John N. Vega SBN 86662
Law Office of John N. Vega
306 West Second Street, Suite 300
San Bernardino, CA 92401
Telephone: (909) 889-0485
Facsimile: (909) 384-0952
E-mail: vegalaw00@yahoo.com

Attorney for Respondent, **Rebecca Lohman**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

OLD HISTORIC COURTHOUSE

In re the Matter of: **REBECCA S. LOHMAN** Petitioner, vs. **COREY C. LOHMAN** Respondent.	)	Case Number: **FAMSB-2207189** **SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF REBECCA LOHMAN**

I, Rebecca Lohman, declare that I am the Petitioner in this matter. If called upon to testify as to the facts set forth in this declaration, I could competently testify to them of my own personal knowledge except as to those facts stated upon information and belief and as to those facts I believe them to be true.

If required by the Court to offer my declaration in lieu of personal testimony, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §2209 and 2015.5, California Rules of Court, *Reifler v. Superior Court*, (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d 479, and *In Re Marriage of Stevenot*, (1984)154 Cal.App.3d 1051. I submit the following declaration:

This Court signed the order appointing the 730 evaluator Dr. Janice Moody on March 6, 2024. I have advanced the cost of the 730 evaluation. My attorney and Respondent have been in communication with Dr. Moody's office regarding the evaluation and we have begun the process of completing the initial paperwork.

Our daughter Addison continues to have weekly therapy sessions with Ms. Claudia Moon Perez. I have informed Ms. Moon Perez that if she believes Addison needs more frequent therapy sessions to inform and I will provide for the additional cost.

Since March 5, 2024, I have requested that Respondent return Addison's flute to the music store that I rent it from in order to avoid Respondent and myself having to meet in person for our daughter to get the flute she needs for her weekly band class. I make the monthly payment for her instrument. Respondent has refused to do this instead, has insisted on keeping the flute at his home, has suggested taking it to her school or requesting that I meet him or his girlfriend somewhere to get the flute. I had to rent another flute on March 6, 2024, in order for Addison to have what she needs for band and her talent show performance. Currently, I am paying both monthly payments for the flutes. I have explained to Respondent that I do not feel comfortable after everything that has happened meeting him or his fiancée in person to obtain the flute which is why I was simply asking that he take it to the music store to have it returned. I am concerned about Respondent's motives for wanting to meet me or for me to meet his fiancée in person.

On March 28, 2024, Respondent's fiancée, Jamie Gauger, text messaged me regarding Respondent's parents sending a gift for Addison for Easter and asking where we could meet so that Addison could get it. I responded that Respondent could bring it to the March 29, 2024 hearing. While both Ms. Gauger and Respondent were present at that court hearing that day, they chose not to bring the gift for Addison.

On March 31, 2024, someone rang the doorbell to my home. I looked to see who it was and Ms. Gauger was outside of my home. Addison was home with me, as it was Easter Sunday. I chose not to answer the door because I was concerned of how this would affect Addison's emotional progress and why Ms. Gauger would come to my home uninvited and unannounced. I have never given her my home address or asked her to come to my home. I have made it very clear to both the Respondent and Ms. Gauger that I do not wish to meet with them right now. I can only assume the Respondent provided her with my home address knowing that I did not want to have interactions with either of them. Ms. Gauger rang the doorbell again and eventually left. This was extremely concerning as I did not know if Respondent had driven her or was in the car outside my home. Ms. Gauger did leave an Easter basket for Addison that I assume was from Addison's paternal grandparents.

On April 9, 2024, I was notified by Addison's school that Respondent had called them at least twice that morning and had requested information regarding Addison's after school program. On that same day, Respondent messaged me on Talking parents indicating that the principal of the school, Ms. Castorena, (referred to by Respondent as "Ms. C") had made it clear he was not welcome on campus. Respondent also insisted that Addison does not trust her school principal.

Due to Respondent's harassment and false allegations, Joseph Barrell and myself decided to end our romantic relationship for the time being, so that I can focus on what is best for Addison, as well as to stop Respondent from making additional false allegations against Mr. Barrell and myself. We believe it is torturous to Addison that her father has continually questioned her about whether she "feels safe" around Mr. Barrell in an attempt to destroy their healthy, loving, and secure relationship with the only purpose of hurting me.

