

Kevin: Realworldfare, *sui juris, in propria Persona*  
C/o 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251  
Temecula, California [92591]  
*non-domestic without* the United States  
Email: [team@walkernovagroup.com](mailto:team@walkernovagroup.com)

*Plaintiff, Real Party in Interest, Injured Party*

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**Kevin: Realworldfare,**  
*Petitioner/Plaintiff/Injured Party,*  
*vs.*

Hon. Sunshine S. Sykes, Hon. Dolly M.  
Gee, **UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
COURT FOR THE CENTRAL  
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,  
EASTERN DIVISION,**

*Respondents.*

Case No.

(District Court Case No 5:25-cv-01357)

**VERIFIED EMERGENCY PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO  
DISQUALIFY JUDGE SUNSHINE  
SUZANNE SYKES, VACATE VOID  
PROCEEDINGS, AND COMPEL ENTRY  
OF FINAL JUDGMENT ON  
UNREBUTTED RECORD**

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE — IN  
EQUITY ONLY — EQUITY JURISDICTION  
PRESERVED)

This matter is brought in **equity**, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of  
this Court as authorized by the Constitution of the United States, Article III, Section  
2. All statutory jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of  
Record. All rights are reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308.  
**COMES NOW**, Plaintiff/Secured Party/Injured Party/Real Party In Interest **Kevin  
Realworldfare**, a living man, proceeding *sui juris, in propria persona*, by *Special  
Limited Appearance* only, not generally, **not pro se**, not as a "United States citizen"  
as defined under the 14th Amendment, nor as surety for any all-cap legal fiction,  
artificial entity, corporate construct, transmitting utility, or cestui que trust — but  
**solely a living, sentient man**, specially appearing in their true private capacity,  
competent to state and defend his own rights, title, and interest.

By this VERIFIED **EMERGENCY** PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, Plaintiff respectfully petitions this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act) and Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure for a Writ of Mandamus directing United States District Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes to disqualify herself, vacate all void orders and proceedings issued after July 11, 2025, and for reassignment of the matter to a neutral Article III judge, and for an order directing the District Court to enter **Summary Judgment and Default Judgment as a Matter of Law and Equity** in favor of Petitioner, based on unrebutted verified filings and procedural default

### I. INTRODUCTION

This Petition presents a constitutional crisis in miniature — a federal judge, formally disqualified under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455, continues to preside over proceedings *without* lawful authority, issuing void orders and refusing to adjudicate dispositive motions supported by an unrebutted record. The result is a structural violation of due process, a breakdown of lawful adjudication, and a textbook case for issuance of the extraordinary writ of mandamus.

Petitioner, Real Party In Interest, and Injured Party seeks immediate relief from this Court pursuant to the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), and Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The lower court's continued post-disqualification actions are void ab initio and represent a **judicial usurpation of power** in direct defiance of controlling statutes and binding precedent.

**There is no adequate remedy at law.** Final judgment on the verified and unrebutted record has been unlawfully withheld. Repeated procedural defaults, failure to strike void filings, and deliberate inaction on dispositive motions constitute not mere error, but **obstruction and ultra vires conduct**. Absent immediate intervention by this Court, Petitioner faces continued deprivation of rights, irreparable harm, and the collapse of lawful process.

This Court has the constitutional, statutory, and supervisory authority to issue the relief demanded. The time for correction by the district court has passed. This Petition is not a collateral appeal — it is a lawful invocation of equity, commercial default, and federal due process principles to preserve judicial integrity, enforce disqualification, and compel final judgment as a matter of law.

## **II. RELIEF REQUESTED**

Petitioner respectfully demands the following relief pursuant to the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, and Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure:

- 1. An order disqualifying United States District Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** from further participation in Case No. 5:25-cv-01357 under **28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455**, based on verified affidavits filed by Petitioner on **July 11, 2025** (Dkts. 72–74), and which triggered mandatory disqualification by operation of law;
- 2. Vacatur of all judicial actions, orders, and docket entries issued after July 11, 2025**, including Dkts. 75–80 and any subsequent filings or minute orders entered under the color of jurisdiction by a disqualified judge, as such actions are **void ab initio** and in violation of federal statute and due process;
- 3. Immediate reassignment of the matter to a neutral, unaffiliated Article III district judge**, untainted by prior rulings or jurisdictional improprieties, to ensure impartial adjudication going forward;
- 4. An order compelling entry of Summary Judgment and Default Judgment as a Matter of Law and Equity** in favor of Petitioner, based on the **unrebutted verified** record and procedural default of the Defendants, as detailed in Dkts. 25, 57–62 — including:
  - **Dkt. 58** – Verified Motion and Demand for Clerk’s Entry of Default and Final Judgment as a Matter of Law and Equity;
  - **Dkt. 59** – Verified Motion to Strike Void Filings and Enforce Final Judgment;
  - **Dkt. 61** – Verified Request for Judicial Notice of Ripeness and Demand for Immediate Ruling on Summary Judgment;

