

Notations throughout...

This is lengthy but worth the read - or at least skim for the highlights.

This is how your Mom or Dad will be treated by the Humboldt County Superior Court IF you don't have a well-connected attorney on retainer.

FILED

DEC 13 2021

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT**

Note the Filed date - read down for why it is significant. You can't escape the date stamps.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

CASE NO. PR2100162

IN RE BARBARA LYNN KELLER

RULING AND ORDER
APPOINTING CONSERVATOR

Presently before the court are two competing petitions for appointment of conservator for Barbara Lynn Keller: a petition by Royce Mendonca (Ms. Keller's husband's nephew), and a *Previously unknown nephew of Barbara's 5th husband - legal name is Roland Royce Mendonca, Jr.* petition by Sharon Wolff (Ms. Keller's daughter). Objections were also filed to both petitions.

Similar competing petitions were filed in Ronald Keller's matter, Humboldt Superior Court case no. PR2100161. Ronald and Barbara Keller are married.

Both petitioners appear to agree that Ms. Keller needs a conservator of her person and of her estate. *The probate investigator also recommended appointment of a conservator.* From the *The investigator recommended approving Sharon's petition AND appointing counsel for Barbara as she had requested* evidence presented to the court, including but not limited to the testimony at the hearing and the investigator's reports, the court finds that Ms. Keller is unable to properly provide for her personal needs for physical health, food, clothing or shelter, and that Ms. Keller is substantially unable to manage her own financial resources or resist fraud or undue influence. The court finds that appointment of a conservator of Ms. Keller's person and estate is in Ms. Keller's best

1 interests.

2 Which petitioner should be appointed conservator is a more difficult question. After
3 reviewing all the filings in this matter as well as in Mr. Keller's matter, and considering the
4 testimony presented at the hearing, the court appoints Mr. Mendonca as the conservator of Ms.
5 Keller's person and estate, for the following reasons. *Recommendations knowingly ignored -
including the recommendation to appoint
counsel for Barbara as she requested.*

6 **The probate investigator recommended that Ms. Wolff be appointed conservator for Ms.**
7 **Keller's person and estate, in her original report and in her subsequent report.** The court is
8 appointing Mr. Mendonca as Mr. Keller's conservator; appointing Ms. Wolff as conservator for
9 Ms. Keller would require either that Mr. Mendonca and Ms. Wolff work together to support Ms.
10 Keller and Mr. Keller as a married couple, or require Ms. Keller and Mr. Keller to live apart and
11 go their separate ways. *Actually, this would have forced Royce to finally talk to Sharon and work
together which Sharon had been asking for since first tracking him down.*

12 Mr. Mendonca and Ms. Wolff are unable to work together. During the hearing, and as
13 reflected in the papers submitted by the parties, it is apparent that each petitioner undermines the
14 other, trades insults, and withholds key information from each other. Appointing Mr. Mendonca
15 for Mr. Keller and Ms. Wolff for Ms. Keller would likely result in more contentious interactions,
16 high stress for the conservatees, and extensive litigation over instructions, orders, accountings
17 and the like. *See the transcript excerpts added below from the July 29, 2021 initial hearing - Sharon has been asking for
help from the Mendonca's since the beginning but they have steadfastly refused throughout.*

18 **Ms. Keller, as did Mr. Keller, signed a written document nominating Mr. Mendonca to be**
19 **her conservator.** A proposed conservatee may nominate a conservator, either in the petition for
20 *That nomination document is evidence of elder financial fraud - which the court ignored entirely*
appointment or in a writing signed by the proposed conservatee at a time when she had sufficient
21 capacity to form an intelligent preference. Prob. C. §1810. The court must appoint the
22 nominee unless it finds that the appointment is not in the best interests of the proposed
23 conservatee. *Recall that the GC-335 Capacity Declaration for Barbara (the legitimate one) was filed with the court on
August 17, 2021 and it has been ignored by this court ever since.*

24 **Though Ms. Keller may have been influenced by Mr. Keller and by Mr. Keller's sister**
25 **when making the nomination of Mr. Mendonca, there was insufficient evidence that any such**

*I am still struggling to figure this one out - there may have been influence on the Alzheimer's patient
but it wasn't necessarily undue? Except it was in direct opposition to all of Barbara's documented
intentions and wishes to date - textbook elder financial fraud undue influence.*

