

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

***Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party,
Injured Party***

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,**

Respondents.

Case No. 25-4549

**[VERIFIED](#) SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
APPLYING THE *BAUMAN* FACTORS
IN SUPPORT OF **EMERGENCY**
PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS**

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

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare, a living man, the Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Creditor, Petitioner, and Beneficiary, proceeding *sui juris* and **not pro se**, appearing **in his proper private and equitable capacity** by **special limited appearance only**, without submission to any foreign, commercial, administrative, or statutory jurisdiction. This verified filing is made for the **sole and exclusive purpose** of enforcing perfected rights, exposing jurisdictional fraud, and compelling immediate and lawful equitable remedy on the un rebutted record. This special limited appearance and **verified** motion are made under the **exclusive original jurisdiction of equity**, invoking the **inherent powers of this Court** under **Article III of the Constitution**, the **law of equity**, and **equity**

jurisprudence, wherein conscience, fairness, and maximum justice govern — not procedural traps or fraudulent administrative fictions. No remedy at law is adequate. Only equity has the jurisdiction, the power, and the mandate to act.

Kevin: Realworldfare explicitly rejects and rebuts any presumption of status as a “U.S. citizen” under the 14th Amendment, individual, legal fiction, corporation, vessel, transmitted utility, person, or other construct created under color of law.

There is **no valid contract**, **no meeting of the minds**, and **no lawful jurisdiction** by which this Court, or any inferior court below, may impose adhesion, suretyship, or agency without express, knowing, and voluntary consent.

This appearance and demand arise under the **law merchant**, **common law**, **commercial right**, and the **maxims of equity**. It is **not** a plea for statutory remedy, nor a request for administrative permission — it is a demand, in law and in fact, for the enforcement of already perfected rights and the extinguishment of colorable and unlawful judicial acts.

All immunities and rights are expressly reserved pursuant to:

- **UCC § 1-308** – reservation of rights,
- **UCC § 3-501** – presentment and protest,
- **Article I, § 10** – no law impairing obligation of contract,
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – for deprivation of rights under color of law,
- and the **organic law and maxims of equity**.

This Court has original supervisory and equitable jurisdiction under:

- **Article III, § 2** of the Constitution,
- **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)**,
- and **Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 21 and 27**.

It is this Court’s duty, not discretion, to intervene where inferior courts act **ultra vires**, where verified disqualification is defied, and where due process and

structural fairness have been obliterated by a judge acting in direct contempt of her oath and outside all lawful jurisdiction.

I. INTRODUCTION

This supplemental brief applies the *Bauman v. U.S. District Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977) **five-factor test** to the verified, ***unrebutted***, and **undisputed** record across **four interlinked district court cases** and this appellate proceeding, with a **5th pending Syke’s continued fraud**:

Case-Specific Context of Post-Disqualification Misconduct Across All Related Actions

- **5:25-cv-01357 (Primary Action – Mandatory Disqualification Origin)**
In this action, Petitioner filed a timely, legally sufficient affidavit of bias and prejudice under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, together with grounds under § 455, which triggered **mandatory and permanent disqualification**. Under *Sibla*, Judge Sykes was required to “proceed no further” except to transfer the matter. Instead, she **ruled on her own recusal**, refused to transfer, and continued issuing substantive orders — including the August 11, 2025 “Order to Show Cause” in Case No. 5:25-cv-01900 — all void *ab initio*.
- **5:25-cv-01434 (Quiet Title – Formal § 144 Affidavit Filed; Recused Judge Rules on Her Own Recusal and Issues Void Remand)**
Petitioner filed a formal § 144 affidavit of disqualification in this case as well, independently mandating Judge Sykes’s immediate recusal. Despite this, she **ruled on her own recusal**, and then issued a remand order post-disqualification. This remand not only violated §§ 144 and 455, but also suppressed federal removal grounds and contravened the non-reviewability bar of **28 U.S.C. § 1447(d)**, rendering it a jurisdictional nullity.
- **5:25-cv-01450 (Unlawful Detainer Removal – Formal § 144 Affidavit Filed; Recused Judge Rules on Her Own Recusal and Suppresses §**