1 **5. Any such further relief as this Court deems necessary and appropriate to**  
2 vindicate Petitioner's rights, protect the integrity of federal judicial proceedings,  
3 and prevent further irreparable harm.

### 4 III. JURISDICTION

5 This Court has original jurisdiction under **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**, the **All Writs Act**, to  
6 issue extraordinary relief in aid of its appellate and supervisory powers. Mandamus  
7 is appropriate where, as here, the Petitioner has **no other adequate remedy** at law,  
8 and the need for intervention is both **urgent and compelled by justice**.

9 Petitioner's right to relief is **clear and indisputable**: The district judge below,  
10 having been **formally and properly disqualified under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and**  
11 **455**, is **without legal authority to preside over the case in any capacity**. All  
12 further actions taken by that judge after disqualification are void *ab initio*  
13 and constitute an **ongoing usurpation of judicial power**. See *United States v.*  
14 *Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842 (7th Cir. 1975); *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*,  
15 486 U.S. 847 (1988).

16 Where a lower court openly defies mandatory disqualification statutes, disregards  
17 the Constitution's guarantee of due process and a neutral tribunal, and continues to  
18 act in clear excess of jurisdiction, mandamus is not just appropriate — **it is**  
19 **necessary to prevent irreparable harm to the integrity of the judicial process**  
20 **itself**.

### 21 IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

22 On **July 11, 2025**, Petitioner filed the following verified documents in the United  
23 States District Court for the Central District of California in **Case No. 5:25-cv-01357**:

- 24 • **Verified Notice of Objection to Judicial Reassignment and Verified**  
25 **Motion and Demand for Disqualification** (Dkt. 72);
- 26 • **Verified Affidavit in Support of Mandatory Disqualification** (Dkt. 74);

27 These filings, submitted under oath and in compliance with **28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and**  
28 **455**, triggered **mandatory judicial disqualification**. Upon receipt of such an

1 affidavit, a judge “**shall proceed no further**”. The law affords **no discretion** to the  
2 presiding judge when a sufficient affidavit is filed. Any judicial action taken  
3 thereafter is void ab initio.

4 Despite this, Judge **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** unlawfully continued to preside over  
5 the case, and the Court Clerk processed filings in **direct defiance of statutory law**  
6 **and binding precedent**. Docket entries **75 through 81** reflect continued judicial and  
7 procedural activity under a disqualified bench, rendering all such filings  
8 **jurisdictionally void**.

9 Even prior to these events, Petitioner had fully briefed and submitted a **Verified**  
10 **Motion and Demand for Summary Judgment in Equity and Final Judgment as a**  
11 **Matter of Law** (Dkt. 25), supported by unrebutted verified affidavits, verified  
12 notices, commercial filings, and *perfected* security instruments. **No verified**  
13 **opposition was ever filed by Defendants.**

14 In fact, the record shows escalating defaults, tacit admissions, and procedural  
15 silence across the following key filings:

- 16 • **Dkt. 57** – Verified Motion and Demand to Strike Defendants’ Declarations  
17 and Objections as Void Under Equity and Procedure;
- 18 • **Dkt. 58** – Verified Notice of Motion and Demand for Clerk’s Entry of Default  
19 and Final Judgment as a Matter of Law and Equity;
- 20 • **Dkt. 59** – Verified Motion to Enforce Summary Judgment and Strike Void  
21 Filings;
- 22 • **Dkt. 60** – Verified Notice of Defamation and Demand to Strike Frivolous  
23 Mischaracterizations;
- 24 • **Dkt. 61** – Verified Request for Judicial Notice of Ripeness and Demand for  
25 Immediate Ruling on Summary Judgment in Equity;
- 26 • **Dkt. 62** – Supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities (83 pages) filed  
27 in further support of Summary Judgment, Default Judgment, and  
28 enforcement under commercial and equitable law.