Ruling on Conservatorship

1 influence was undue. Though Ms. Keller is clearly suffering from memory loss and some
2 diminished capacity, it appears to the court that Ms. Keller had sufficient capacity to form an
3 intelligent preference at the time she signed the nomination. At the hearing, Ms. Keller also
4 clearly and unequivocally testified that she preferred the appointment of Mr. Mendonca over the
5 appointment of Ms. Wolff. Ms. Keller also told the probate investigator that she preferred Mr.
6 Mendonca be appointed conservator. **Barbara's medical providers signed a GC-335 & GC-335A
Capacity Declaration months prior and it has been on file with
the court ever since.**
7 The court finds that Ms. Keller had sufficient capacity to form an intelligent preference
8 for a conservator at the time she nominated Mr. Mendonca.

9 The court further finds that Mr. Mendonca's appointment is in Ms. Keller's best interest.
10 According to Alma Barber, a social worker with Adult Protective Services, prior to the
11 involvement of Mr. Keller's sister and Mr. Mendonca, when Mr. Keller and Ms. Keller were
12 living close to Ms. Wolff and her family, they stopped accepting assistance from Ms. Wolff and
13 began trying to sell their house and leave the area. When visited by Ms. Barber, the Kellers had
14 no food in their house, and Ms. Keller had lost 10 pounds. Ms. Barber testified that Mr. Keller
15 looked disheveled and was crying frequently. Ms. Barber concluded that both were
16 decompensating rapidly. **Ron's sister only became involved because Sharon searched for her and sought out her help for
her brother - Diane refuses to speak to Sharon and believes the delusions that Sharon was
breaking into the Keller home to watch them sleep, bragging about it and poisoning their food.**

17 In contrast, after Mr. Keller's sister and Mr. Mendonca became involved, both Mr. and
18 Ms. Keller were placed in an assisted living facility where they both are receiving medical care,
19 **They were placed by the previously unknown nephew of Barbara's 5th husband without any legal authority to do so**
eating well, live in a safe environment, and are generally being well-cared for. At the hearing on
20 the petitions, the court was able to observe the Kellers as they testified via Zoom, and they both
21 appeared to be doing well in the assisted living facility. **Legal authority for placing vulnerable elders into a
locked memory care unit is apparently not a concern
in Humboldt County**

22 In addition, and as recommended by the probate investigator, Mr. Mendonca is
23 committed to Mr. and Ms. Keller living together, as long as their medical condition allows it and
24 as long as there are no concerns regarding physical safety. **In contrast, Ms. Wolff did not appear**
25 **to be strongly in favor of the Kellers living together, at least not initially.**

**See the transcript excerpts added below from the July 29, 2021 initial hearing - Sharon found a safe placement nearby
for both of the Keller's. But again, the court ignored everything presented to it by Sharon as an In Pro Per**

Read the Amended Court Investigators Report posted online to see what was actually said and what was recommended

1 It is also clear from testimony as well as the investigator's reports that Ms. Keller (and
2 Mr. Keller) are willing to listen to and cooperate with Mr. Mendonca, whereas neither proposed
3 conservatee seemed willing or able to do so with Ms. Wolff. Ms. Keller not only expressed a
4 strong preference for the appointment of Mr. Mendonca -- which she has consistently asserted
5 since the first investigator's report -- but she also strongly expressed her opposition to Ms.
6 Wolff being appointed. Barbara told the court investigator in July that she did NOT want Royce as
her conservator because she didn't know him. The court investigators report
is very clear and the Judge simply ignored it for whatever reason.

7 The court gives no weight to Mr. Mendonca's assertions that Ms. Wolff is not qualified
8 to serve as a conservator of the estate because of her prior bankruptcy or current financial
9 situation. Those factors do not support a conclusion that Ms. Wolff would embezzle or misuse
10 the conservatees' financial assets. This is literally the only line in writing from this court regarding
the serious allegations of elder fraud and the submitted
documentation. The court simply ignored the glaringly obvious.
11 Similarly, the court does not give any weight to Ms. Wolff's assertions that Mr.

12 Mendonca was falsifying documents or otherwise not qualified to serve as conservator.
In Humboldt County, glaringly obvious fraudulent documentation is given the same consideration as legal paperwork...