1443(1))

Petitioner likewise filed a formal § 144 affidavit in this case, triggering mandatory recusal. Judge Sykes, already disqualified in 5:25-cv-01357 and 5:25-cv-01434, nevertheless **ruled on her own recusal** here and then issued a remand order without addressing the asserted **civil rights removal grounds under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**. Both acts — ruling on her own disqualification and remanding without adjudicating § 1443(1) — are jurisdictionally void.

- **5:25-cv-01900 (Re-Removed Unlawful Detainer – Recused Judge Blatantly Ignores Recusal)**

Although no new affidavit was necessary here because the prior § 144 disqualifications in 5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, and 5:25-cv-01450 already extended to this related action, Judge Sykes is **permanently recused by operation of law**. Petitioner in good faith filed several verified affidavits and notice regarding Sykes’ mandatory recusal (see docket nos. 10 and 11 in Case No. 5:25-cv-01900) Nonetheless, she has **blatantly ignored her recusal**, continuing to act and allowing her prior void rulings to control, infecting this case from its inception.

- **5:25-cv-01918 (Re-Removed Quiet Title — pending Sykes’ fraudulent action)**

This re-removed quiet title action is likewise within the scope of the existing disqualifications. Judge Sykes’s prior void rulings and procedural interference in the related cases still exert force here, blocking lawful adjudication despite an unrebutted evidentiary record in Petitioner’s favor.

Since the petition in **No. 25-4549** was docketed, post-petition developments have not just “magnified urgency” — they have exposed a pattern of **calculated, repeat-offense judicial fraud** across multiple dockets:

- On **August 11, 2025**, Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes — **already mandatorily and permanently disqualified** in **5:25-cv-01357**, **5:25-cv-01434**, and **5:25-cv-01450** by formal § 144 affidavits — **knowingly committed further jurisdictional trespass** by issuing an “Order to Show Cause” in **5:25-cv-01900**. This was not an accident; it was a deliberate violation of the statutory mandate that a disqualified judge “shall proceed no further,” and an unmistakable act of contempt toward this Court’s jurisdiction.
- In **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450**, she committed **fraud by omission** by issuing remand orders post-disqualification without adjudicating the asserted **§ 1443(1) civil rights removal grounds**. This is her well-worn tactic — **pretend the § 1443(1) claim doesn’t exist, refuse to engage it, and push out a remand order** — in open violation of § 1447(d) and controlling Supreme Court precedent.
- The district court, under her unlawful participation, has **continued to act on the very same issues now under this Court’s review in 25-4549**, in direct violation of appellate divestiture under *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Disc. Co.*, 459 U.S. 56 (1982).

This is not “ordinary error.” It is a **coordinated, multi-case jurisdictional collapse**, sustained across five dockets, driven by **knowing statutory violations, repeated fraudulent omissions, and conscious suppression of controlling federal law**, all in open defiance of this Court’s supervisory authority.

II. FACTOR ONE — NO OTHER ADEQUATE MEANS OF RELIEF

In **5:25-cv-01357**, Petitioner filed a timely, facially sufficient affidavit of bias and prejudice under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, independently invoking **§ 455**. This triggered *mandatory and permanent recusal*. By law, Judge Sykes was stripped of all authority to do anything except transfer the matter to another judge. Instead, she

defied the statute, ruled on her own disqualification, and continued to preside, manage, and issue substantive orders — including the August 11, 2025 “Order to Show Cause” in 5:25-cv-01900, a separate case in which her disqualification was already fully operative.