To date, no competent, admissible, or verified rebuttal exists to any of the facts, claims, or filings in the verified record. All opposing declarations (Dkts. 52–56) are unverified, procedurally defective, and filed without jurisdictional authority, as they were submitted while the Court was operating in **post-disqualification dishonor**.

Petitioner has demanded **final judgment** based on unrebutted facts, procedural default, and failure to respond to verified commercial offers and notices of dishonor. Nonetheless, the district court has **refused to adjudicate the ripe, dispositive motions** and has instead permitted continued obstruction and fraudulent litigation tactics, compounding the harm and further disqualifying itself from lawful administration.

In light of these circumstances – and the Court’s continued refusal to strike void actions, enter judgment, or enforce its mandatory recusal – **Petitioner has no adequate remedy other than extraordinary relief by way of mandamus.**

#### V. LEGAL STANDARD FOR MANDAMUS

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, reserved for situations where a lower court has exceeded its lawful authority, failed to perform a clear legal duty, or where a party has no other adequate means to obtain relief. It is not intended to correct ordinary legal error, but to prevent **judicial usurpation of power**, to compel performance of **a ministerial duty**, or to address **a clear abuse of discretion** that undermines the integrity of judicial proceedings.

The United States Supreme Court has emphasized the exceptional nature of mandamus:

**“Only exceptional circumstances amounting to a judicial usurpation of power, or a clear abuse of discretion, will justify the invocation of this extraordinary remedy.”**

– *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004) (internal citations omitted).



The Ninth Circuit evaluates petitions for writ of mandamus under the five-factor test set forth in *Bauman v. U.S. District Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977):

1. The party seeking the writ has no other adequate means to attain relief;
2. The petitioner will be damaged or prejudiced in a way not correctable on appeal;
3. The district court's order is clearly erroneous as a matter of law;
4. The error is an oft-repeated one or manifests a persistent disregard of federal rules;
5. The issue raises new and important problems, or implicates questions of law of first impression.

Not all five factors need be satisfied; rather, the Ninth Circuit has held that the first three factors are **dispositive** when clearly met. See *In re Cement Antitrust Litig.*, 688 F.2d 1297, 1302 (9th Cir. 1982), *aff'd*, 459 U.S. 1190 (1983).

The threshold inquiry is whether **the petitioner has a "clear and indisputable" right to relief**, and whether **the lower court has committed a clear legal error or refused to act where required by law**.

Mandamus is particularly appropriate where a district judge has refused mandatory disqualification under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 or 455, or has **continued to act after losing lawful authority to preside**. Any such conduct is **void ab initio**, and the appellate court may issue mandamus to vacate all resulting proceedings and enforce judicial disqualification as a matter of due process and statutory compliance.

**VI. GROUNDS FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455,**

**AND THE ALL WRITS ACT**

A writ of mandamus is warranted where a district court judge **refuses to disqualify**, continues to exercise jurisdiction **after the statutory basis for recusal**

1 **has been triggered**, and fails to adjudicate dispositive motions supported by an  
2 un rebutted record. That is precisely the situation here.

3 **A. Mandatory Disqualification Under Federal Law**

4 Federal law imposes **two independent and mandatory bases for disqualification**:

5 **1. 28 U.S.C. § 144** requires disqualification when a party files a **timely and**  
6 **sufficient affidavit** demonstrating that the judge has a personal bias or  
7 prejudice. The statute **removes all discretion** from the judge, who must  
8 immediately step aside.

9 *United States v. Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1975):

10 “Once a party files a proper affidavit under § 144, the judge shall proceed no  
11 further in the matter.”

12 **2. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)** requires disqualification where the judge’s impartiality **might**  
13 **reasonably be questioned** — a lower standard. This provision is **self-enforcing**  
14 and must be honored **whether or not a motion is filed**.

15 *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 865 (1988):

16 “The issue is not whether the judge is impartial in fact, but whether the  
17 judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”

18 Once the statutory standard is met, **any further judicial action is void**.

19 *Russell v. Lane*, 890 F.2d 947, 948–49 (7th Cir. 1989):

20 “[A] judge who continues to preside after a valid recusal motion acts without  
21 jurisdiction, and any orders entered thereafter are a nullity.”

22 **B. Mandamus Standard and Applicability**

23 The Ninth Circuit applies the five-part test articulated in *Bauman v. U.S.*  
24 *Dist. Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977), for determining whether a writ  
25 of mandamus is appropriate. The following three factors are dispositive  
26 here:

27 **1. Petitioner has no other adequate means to attain relief**

28 The district court has refused to disqualify, continues to act without jurisdiction,



and has failed to rule on ripe, dispositive motions — foreclosing any remedy other than mandamus.