13 Considering the vitriolic accusations made against each other, Ms. Wolff and Mr.
14 Mendonca are not able to cooperate with each other in making decisions regarding care and
15 support for Ms. Keller and her husband. Instead, it is likely that each conservator would make
16 decisions inconsistent with the other's decision, which in turn would not be in the best interests
17 of the married couple. A likely outcome of having two different conservators is that Mr. Keller
18 and Ms. Keller may be split up. As the investigator noted, splitting Mr. Keller and Ms. Keller
19 up may cause their respective conditions to deteriorate more rapidly.

20 The court further concludes that having a different conservator for Mr. Keller and for Ms.
21 Keller would not be in the conservatees' best interests, but would likely be disastrous.

22 For the foregoing reasons, the court finds that the appointment of Royce Mendonca as
23 conservator for Ms. Keller's person and estate is in the best interests of Ms. Keller. The court
24 grants Mr. Mendonca's petition for appointment, and appoints Mr. Mendonca as conservator for
25 Ms. Keller's person and estate. Except as expressly granted herein, all other requests for relief in
This is the exact opposite of what the court investigator has stated - twice now. Don't forget, Barbara
told the court investigator that she did NOT want Royce as her conservator because she didn't know
him. The Humboldt County Superior Court simply didn't care.
Ruling on Conservatorship

1 this case have been considered and are denied.

2 For the foregoing reasons,

3 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

4 1. Sharon Wolff's petition for appointment as conservator is denied;

5 2. Royce Mendonca's petition for appointment as conservator of the person and estate of
6 Ms. Keller is granted, and letters shall issue; and

7 3. The court will set dates for review and accounting, and will notify the parties of those
8 dates.

9

TIMOTHY A. CANNING

10 Dated: December 10, 2021

Timothy A. Canning
Judge of the Superior Court

11

12 Notice the signature date of December 10, 2021 and the Filed stamp date above of December 13, 2021

13 Attorney Hamer was obviously advised of this order being signed - but not yet filed - when she
14 submitted her GC-340 Order Appointing Probate Conservator that same day (already posted online),
15 as evidenced by the Register of Actions. Petitioner Sharon Wolff received this order in the mail -
16 postmarked December 14, 2021 and received on Thursday December 16, 2021.

17 Sharon then filed a DE-154 Request for Special Notice on December 20, 2021 after having served it
18 on Attorney Hamer and the previously unknown nephew of Barbara's 5th husband. This REQUIRES
19 them to send Sharon a copy of everything they file in this case within 15 days of filing - and notices of
20 hearings no later than 15 days prior to any hearing.

21 Attorney Hamer has continued to disregard the law without fear of scrutiny or reprisal from the
22 Humboldt County Superior Court and has not provided the required notices. Sharon has retrieved
23 copies of the GC-350 Letters of Conservatorship filed by Attorney Hamer on January 13, 2022 from
24 the court clerk during her inspection of the case file. Over fifteen (15) days have expired and no copy
25 has been received by Sharon Wolff.

There is no reason to think these kinds of deceptive tactics and blatant refusal to follow the law by
Attorney Hamer and the previously unknown nephew of Barbara's 5th husband won't continue
unless and until the Humboldt County Superior Court decides to stand up for vulnerable elders for a
change.

Read the 7.29.21 Initial Hearing Transcripts below...

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, a resident of the County of Humboldt, State of California, and not a party to the within action; that my business address is Humboldt County Courthouse, 825 5th St., Eureka, California, 95501; that I served a true copy of the attached RULING AND ORDER APPOINTING CONSERVATOR by placing said copies in the attorney's mail delivery box in the Court Operations Office at Eureka, California on the date indicated below, or by placing said copies in envelope(s) and then placing the envelope(s) for collection and mailing on the date indicated below following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business 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 at Eureka, California in a sealed envelope with postage prepaid. These copies were addressed to:

Sharon Wolff, 3 Painter St., Rio Dell, CA 95562

Alex Grotewohl, County Counsel, Court Operations Box #39

Chris Hamer, Court Operations Box #4

Yet Attorney Hamer knew about the signed order on 12/10/21 - before it was Filed with the court - as evidenced by her GC-340 Order Appointing Conservator which she filed later that same day

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on the 13th day of December 2021, at the City of Eureka, California.

Kim M. Bartleson, Clerk of the Court

By Audrey D.
Deputy Clerk

7.29.21 Initial Hearing Transcript below...

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
DEPARTMENT 6

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN T. FEENEY, JUDGE

IN RE THE MATTERS OF:

SHARON WOLFF,

Petitioner,

and

Case Nos. PR2100161
PR2100162

RONALD KELLER and BARBARA KELLER,

Conservatees.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (via Zoom)

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 2021, 2:22 P.M.

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner:

SHARON WOLFF
IN PROPRIA PERSONA

Also Present: ALMA BARBA

Both Proposed Conservatees and Diana Mendonca were also present via Zoom but Diana did not inform the court they were there - she filed a declaration after the fact.

Reported By:

SHERYL A. BROWN, CSR No. 3908

PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE COURT: We have two related cases to call next, and they are in sequence on the calendar, the matter of Ronald Keller, PR2100161, also the matter of Barbara Keller, PR2100162.

Do we have Ms. Sharon Wolff with us today?

MS. WOLFF: Yes, Your Honor, I'm here.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon.

MS. WOLFF: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: And let me get the files here. Now I have them. And we do have separate Petitions for appointment of a conservator.

And let's see. Ms. Wolff, I think we'll need probably just a brief continuance, as some of the documents are not in proper form or otherwise have not been provided to the Court. More specifically, the order, itself, is blank, and we'll need you to submit orders, one for each file that has the necessary information. Again, that's the order appointing probate conservator. And the letters of conservatorship, we'll need to have the letters of conservatorship signed.
And --

MS. WOLFF: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead, please.

MS. WOLFF: Your Honor, I understand -- if there's anything that is missing, I am more than happy to submit anything that the Court needs.

1 I would hope to have a chance to speak to the --
2 to yourself and to the Court prior to any continuance,
3 because there have been some very drastic changes in this
4 case since I filed the Petition on June 21st.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's see.

6 MS. WOLFF: May I make --

7 THE COURT: Ms. Wolff --

8 MS. WOLFF: -- at some point make -- I would
9 hope to be able to advise the Court of what the changes
10 are.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Wolff, have you consulted
12 with an attorney as of yet? See answer below - plus no attorneys
available for initial consult due to COVID

13 MS. WOLFF: No. I have consulted on the
14 paperwork with Arthur Nielsen locally. None of the
15 attorneys' offices are willing to represent a case where
16 an APS investigation is currently ongoing. I don't know
17 if that's because of the big turmoil over the previous
18 APS case and the two county counsel members possibly
19 losing their law license, but it is an obstacle we face.
20 So as long as APS had their investigation going,
21 attorneys did not want to represent us.

22 But Arthur Nielsen was a fantastic advocate,
23 helped me look over this paperwork before it was
24 submitted. So, if anything is missing, again, I will fix
25 anything that is in there, but that is why we are in pro
26 per. And that is where we are.

27 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

28 And, Ms. Wolff, I -- in just preparing to call

1 the cases, I did sense there may be some sort of urgency.
2 And --

3 MS. WOLFF: Yes.

4 THE COURT: -- I thought -- I cannot give legal
5 advice, but perhaps consideration should be given to
6 filing for -- for a temporary conservatorship, just to,
7 perhaps, move things along a little bit quicker.

8 MS. WOLFF: Yes. Yes. And that's -- that's
9 part of the change that has happened since June 21st. We
10 now have a Capacity Declaration, a GC-335, for
11 Barbara Keller, my mom, that we did not have. I just
12 received a copy of that yesterday.

13 Although Ron Keller was advised that this was
14 being submitted by the doctor back when he and my mom met
15 with Danielle Cole on the 19th of this month -- he was
16 aware of that -- they -- he then contacted -- I believe
17 he contacted his sister Diane and nephew Royce and had
18 those assist them in fleeing the county. They are no
19 longer in Humboldt County jurisdiction.

20 They are down in Citrus Heights, as far as I
21 know, because Diane has refused to speak with Barbara's
22 family and tell us anything that is going on. She
23 believes every word that Mom is telling her. And we are
24 stuck. They are down in Citrus Heights, as far as I
25 know, with Diane. And I don't know the situation that is
26 going on down there, because, like I said, they have left
27 the area. They're not communicating to us. And I am
28 extremely worried about that, based on the information

1 from the court investigator's report, I think that's
2 absolutely chilling. The situation inside their home is
3 much worse than I had anticipated, even.