In **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450**, Petitioner again filed formal § 144 affidavits, mandating her immediate recusal in each. Nevertheless, she **ruled on her own disqualification** in both cases and then issued remand orders **after** being disqualified. In doing so, she engaged in **fraud by omission** by deliberately refusing to adjudicate the asserted **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) civil rights removal grounds**, and by issuing remands in violation of the jurisdictional bar in **28 U.S.C. § 1447(d)**. This is not ignorance — it is the repeated, intentional suppression of controlling federal law to achieve predetermined outcomes.

In **5:25-cv-01900**, the misconduct escalates. This case was **not even originally assigned to Judge Sykes**, yet — despite her prior disqualifications in 5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, and 5:25-cv-01450 — it was **improperly and suspiciously reassigned to her**. That reassignment itself is evidence of **collusion and coordinated fraud** to place the matter under the control of a judge who had already lost all jurisdiction over Petitioner’s cases. Once in her hands, she issued the void and fraudulent August 11, 2025 OSC in direct violation of her disqualification and in contempt of this Court’s live jurisdiction in **No. 25-4549**.

In **5:25-cv-01918**, another re-removal from the same property dispute, the taint is identical. Though her disqualification was already in effect, her prior void rulings and procedural manipulations from the related cases still control the trajectory of the matter, depriving Petitioner of any lawful adjudication despite an un rebutted evidentiary record.

Across all five cases, the district court has **stonewalled adjudication of ripe, dispositive and verified motions** supported by **unrebutted evidence** and

procedural default. This is not delay; it is a deliberate deprivation of rights through unlawful retention of control by a judge with no lawful authority to act.

No appeal after final judgment can cure this. Under settled Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit law, **every act of a disqualified judge is void ab initio**. The harm is built into the record, irreparable, and compounding with every passing day — making mandamus the only vehicle capable of halting the ongoing jurisdictional abuse and institutional collusion.

III. FACTOR TWO — DAMAGE OR PREJUDICE NOT CORRECTABLE ON APPEAL

The prejudice here is **structural, permanent, and incapable of post hoc repair**. Once a judge is mandatorily disqualified under **28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455**, **every subsequent act is void ab initio**. No appeal can unring that bell or reconstruct the impartial forum that Congress and the Constitution guarantee.

The **August 11, 2025 “Order to Show Cause”** — issued not in 5:25-cv-01357, but in **5:25-cv-01900** after her permanent disqualification — is a blatant and knowing act of jurisdictional trespass. It is not a “harmless error” or a “technical defect.” It is the **exact scenario the Supreme Court in *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927)** recognized as a per se violation of due process: being forced to answer to a tribunal that is unlawfully constituted and fundamentally biased.

In **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450**, the injury compounds. Post-disqualification remand orders — issued after Judge Sykes improperly ruled on her own recusal — are still being wielded by opposing parties as if they had legal effect. Those orders are **jurisdictional nullities**, but they remain lodged in the record like a poisoned stake, infecting related litigation and stripping Petitioner of statutory civil rights removal protections under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**.

In **5:25-cv-01900**, the prejudice is aggravated by the fact that the case was **not even originally assigned to Judge Sykes**, but was **reassigned to her despite her disqualification** — an act that reeks of collusion and calculated interference.

And while **5:25-cv-01918** is not yet in her hands, the pattern of conduct already on display — combined with the district court’s demonstrated willingness to funnel Petitioner’s matters back to a permanently disqualified judge — makes it a near-certainty that, absent immediate intervention, this case will meet the same fate: unlawful retention, suppression of § 1443(1), and further jurisdictional trespass. These are not abstract procedural missteps; they are **live, ongoing violations of structural due process** that will taint every ruling and proceeding unless stopped immediately. They cannot be “fixed” on appeal because the entire framework of adjudication has been corrupted from the outset. The damage is **baked into the record, irreversible, and growing daily** — which is precisely why mandamus exists.

IV. FACTOR THREE — CLEAR ERROR AS A MATTER OF LAW

The controlling rule is beyond dispute: once a timely and sufficient affidavit under **28 U.S.C. § 144** is filed, the judge “**shall proceed no further**” except to transfer the case to another judge. *United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980). **28 U.S.C. § 455** imposes the same non-negotiable standard: recusal is mandatory whenever impartiality “might reasonably be questioned.” These statutes are not advisory. They are commands. Post-recusal acts are void *ab initio* under *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847 (1988).