It is unfortunate that Respondent's efforts to cause turmoil in my romantic relationship with Mr. Barrell have been successful. Mr. Barrell and myself just want to do what is best for Addison.

On April 11, 2024, San Bernardino County Civil Court granted Joseph Barrell's request for a Civil Harassment Restraining Order against Respondent. Due to Respondent's agitated behavior towards the end of the court proceeding, court security requested that I wait in the court conference room to allow Respondent to leave first without him walking by where I was sitting. Additionally, Court security requested that the Sheriff's Department accompany myself, Mr. Barrell and Mr. Vega upon leaving the Courthouse.

On April 12, 2024, Addison was performing in her school's talent show in the evening at 6:00 p.m. Prior to the show beginning, I noticed that Ms. Gauger and her 8-year-old son had sat down behind me. I immediately went over to where the performers were waiting to ensure that Addison did not see her as I am very concerned about what Addison's emotional reaction or state would be. I did notice that Ms. Gauger brought Addison's flute but did not attempt to give it to me or any school staff. Upon ensuring that Addison was okay and had not seen Ms. Gauger, I located the principal to inform her of the situation. At that time, my concern was that Ms. Gauger would use this as an opportunity to say something inappropriate to Addison or facilitate contact via phone with Respondent and Addison. The principal informed me that Ms. Gauger had called the school that week requesting information about the talent show. The school advised Ms. Gauger that it was not a public event and the school set "boundaries" with her. It was my impression that Ms. Gauger had been specifically told not to come to the event that evening. I saw Ms. Gauger and her son being asked to step outside by school personnel.

Approximately half way through the performance, the school's assistant principal requested that I speak with him. He informed me that Respondent was actually present on campus, that law enforcement had been called and had arrested him. Deputy Ramirez of Loma Linda Police Department came to speak with me. I advised him of this court's current order suspending his visitation and granting me temporary sole legal and physical custody. I advised him that my mother was also present and had a restraining order against Respondent as well. I explained that there would be no legitimate or legal reason for Respondent to be present at our daughter's school that evening, except to attempt to violate court orders. I was provided with the following police report number, 152400646.

I am gravely disturbed by Respondent and his fiancée's actions this last Friday. Both of them knew that they were not to come to Addison's school, but chose to do so anyway. Additionally, they brought another young child along with them who was exposed to this situation. I am most concerned about the motivations behind what occurred, considering that Ms. Gauger chose to come, bring Addison's flute but Respondent waited outside the multipurpose room. At the very least, it is clear that Respondent came to either violate this Court's suspension of visitation order and/or to intimidate me. However, given the fact that Respondent chose to keep our daughter for over three days in violation of the custody order, not even taking her to school, I can only question whether there was a more sinister motive or plan to lure Addison with Ms. Gauger and her son and leave the campus with her father.

Respondent acknowledges that he was at the school and has messaged me on Talking Parents the following, ***..."my order with you is a no-negative order. That's why we legally can be by each other. Gym. School events. Pick up and drop off at Starbucks etc. ...."*** The nature of Respondent's message concerns me that he will continue to show up at school events and extracurricular activities in order

to intimidate me, violate this court's suspension of visits order or physically take Addison. There is no reason he needs to write this on Talking Parents other than to try and intimidate me that he is going to keep showing up at these places and there is nothing I can do to stop him.

Respondent continues to call me regularly and request updates on Addison's wellbeing. I have updated him on how she is doing. However, after being released from custody, Respondent posted on Facebook the following ***"I was graciously asked to go to jail last night. But knowing my little girl is safe. I would graciously go again.... #daddysgirl4life #1134 #dontfuckwithmygirl"*** **(Exhibit A).** This post concerns me that Respondent does not see how his behavior and presence at the school was an attempt to violate this court's orders. Respondent believes his arrest shows that he is protecting his daughter, but I cannot imagine the emotional toll it would have taken on Addison had she seen Ms. Gauger or her father, knowing that right now she does not have visitation with him. Additionally, Respondent does not even take into consideration the emotional trauma had our daughter witnessed him being arrested. I am highly concerned about how things have escalated and my personal fear that Respondent may, given his irrational state, to kidnap our daughter.

