as a sword to
26 **undermine equity**, evade commercial liability, and obfuscate the perfected record.
27 But equity does not allow a wrongdoer to benefit from their own fraud or
28 misrepresentation. *He who comes into equity must come with clean hands.*

MARINAJ's position violates this fundamental maxim. **Furthermore, private trusts are governed by contract and commercial law, not bar licensing monopolies.** The uncontested, unbrebutted, and perfected record before this Court **unequivocally** confirms that Defendants MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC *and* their counsel are a **criminal enterprise (RICO) engaged in a calculated pattern of fraud, dishonor, and procedural manipulation**. They have offered no verified rebuttals, no lawful claim of title, and no standing under law or **equity**. The Trustee's Deed they rely upon is **unequivocally void ab initio** and constitutes a **legal nullity**. Every filing based thereon is the product of **simulated legal process, commercial trespass, and fraud upon the court**. Despite multiple verified responses, conditional acceptances, and motions filed between May 12–19, 2025 — **none of which have been lawfully rebutted** — Defendants continue to grab at procedural straws in a desperate effort to bypass equity and conceal **their defective standing**. Their silence in the face of **point-for-point** rebuttals constitutes commercial dishonor, default, and an admission of liability by operation of law. This Court is **duty-bound** to uphold equity and judicial integrity. Courts of **equity** do **not** reward **bad faith, unclean hands, or** those who **manufacture jurisdiction by simulated process**.

Equity Forbids Use of Fraud to Block Remedy

A party who enters the court with **unclean hands**, who relies on a void Trustee's Deed, or who uses procedural accusations to evade remedy, **cannot invoke equity or legal protections**. The maxim "*He who seeks equity must do equity*" bars MARINAJ from using the UPL claim as a sword to defeat lawful trust enforcement.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Accordingly, **Plaintiffs respectfully demand that this Court:**

- 1. Strike and bar** the Cross-Complaint of MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC as procedurally defective, unverified, and judicially **estopped**;

- 1 **2. Declare void ab initio** all filings predicated upon the fraudulent Trustee's
2 Deed and simulated authority;
- 3 **3. Enter summary disposition and default** against Defendants based on
4 unrebutted commercial dishonor and failure to plead;
- 5 **4. Sanction all counsel and actors** involved for fraud upon the court,
6 procedural abuse, and reputational defamation of private parties acting
7 within their own trust interests;
- 8 **5. Affirm title and standing** of Plaintiffs as Real Parties in Interest, Secured
9 Parties, and Beneficial Owners in Equity.
- 10 **6. A judicial declaration and final order quieting title** to the subject property
11 exclusively in favor of Plaintiff(s), free and clear of any adverse claim, lien, or
12 encumbrance arising from the purported **Trustee's Deed Upon Sale** or any
13 other instrument asserted by Defendants, and further:
 - 14 • **Striking from the public record the fraudulent and void ab initio**
15 **Trustee's Deed Upon Sale**, which has no lawful force or effect and
16 constitutes a simulated legal instrument, recorded *without* authority,
17 and in violation of commercial and property law
- 18 **7. Enforcement of commercial liability** and immediate settlement of claims
19 arising from unauthorized **use of copyrighted and trademarked names**, as
20 contractually agreed to by default, with all associated penalties, liens, and
21 damages enforceable in law and equity;
- 22 **8. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just, proper, and**
23 **consistent with equity, commercial law, and the interests of justice**

24 Let the record reflect: This Court now stands at a crossroads between remedy and
25 collusion. Equity demands immediate action. Integrity requires final judgment.

26 //

27 //

28 //

VERIFICATION:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

BY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE WITH FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE

I, Kevin Realworldfare, over the age of 18, competent to testify, and having firsthand knowledge of the facts stated herein, do hereby **declare, certify, verify, affirm, and state** under penalty of perjury under the laws of the **United States of America**, that the foregoing statements are **true, correct, and complete**, to the best of my **understanding, knowledge, and belief**, and made in **good faith**.

Executed, signed, and sealed this 19th day of May in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty five, *without* the United States, **with all rights reserved and without recourse and without prejudice**.

All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.

By: Kevin Realworldfare
Kevin: Realworldfare, Secured Party, Fiduciary,
Authorized Representative, Executor, Master Beneficiary

//

Let this document stand as truth before the Almighty Supreme Creator and let it be established before men according as the scriptures saith: *"But if they will not listen, take one or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses."* Matthew 18:16. *"In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established"* 2 Corinthians 13:1.

All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308

By: Corey David Walker
Corey: Walker (Witness)

All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308

By: Donnabella Realworldfare
Donnabella: Realworldfare (Witness)

//

//

LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:

1. **Exhibit A:** GRANT DEED recorded in Official Records County of Riverside, DOC #2024-0291980, APN: 957-570-005, File No.: 37238 KH, where the private trust property is titled to 'WG Private Irrevocable Trust, dated February 7, 2022'.
2. **Exhibit B:** UCC1 filing #2024385925-4.
3. **Exhibit C:** UCC1 filing #2024385935-1.
4. **Exhibit D:** UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402433-7.
5. **Exhibit E:** UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024411182-7.
6. **Exhibit F:** GRANT DEED, DOC #2022-0490841, APN: 957-570-005, File No.: 30291 KH, recorded in Official Records County of Riverside.
7. **Exhibit G:** Affidavit and Contract and Security Agreement #EI988807156US.
8. **Exhibit H:** Affidavit and Contract and Security Agreement #RF775822865US.
9. **Exhibit I:** Affidavit and Contract and Security Agreement #RF775823755US.
10. **Exhibit J:** Contract and Security Agreement / Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION and LIEN AUTHORIZATION, #RF775824288US.
11. **Exhibit K:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
12. **Exhibit L:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.
13. **Exhibit M:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit I.
14. **Exhibit N:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit J.
15. **Exhibit O:** Trust Certificate of WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST.
16. **Exhibit P:** Affidavit: Power of Attorney-In-Fact
17. **Exhibit Q:** Contract and Security Agreement / Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION and LIEN AUTHORIZATION, #RF661592201US.
18. **Exhibit R:** TMKEVIN WALKER© Trademark and Copyright Agreement
19. **Exhibit S:** TMDONNABELLE MORTEL© Trademark and Copyright Agreement
20. **Exhibit T:** Copy of Rule 8.4 Misconduct Approved by the Supreme Court.

- 1 21. **Exhibit U:** Copy of Defendants **defective and fraudulent** CROSS-COMPLAINT
- 2 22. **Exhibit V:** Copy of VERIFIED RESPONSE, *CONDITIONAL* ACCEPTANCE,
- 3 AND MOTION AND DEMAND TO STRIKE CROSS-COMPLAINT, SANCTION
- 4 COUNSEL FOR FRAUD, AND QUIET TITLE IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS, as a
- 5 matter of law (Express Mail #ER192833495US).
- 6 23. **Exhibit W:** Copy of NOTICE OF RETURN of Defendants defective CROSS-
- 7 COMPLAINT.
- 8 24. **Exhibit X:** Proof of delivery of 'VERIFIED RESPONSE..' (Exhibit V) to Court.
- 9 25. **Exhibit Y:** Email correspondence from John Bailey and Barry Lee O'Connor
- 10 showing their clear **evasion, bad faith, and dishonor.**
- 11 26. **Exhibit Z:** Copy of GEORGIA'S OWN CREDIT UNION'S Request to Dismiss
- 12 27. **Exhibit AA:** [PURPORTED] 'DEFENDANTS' VERIFIED RESPONSE AND
- 13 DEMAND FOR DISMISSAL OF FRAUDULENT UNLAWFUL DETAINER AND
- 14 SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF AND DEMAND FOR CONSIDERED AND
- 15 STIPULATED JUDGEMENT, AND DEMAND FOR QUIET TITLE AND
- 16 DEMAND FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS, AS A
- 17 MATTER OF LAW
- 18 28. **Exhibit BB:** Final Commercial Settlement Offer and Stipulated Quiet Title
- 19 Judgment.
- 20 29. **Exhibit CC:** Defendants dishonorable denial of settlement Offer.
- 21 30. **Exhibit DD:** Declaration of Notice of Ex Parte Application given to Plaintiffs —
- 22 as served by Defendants' counsel Therese Bailey via email on May 16, 2025,
- 23 purporting notice of hearing on May 20, 2025.
- 24 31. **Exhibit EE:** Defendants' Ex Parte Application to Direct Clerk to File Cross-
- 25 Complaint and Issue Summons — evidencing improper post-default procedural
- 26 maneuvering and attempted backdoor litigation in derogation of perfected and
- 27 un rebutted commercial record.
- 28 32. **Exhibit FF:** Email Correspondence from Defendants' Counsel Re: Ex Parte

Hearing Notice — Email dated May 16, 2025, from Therese Bailey, purporting service of Ex Parte Application without proper standing, good cause, or lawful rebuttal to the perfected commercial record, evidencing continued bad faith, simulated process, and procedural abuse.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I competent, over the age of eighteen (18) years, and not a party to the within action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, care of: 30650 Rancho California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about **May 19, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. VERIFIED RESPONSE, REBUTTAL, AND MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW, AND AFFIRMATION OF PRIVATE CAPACITY STANDING.

By United States Mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below by placing the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepared. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail in Riverside County, California, and sent via Registered Mail with a form 3811.

Clerk(s), Agent(s)
C/o CLERK OF COURT
27401 Menifee Center Drive
Menifee, California [92584]
Express Mail #ER192833955US

Naji Doumit, Mary Doumit, Daniel Doumit
C/o NAJI DOUMIT, MARINAJ PROPERTIES, FOCUS ESTATES INC
1130 South Tamarisk Drive
Anaheim, California [92807]
Registered Mail #RF775825535US

John L. Bailey (#103867), Therese Bailey (#171043)
C/o THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP
25014 Las Brisas South, Suite B
Murrieta, California [92562]
Registered Mail #RF775825544US

Barry-Lee: O'Connor
C/o BARRY LEE O'CONNOR, BARRY LEE O'CONNOR & ASSOCIATES
3691 Adams Street
Riverside, California [92504]
Registered Mail #RF775825558US

By Electronic Service. Based on a court order and/or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below.

Naji Doumit, Mary Doumit, Daniel Doumit
C/o NAJI DOUMIT, MARINAJ PROPERTIES, FOCUS ESTATES INC
1130 South Tamarisk Drive
Anaheim, California [92807]
udlaw2@aol.com
louisatoui3@yahoo.com
najidoumit@gmail.com
klacroix@tblglaw.com
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com

John L. Bailey (#103867), Therese Bailey (#171043)
C/o THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP
25014 Las Brisas South, Suite B
Murrieta, California [92562]
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com
klacroix@tblglaw.com

Barry-Lee: O'Connor (#134549)
C/o BARRY LEE O'CONNOR, BARRY LEE O'CONNOR & ASSOCIATES
3691 Adams Street
Riverside, California [92504]
udlaw2@aol.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on **May 19, 2025** in Riverside County, California.

/s/Corey Walker/
Corey Walker

//

//

//

NOTICE:

Using a notary on this document does *not* constitute joinder adhesion, or consent to any foreign jurisdiction, *nor does it alter my status in any manner*. The purpose for notary is verification and identification only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction.

//

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

State of California)

) ss.

County of Riverside)

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

On this 19th day of May, 2025, before me, Joyti Patel, a Notary Public, personally appeared Kevin Realworlfare (formerly Kevin Walker), who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature Joyti Patel (Seal)