Judge Sykes has not merely “erred” — she has **consciously and repeatedly violated** these mandates, acting as if neither the statutes nor this Court’s precedent apply to her:

- **5:25-cv-01357** — Permanently disqualified by a facially sufficient § 144 affidavit, she **illegally ruled on her own disqualification**, then continued

issuing substantive orders, including directing proceedings in related cases.

She also ignored verified filings and sworn affidavits establishing dispositive facts, deliberately sidestepping them to preserve control of the matter.

- **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450** — In each, Petitioner filed separate, formal § 144 affidavits mandating her immediate recusal. She again **sat in judgment of her own disqualification** and issued remand orders *after* recusal. Critically, in both cases she **deliberately refused to adjudicate the asserted § 1443(1) civil rights removal grounds**, ignoring verified filings and sworn affidavits, and issuing remands without even mentioning § 1443(1). This calculated omission is not a slip — it is **fraud by omission** designed to avoid applying federal law she does not want to enforce, in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. § 1447(d)**.
- **5:25-cv-01900** — Not originally assigned to her, yet **reassigned after her disqualification** — an act that reeks of collusion. Once she had the case, she issued the August 11, 2025 “Order to Show Cause” in blatant violation of her recusal and in contempt of this Court’s jurisdiction in No. 25-4549. She has continued the same pattern: ignoring dispositive verified filings and affidavits, refusing to acknowledge § 1443(1), and issuing directives without lawful authority.
- **5:25-cv-01918** — While not yet assigned to her, the district court’s repeated willingness to funnel Petitioner’s cases to her makes future unlawful interference almost certain. Her past void orders already cast a prejudicial shadow here, and if the pattern holds, she will again ignore § 1443(1), disregard verified affidavits, and force through orders without jurisdiction.

This is not mere “judicial error” — it is **deliberate lawlessness** and systemic defiance of binding law. Judge Sykes’s conduct shows a sustained, willful refusal to adjudicate § 1443(1) removals, a pattern of ignoring verified, un rebutted

evidence, and a habit of issuing remands without addressing the controlling statutes at all. Under settled law, **a disqualified judge is no judge at all** — and every act she has taken post-recusal is a legal nullity that deepens the structural injury.

V. FACTOR FOUR — OFT-REPEATED ERROR OR PERSISTENT DISREGARD OF FEDERAL RULES

This is not a one-off lapse of judgment or a stray procedural misstep — it is a **documented, serial abuse of judicial authority** spanning multiple dockets, with the same unlawful tactics deployed over and over to sidestep federal statutes, suppress civil rights removal, and neutralize appellate oversight.

- **5:25-cv-01357** — The misconduct began here with a **direct violation of § 144 and § 455**. After a legally sufficient affidavit of bias triggered *mandatory and permanent* disqualification, Judge Sykes **illegally ruled on her own recusal** and refused to transfer the case. She then kept issuing orders, proving her intent was not to follow the law, but to **retain control** of a case she was barred from touching.
- **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450** — Here, the pattern expanded into **deliberate suppression of § 1443(1)** civil rights removal grounds. In each, Petitioner filed formal § 144 affidavits requiring recusal, yet she **sat in judgment of her own disqualification**, then issued remand orders post-recusal without ever adjudicating § 1443(1). She ignored verified filings and sworn affidavits, engaging in **fraud by omission** to evade federal law she did not want to apply.
- **5:25-cv-01900** — This was **not even originally her case**, yet it was **reassigned to her after her disqualification** — an act that cannot be explained except as **collusion** within the district court to place Petitioner’s matters back under her control. Once reassigned, she immediately resumed

her unlawful tactics: issuing the August 11, 2025 “Order to Show Cause” in defiance of her disqualification, ignoring § 1443(1), and disregarding dispositive verified evidence.