Respondent continues to make this situation about himself and not about Addison's best interest. I, along with the school personnel, have done everything possible to protect her from knowing that this happened to protect her for the emotional toll it would cause. However, Mr. Lohman seems obsessed with projecting himself as a martyr, rather than protecting Addison, and simply following the rules and court's orders.

Since the last court hearing, Addison has returned to school from a two-week spring break. Since I was off work for almost all of her spring break, I was concerned if it would be difficult for Addison to transition back to school. However, Addison

transitioned back to her regular schedule with no anxiety in the mornings or issues generally. Prior to the Court issuing the suspension of visitation order, Addison had an extremely difficult time after spending the weekend home leaving to go to school. She had multiple episodes of not wanting to leave the car and crying in the morning before going to school. This also not occurred since the Court issued the suspension of visitation order.

Addison continues to thrive in her stability, she appears happier and more well-adjusted than she has been in months. She is back to being excited to go to school each morning, always with something she is looking forward to. Even when something happens that upsets her, like her feelings get hurt, she is able to regulate her emotions timely and express how she is feeling to me. The past several months prior to this suspension of visits, she would have frequent emotional "meltdowns" and not be capable of expressing what she was feeling and/or why and it would take a significant period of time for her to calm down.

Mr. Lohman continues to call my phone multiple times on some days. On Easter, Addison saw my phone ringing with the Talking Parents number which upset her and she became withdrawn. We were able to talk about it. She expressed how she missed her animals at her dad's home and him. I validated her feelings and expressed understanding why she feels this way. She was able to appropriately express her emotions and then adjust to playing with her toys and moved on. Addison talks about things from time to time that involve her dad and she does not become depressed or sad and I believe she had adjusted well to the fact that for right now she is not seeing him. She appears much more care-free and happy. She has returned to a polite, playful child at home. Her suspicion of her best friend, mentioned in the FCS report, has completely subsided and once again they are best friends.

She does ask about Joe Barrell, requesting to speak with him or text him. She says she is no longer uncomfortable with him and just "got over it". I tell her right now I just want to focus on her and making sure she feels safe and secure. Additionally, spontaneously Addison has expressed feeling happy that she has her school counselor to confide in. This is another person that Addison told the FCS mediator that she did not "trust" in December. Addison's trust of the world is starting to open up again.

I am asking this court to continue the suspension of visitation order pending a trial because I believe that Addison's best interest is that she remain in an emotional stable place where she is not subject to the irrational and disruptive decisions of her father. My concern with even the Court implementing a supervised visitation order with a professional monitor is that Respondent has shown that he is unable or unwilling to follow the rules set forth by the law and courts.

He could say anything in a supervised visit, like ***"your mom and your school had me arrested"*** or ***"your grandmother is trying to send me to jail"***, that would be emotionally devastating for his daughter to hear and while the visitation would be ended by the monitor if they heard what he stated, the emotional damage to Addison will have already occurred and could not be undone. Given Mr. Lohman's pattern of behavior demonstrating that he is unwilling or unable to comply with rules, the lack of insight to what is protective parental behavior, and what is emotionally damaging, I do not believe there is a way to guarantee Addison's emotional or physical safety, even in a supervised visitation setting. I am asking that the Court not give him another opportunity to be emotionally abusive to Addison. I believe that he needs some serious therapeutic interventions to address his choices and that this court needs the information from psychological testing in order to determine what sort of visitation he should have or what sort of services he needs to engage in prior to having supervised visitation with Addison.

When we look at what has occurred this past year, Mr. Lohman has violated the no discussion order, brags about doing so, has also discussed the 730 evaluation with Addison, has continually tried to involve Addison in the dispute he has with me, has kept in her in violation of court orders for an extended period of time. He has violated my restraining order, along with my parents'. He is facing criminal charges due to his violations; another restraining order was imposed against him and was arrested last week while being on Addison's school campus with no legal or legitimate reason to be there other than to violate this court's orders regarding his visitation.

I believe if something were to happen to Addison, even at a supervised visit, we would look back on everything that has happened this last year and see how all the red flags were present that this is going in the wrong direction for Addison's safety and wellbeing. I am desperately trying to avoid Addison being further traumatized. I am terrified that things are only going to get worse for myself and Addison, unless the current order remains in effect and Court establish more restrictive orders protecting us.

Addison is finally in a good place and opening up about her feelings. I believe that reintroducing visitation with her father at this point is not in her best interest, especially as he continues to display erratic, unpredictable, and unlawful behavior. In fact, I believe his behavior is still escalating and I am significantly concerned about Addison and my own physical safety, not just emotional safety. I know that it will take time in therapy to unpack what occurred while Addison was in her father's care, but I believe reintroducing him in will only delay that progress or enable it from occurring at all.

I am asking this court to make specific orders to keep the suspension of visitation order in effect, modify my current restraining to temporarily be a no contact order with no exceptions, as well as a 100 stay away order, pending a trial. Additionally, I am asking for an order that Respondent and Ms. Gauger not be allowed to be present at

Addison's school, Mission Elementary School, attend any of Addison's school or extracurricular activities, or have contact with Addison. I believe unless this Court makes specific orders protecting Addison, as well as myself, Respondent will continue to do everything, including using third parties to try to violate the suspension of visitation orders or worse, flee with Addison.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge under the laws of the State of California.

Date: 4/17/2024

RSL
ID hNSWg7xJ1LPzmtVYpBg14dQo

FAXED/ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE PER CRC SECTION 2.305(
SIGNATURE DEEMED OR

Rebecca Lohman, Declarant

EXHIBIT A



Corey Lohman

9m ·

I was graciously asked to go to jail last night. But knowing my little girl is safe. I would graciously go again.....
#daddysgirl4life #1134
#dontfuckwithmygirl

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY: STATE BAR NO:
NAME: John N. Vega SBN 86662
FIRM NAME: Law Office of John N. Vega
STREET ADDRESS: 306 West Second Street, Suite 300
CITY: San Bernardino STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 92401
TELEPHONE NO.: (909) 889-0485 FAX NO.: (909) 384-0952
E-MAIL ADDRESS: vegalaw00@yahoo.com
ATTORNEY FOR (name): Rebecca Lohman

FOR COURT USE ONLY

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Bernardino County
STREET ADDRESS: 351 North Arrowhead Avenue
MAILING ADDRESS:
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Bernardino, CA 92415
BRANCH NAME: Old Historic Courthouse

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Rebecca S. Lohman

DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Corey C. Lohman

CASE NUMBER: FAMSB-2207189

JUDICIAL OFFICER:

DEPARTMENT: S-43

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

1. I am at least 18 years old.
   a. My residence or business address is *(specify):*
      306 West Second Street, Suite 300
      San Bernardino, CA 92401
   b. My electronic service address is *(specify):*
      rosalindamedel@yahoo.com
2. I electronically served the following documents *(exact titles):*
   Supplemental Declaration of Rebecca Lohman.
   ☐ The documents served are listed in an attachment. *(Form POS-050(D)/EFS-050(D) may be used for this purpose.)*
3. I electronically served the documents listed in 2 as follows:
   a. Name of person served: **Corey C. Lohman**
      On behalf of *(name or names of parties represented, if person served is an attorney):*
      In Pro per
   b. Electronic service address of person served: **coreyclohman@gmail.com**
   c. On *(date):* **April 17, 2024**
   ☐ The documents listed in item 2 were served electronically on the persons and in the manner described in an attachment. *(Form POS-050(P)/EFS-050(P) may be used for this purpose.)*

Date: **April 17, 2024**

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

Rosalinda Medel
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

Form Approved for Optional Use
Judicial Council of California
POS-050/EFS-050 [Rev. February 1, 2017]
CEB Essential Forms ceb.com

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
(Proof of Service/Electronic Filing and Service)

Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.251
www.courts.ca.gov