**2. Petitioner’s right to relief is clear and indisputable**

Verified disqualification filings (Dkts. 72–74) triggered mandatory recusal. Continued judicial participation thereafter violates §§ 144 and 455 and renders all subsequent actions void.

**3. The lower court has committed a clear judicial usurpation of power**

A judge acting **after disqualification** is committing a constitutional violation and cannot invoke judicial immunity or discretion.

*In re Cement Antitrust Litig.* (MDL No. 296), 688 F.2d 1297, 1303 (9th Cir. 1982), *aff’d*, 459 U.S. 1190 (1983):

“Mandamus is appropriate where the district court has committed a clear error of law and failed to perform a duty mandated by statute.”

All three prongs are irrefutably met on the record.

**C. Denial of Summary Judgment on Unrebutted Record Violates Due Process**

In addition to violating federal recusal statutes, the district court has failed to adjudicate Plaintiff’s **Verified Motion for Summary Judgment** (Dkt. 25), despite no verified opposition and a complete record of unrebutted affidavits and procedural default:

- **Dkt. 58** – Motion and Demand for Clerk’s Entry of Default and Final Judgment;
- **Dkt. 59** – Motion to Strike Void Filings and Enforce Final Judgment;
- **Dkt. 61** – Judicial Notice of Ripeness;
- **Dkt. 62** – 83-page Memorandum in support of Summary Judgment.

Where a party moves for summary judgment supported by competent evidence, and the opposing party fails to create a genuine dispute of material fact, **judgment must be granted** as a matter of law.

*Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986):

“Rule 56 mandates the entry of summary judgment... against a party who fails

1 to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to  
2 that party's case."

3 *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986):

4 "Only disputes over facts that might affect the outcome of the suit under  
5 governing law will properly preclude the entry of summary judgment."

6 The lower court's failure to adjudicate the motion constitutes an additional **due**  
7 **process violation** and **judicial obstruction of final judgment**.

8 This is not mere error. It is a complete breakdown in the rule of law. The judge's  
9 refusal to disqualify herself, continued post-disqualification actions, and deliberate  
10 inaction on dispositive motions represent a **judicial usurpation of power**, a  
11 **structural due process failure**, and a **textbook case for mandamus**.

## 12 VII. CONCLUSION

13 The record in this matter presents a **clear and indisputable case of judicial**  
14 **lawlessness**, jurisdictional misconduct, and systemic due process violations. The  
15 verified disqualification filings submitted by Petitioner on **July 11, 2025 (Dkts. 72–**  
16 **74)** triggered **mandatory** recusal under **28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455**, stripping Judge  
17 Sunshine Suzanne Sykes of all lawful authority to proceed. Her continued  
18 involvement, and the acceptance of filings by the Clerk of Court, constitute a  
19 **direct usurpation of power**, rendering all subsequent docket activity **void ab**  
20 **initio**.

21 Concurrently, the district court has refused to adjudicate **ripe, dispositive motions**  
22 (Dkts. 25, 57–62), including a properly supported and un rebutted **Verified Motion**  
23 **for Summary Judgment and Default Judgment**, despite Defendants' procedural  
24 silence and the absence of any genuine issue of material fact. This is not a clerical  
25 oversight — it is a **deliberate obstruction of justice** and a structural breach of the  
26 judicial oath.

27 Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully demands that this Court issue an immediate  
28 **Writ of Mandamus**, ordering the following:

**1. The mandatory and immediate disqualification of Judge Sunshine**

**Suzanne Sykes**, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455, and a formal finding that any judicial acts performed after July 11, 2025, are void for want of jurisdiction;

**2. Vacatur of all post-disqualification docket entries** in Case No. 5:25-

cv-01357, including Dkts. 75 through the present, and the removal of all actions, orders, or filings issued under color of authority by a disqualified judge;

**3. Reassignment of the matter to a neutral and unaffiliated Article III judge,**

consistent with due process and the appearance of impartiality required under federal law;

**4. Entry of Summary Judgment and Default Judgment as *a Matter of Law***

**and Equity in favor of Petitioner**, based on the un rebutted affidavits, procedural default of all Defendants, and the absence of any material factual dispute in the verified record;

**5. Any such further relief as this Court deems just, proper, and necessary** to

preserve the integrity of the judicial system, restore lawful jurisdiction, and prevent the irreparable harm caused by ongoing judicial misconduct.

The time for correction by the lower court has passed. Petitioner turns to this Court not merely for relief — but for restoration of the rule of law.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

**VERIFICATION:**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

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 and the State of California**, 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 June 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**, Real Party In Interest,  
Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party, Petitioner

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

## **LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:**

### **I. Verified Disqualification Filings (Mandatory Disqualification Trigger)**

- **Exhibit A** – Dkt. 72: Verified Notice of Objection to Judicial Reassignment and Verified Motion and Demand for Disqualification (Filed July 11, 2025)
- **Exhibit B** – Dkt. 73: Verified Notice of Affidavit in Support of Disqualification (Filed July 11, 2025)
- **Exhibit C** – Dkt. 74: Verified Affidavit and Verified Notice of Mandatory Disqualification (Filed July 11, 2025)

### **II. Post-Disqualification Void Judicial Activity**

- **Exhibit D** – Dkt. 75: Defendants' Opposition to Objection and Verified Motions (Filed July 15, 2025)
- **Exhibit E** – Dkt. 76: Declaration of Therese Bailey Post-Disqualification (Filed July 15, 2025)
- **Exhibit F** – Dkt. 77: Clerk's Deficiency Notice (Filed July 16, 2025)
- **Exhibit G** – Dkt. 78: Defendants' Reply/Objection to Verified Motions (Filed July 16, 2025)
- **Exhibit H** – Dkt. 79: Reply to Opposition on Clerk Demands and Judgment (Filed July 16, 2025)
- **Exhibit I** – Dkt. 80: Judicial Notice re: Motions Filed After Disqualification (Filed July 16, 2025)
- **Exhibit J** – Dkt. 81: Verified Motion to Strike Void Filings and Enforce Disqualification (Filed July 15, 2025)

### **III. Unrebutted Summary Judgment / Default Judgment Motions**

- **Exhibit K** – Dkt. 25: Verified Motion and Demand for Summary Judgment in Equity and Final Judgment Based on Unrebutted Record (Filed June 13, 2025)
- **Exhibit L** – Dkt. 57: Verified Motion to Strike Defendants' Declarations and Objections as Void (Filed July 3, 2025)

- 1 • **Exhibit M** – Dkt. 58: Verified Motion and Demand for Clerk’s Entry of  
2 Default and Final Judgment as a Matter of Law (Filed July 6, 2025)
- 3 • **Exhibit N** – Dkt. 59: Verified Motion to Strike Void Filings and Enforce  
4 Summary Judgment in Equity (Filed July 6, 2025)
- 5 • **Exhibit O** – Dkt. 60: Verified Notice of Defamation and Motion to Strike  
6 Frivolous Mischaracterizations (Filed July 6, 2025)
- 7 • **Exhibit P** – Dkt. 61: Verified Request for Judicial Notice of Ripeness and  
8 Demand for Immediate Ruling (Filed July 6, 2025)
- 9 • **Exhibit Q** – Dkt. 62: Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of  
10 Final Judgment (83 pages) (Filed July 7, 2025)

11 //

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //



# PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )

) ss.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE )

I competent, over the age of eighteen 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 **June 19, 2025**, I served the within documents:

**1. VERIFIED EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO DISQUALIFY JUDGE SUNSHINE SUZANNE SYKES, VACATE VOID PROCEEDINGS, AND COMPEL ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT ON UNREBUTTED RECORD**

**2. EXHIBITS A through Q**

**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.

Mary H. Murguia, Elena Kagan, Fiduciary(ies)  
C/o UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL  
95 Seventh Street  
San Francisco, California [94103-1526]  
**Express Mail No. [ER204090789US](#) with form [3811](#)**

Tamara-Lucile: Wagner (#188613)  
C/o TAMARA WAGNER  
505 South Buena Vista,  
Corona, California [92882]

**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.

Kai Fan  
3426 Vineland Avenue  
Baldwin Park, California [91706]  
[kevin Yin520@gmail.com](mailto:kevin Yin520@gmail.com)

Kai Fan  
12220 Casper Court  
Rancho Cucamonga, California [91739]  
[kevinvin520@gmail.com](mailto:kevinvin520@gmail.com)

**Sunshin S Sykes and Dolly M Gee**  
3470 Twelfth Street  
Riverside, California [92501-3801]  
[SSS\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:SSS_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)  
[DMG\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:DMG_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)

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

/s/Chris Yarbra/  
Chris Yarbra