- **5:25-cv-01918** — While not yet formally assigned to her, the district court’s consistent funneling of Petitioner’s cases to a permanently disqualified judge makes it virtually certain she will interfere here too. Given her track record, the outcome is predictable: more suppression of § 1443(1), more disregard for verified affidavits, more jurisdictional trespass.

This is **not** “error” in the legal sense — it is a **sustained pattern of calculated violations** of federal recusal statutes, removal provisions, and appellate divestiture. It undermines the integrity of **28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 1443(1), and 1447(d)**, guts the protections Congress enacted for civil rights removals, and signals to litigants that the rules mean nothing if a judge chooses to ignore them.

This Court has a duty to halt this pattern **now**. Every day it continues, the contamination spreads across dockets, depriving Petitioner of lawful adjudication and eroding public trust in the judiciary. This is exactly the kind of **persistent, cross-case lawlessness** the fourth *Bauman* factor was designed to address.

VI. FACTOR FIVE — NEW AND IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

This case forces the Ninth Circuit to confront **five urgent, systemic questions** that go to the heart of statutory enforceability, constitutional supremacy, and the Court’s own ability to maintain control over the federal judiciary. These are not academic hypotheticals — they are **live, ongoing violations** happening right now across multiple dockets.

1. May a disqualified judge act after mandatory § 144/§ 455 disqualification?

If the answer is “yes,” then **§§ 144 and 455, along with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 63**, are meaningless. Congress’s recusal commands become

empty suggestions, and litigants lose the basic right to an impartial tribunal the moment a judge decides to ignore them.

2. May a sitting judge deliberately defy the Ninth Circuit’s appellate jurisdiction and do whatever they want while a mandamus petition is pending?

If the answer is “yes,” *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Disc. Co.*, 459 U.S. 56 (1982), is effectively repealed by judicial fiat. Judge Sykes’s post-recusal “Order to Show Cause” in 5:25-cv-01900 — issued while this Court’s jurisdiction in No. 25-4549 was active — is not a mistake. It is a **direct challenge to appellate authority**.

3. May a disqualified judge be deliberately reassigned new cases by the district court to continue exercising control over a litigant?

If the answer is “yes,” recusal statutes are worthless and can be nullified by administrative maneuver. The reassignment of 5:25-cv-01900 to Judge Sykes — *after* her disqualification in three related cases — is evidence of **institutional collusion** and systemic corruption, not an isolated administrative quirk.

4. May a judge rule on their own disqualification, issue collusive orders to preserve control, and then claim absolute judicial immunity as a shield?

If the answer is “yes,” judicial immunity becomes a weapon for lawless self-protection. It gives a judge the green light to violate recusal laws, keep cases through fraudulent rulings, and coordinate with court staff — all without accountability.

5. May a federal judge declare war on the Constitution by openly rejecting federal supremacy and separation of powers?

If the answer is “yes,” then Article III and the Supremacy Clause are optional. Judge Sykes’s conduct shows an unmistakable pattern: disregard

federal statutes, suppress constitutional protections like § 1443(1), and ignore the boundaries of her own jurisdiction — all while knowing those acts violate supreme law. This is not error; it is **open insurrection against the governing framework**.

These five questions are **not isolated issues** — they are all manifesting now across five related cases. The damage is cumulative, systemic, and targeted. If this Court does not act, the precedent will be catastrophic: disqualified judges will know they can ignore statutory recusal, defy appellate jurisdiction, trample the Constitution, receive new cases by collusive reassignment, and then hide behind immunity. That is not judicial error — it is **institutionalized lawlessness**, and it is unfolding in real time.

VII. CONCLUSION AND DEMAND FOR RELIEF

This case is the blueprint for why the writ of mandamus exists. **Every Bauman factor is satisfied in the extreme**. The first three alone compel issuance of the writ; the last two reveal a coordinated, cross-docket campaign of **judicial lawlessness, collusion, and statutory nullification** that will continue unabated without this Court's direct intervention.