4 The suicidal threats that Ron continues to make,
5 and then he made suicidal threats on behalf of my mom,
6 which she never, ever, ever -- suicide wouldn't -- I
7 mean, it would interfere with lunch. Mom would not
8 commit suicide. He is making suicidal threats on her
9 behalf. And his last line to this court investigator was
10 that he would use pills and off them both.

11 So I am very concerned. Ron's family doesn't
12 believe any of this, according to their statements to the
13 court investigator. So they are not going to protect my
14 mom, because they don't believe there is a problem. And
15 I am very scared for my mom.

16 THE COURT: I see. Recall that Ron's sister Diane is
17 listening to this hearing along with
18 Barbara and Ron. She still believes Ron's
19 delusions over reality.

20 And you did mention APS. Is there an ongoing
21 investigation?

22 MS. WOLFF: Yes.

23 THE COURT: There is?

24 MS. WOLFF: There is. Alma Barba is in
25 attendance here. I see her on Zoom. Although she will
26 likely have to close her case, because they have fled the
27 jurisdiction.

28 THE COURT: Hmm. Okay. Okay. Well, without
the proper documentation, I'm not able to provide -- do
any orders at this time. But I would suggest -- so
you've already been in contact with APS, the Adult

I believe the judge could have assigned counsel for both proposed conservatees at this point but no orders were issued and counsel was never assigned despite their request for representation and their civil rights. Three different judges heard this case along the way - none of them assigned counsel.

1 Protective Services. You may -- again, I cannot give
2 legal advice.

3 MS. WOLFF: Yes.

4 THE COURT: But you may want to consider
5 contacting --

6 MS. WOLFF: Of course.

7 THE COURT: -- contacting the Sheriff's
8 Department, given -- given your concerns.

9 And, again, I think you might want to consider
10 possibly filing for a temporary conservatorship with both
11 your mother and --

12 MS. WOLFF: Yeah. I --

13 THE COURT: -- and father-in-law.

14 MS. WOLFF: I am filing for conservatorship of
15 Barbara Keller, the person, as soon as humanly possible.
16 As soon as I get a copy of the original GC-335, so that I
17 can file it with the Court papers, I intend to file an
18 Amended Petition for the conservatorship of my mom's
19 person, also for the estate.

20 And I strongly encourage Ron's family to step up
21 and take conservatorship of Ron's person. I am -- I am
22 really happy to work with them in any way, shape, or form
23 to protect these people. Ron's paranoia, however, has
24 made it very, very dangerous.

25 We have located housing at Sequoia Springs in
26 Fortuna, a very fine place --

27 THE COURT: Okay.

28 MS. WOLFF: -- for the both of them. They have

1 it available right now. And I -- in my opinion, that's
2 the best of -- of that option.

3 But if we could work with Ron's family for the
4 first -- we've been asking them for months to help us.
5 If -- if they are finally willing to admit that there is
6 an issue that requires family support and we can work
7 together to make sure they are safe, that's great.

8 But in the meantime, I need to have the
9 conservatorship of the estate. And I will be filing for
10 the person, because what they are going to try to do is
11 the same thing that they did in 2017 and destroy their
12 finances as best as possible because they're not thinking
13 clearly. And every last nickel of the inheritance that
14 they have set aside is going to be needed for long-term
15 care for both Ron and Mom, every penny of it.

16 So I do want to make clear there is a living
17 trust in place. There's a full copy of it in the
18 documentation. The living trust that Ron and Barbara
19 filled out names my brother Tim Jenkins and myself off of
20 the will that they had filled out back in 2003, named
21 both my brother and I on this as executors because we've
22 always been the trusted family members.

23 With the incapacity declaration that I now have
24 for my mom, we are immediately invoking the capacity
25 conditions of that trust. Mom can -- has no legal
26 capacity to sign any documents, to sign anything, for
27 selling their house out at a fire sale price and getting
28 rid of everything, like they did in 2017, or anything

1 else.

2 So I am doing that immediately. And then I will
3 be following up with whatever paperwork this Court needs.
4 I will do anything it takes to protect my mom.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm sorry for all these
6 occurrences. But as far as what we would need for the
7 court files in these cases, we need a completed order.
8 Also, the proposed letters of conservatorship would need
9 to be completed, and also --

10 MS. WOLFF: The forms were submitted, and I --
11 I'm sorry, Your Honor. I understand you're not able to
12 give legal advice. The forms were submitted to the
13 Court. You need to have the forms filled out, the boxes
14 on there. I need to choose the orders that the -- that
15 I'm asking the Court to do. Is that correct?

16 THE COURT: That's what --

17 MS. WOLFF: I just want to make sure I'm clear.

18 THE COURT: Exactly, Ms. Wolff, yes.

19 MS. WOLFF: Okay.

20 THE COURT: And also --

21 MS. WOLFF: Okay.

22 THE COURT: Also --

23 MS. WOLFF: I will do that, and I can have it to
24 you by today.

25 THE COURT: Well, also, we did not see what's
26 referred to as a citation. The citation advises the
27 proposed conservatee, your mother and stepfather, of
28 their rights and their ability to appear before the

Barbara and Ronald Keller were both present (on Zoom) with Diana Mendonca but only Diane was visible on camera and she never informed the court that they were there. Diana filed a declaration after the fact - found in the file by Sharon - confirming they were there.

1 Court. I -- I did not see the --

2 MS. WOLFF: Right.

3 THE COURT: -- citation, either. So we --

4 MS. WOLFF: That was what -- I -- I believe that
5 was what was personally served on -- on the two of them.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Well --

7 MS. WOLFF: The citation with a copy of the
8 Petition.

9 THE COURT: If that was, that's great. I just
10 did not see a return to the court file of the -- of the
11 citation. But it sounds like you may have already done
12 that.

13 MS. WOLFF: I -- well, North Coast Legal
14 Services did the service of the papers, so I will make
15 sure that that has been submitted and completed. They
16 had a heck of a time serving the papers, but they were
17 able to serve them in person with -- with the citation or
18 whatever else was attached to it that they needed.

19 THE COURT: If you know, did the service
20 occur -- it really doesn't matter if it occurred in
21 Humboldt County or out -- it doesn't --

22 MS. WOLFF: It did. It occurred in Humboldt.
23 And Alma Barba was actually a witness to them being
24 served. She assisted, because they refused to answer
25 their door, for whatever reason. Alma Barba actually
26 assisted the service of the papers, to make sure that
27 they got them, to make absolutely sure they were advised
28 of their rights and everything is being done legally,

1 above board, anything that we can do.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 Well, Ms. Wolff, normally I would say we should
4 probably put this over for two or three weeks, but given
5 the urgency of everything described for me, I think we
6 should probably put this over to next Thursday. And
7 we'll see what the status is. Okay? No orders were issued from this
court until Dec. 10, 2021

8 MS. WOLFF: Okay. I will submit the order
9 appointing conservator and the letters requested. I'll
10 resubmit those completed. I'll double-check on the
11 North Coast Legal Services to make sure that you have the
12 notice that they were served correctly.

13 Is there anything else that you need?

14 THE COURT: And we did discuss the citation, as
15 well, yes, but --

16 MS. WOLFF: The citation that goes with the
17 Proof of Service.

18 THE COURT: Yes. Yes.

19 MS. WOLFF: Okay.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's --

21 MS. WOLFF: Is there -- is there anything else?

22 THE COURT: I think that should suffice.

23 So we'll place both these matters back on
24 calendar a week from today, please, the clerk of the
25 Court.

26 THE CLERK: August 5th at 2:15.

27 MS. WOLFF: August 5th, 2:15. I will be here.

28 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Wolff, thank you. Take

1 care.

2 MS. WOLFF: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: You bet. Bye.

4 (The proceedings were concluded at 2:35 p.m.)

5

6

---o0o---

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

IN RE THE MATTERS OF:

SHARON WOLFF,

Petitioner,

and

Case Nos. PR2100161
PR2100162

RONALD KELLER and BARBARA KELLER,

Conservatees.

_____ /

I, SHERYL A. BROWN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in the State of California, do hereby certify:

That on July 29, 2021, in the County of Humboldt, State of California, I took in stenotype a true and correct record of the proceedings had in the above-entitled case, Pages 1 to 12, and that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes, taken as aforesaid, and is the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of January, 2022.

Sheryl A. Brown

SHERYL A. BROWN

CSR No. 3908