The record is **unrebutted**. **Verified** affidavits, dispositive evidence, and civil rights removal grounds under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** stand wholly uncontested. On the merits, Petitioner is **entitled to quiet title and summary judgment as a matter of law** under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 and applicable state quiet title statutes. The only reason that relief has not been granted is that a **permanently disqualified judge** continues to seize jurisdiction, ignore controlling statutes, and issue void orders in direct violation of **§§ 144, 455, and 1447(d)**, all while this Court's jurisdiction is active.

This is structural prejudice at its most corrosive: even where the law and the record guarantee judgment, the process has been hijacked by a tribunal with no lawful

authority, operating in open defiance of federal supremacy and constitutional command. **No appeal can fix this — the damage is permanent and expanding.**

Petitioner therefore demands that this Court:

1. **Grant the writ of mandamus and vacate all post-disqualification orders in 5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, 5:25-cv-01450, 5:25-cv-01900, and 5:25-cv-01918, including the fraudulent August 11, 2025 Order to Show Cause in 5:25-cv-01900.**
2. **Vacate all void remands** entered without adjudicating § 1443(1), and bar any future remand in any related case absent a full, explicit adjudication of § 1443(1) on the record.
3. **Reassign all related cases** to a neutral, unconflicted Article III judge with no prior involvement in any of these matters.
4. **Order immediate adjudication** of all ripe dispositive motions on the existing un rebutted record, including entry of **quiet title and summary judgment in Petitioner's favor** as a matter of law.
5. **Order sanctions** against Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes, Wesley L. Hsu, Dolly M Gee, Kenly Kita Kayo, Kenly Kiya Kato, Michael F Fitzgerald, and her co-conspirators **John Bailey** and **Therese Bailey** for their knowing, willful, and ongoing participation in **fraud on the court, simulated legal process, extortion, harassment, deprivation of rights under color of law, and railroading.**
6. **Order full restitution** to Petitioner for all damages caused by these unlawful acts, including costs, fees, and any losses directly resulting from the indisputably void orders and collusive conduct.
7. **Enjoin Judge Sykes, John Bailey, Therese Bailey, and all persons acting in concert with them** from any further acts of **extortion, harassment, deprivation of rights under color of law, fraud on the court, simulated**

**legal process, and any further attempt to influence or control
Petitioner's cases.**

8. Issue any further orders necessary to restore lawful jurisdiction, enforce appellate supremacy, and prevent any future circumvention of this Court's authority.

Anything less will ratify the principle that a disqualified judge may retain jurisdiction, override appellate authority, nullify federal statutes through omission, collude with court staff to seize new cases, and hide behind absolute immunity while doing so. That is not the rule of law — it is **institutionalized judicial lawlessness** — and it must be stopped now.

//

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**, 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 12th day of August 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, Real Party In Interest,
Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party/Petitioner

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 **August 12, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. **VERIFIED SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF APPLYING THE *BAUMAN***
FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF **EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
MANDAMUS

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]

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.

Sunshine K. Sykes, Dolly Maize Gee
C/o **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE**
3470 Twelfth Street Riverside
Riverside, California [92501-3801]
DMG_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
SSS_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
Vanessa_Figueroa@cacd.uscourts.gov
yolanda_skipper@cacd.uscourts.gov

Naji Doumit, Mary Doumit, Daniel Doumit
C/o **NAJI DOUMIT, MARINAJ PROPERTIES, FOCUS
ESTATES INC**
louisatoui3@yahoo.com
najidoumit@gmail.com
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com
udlaw2@aol.com

John L. Bailey (#103867), Therese Bailey (#171043)
C/o **THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP**
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com

Barry-Lee: O'Connor (#134549)
C/o **BARRY LEE O'CONNOR, BARRY LEE O'CONNOR &
ASSOCIATES**
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 **August 12, 2025** in Riverside
County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra