

Neslihan [REDACTED] v. John [REDACTED]

Critical Issues

1. Verification required — Medical exhibit may expose sensitive information in the public court file

Form/page: CH-100 attachment, Exhibit 1, medical-record pages 1–3 (packet pages 9–11)

Issue: The attached urgent-care record displays the protected person’s full date of birth, patient identification number, detailed medical history, vital signs, diagnosis, prescription information, and pharmacy information. The packet does not identify a public-redacted version or a conditionally sealed version.

Why it matters: If filed publicly as-is, the exhibit would place extensive personal and medical information in the public case record. A sealing request cannot be replaced by simply marking the exhibit confidential.

Fix: Attorney/filer should verify the minimum medical material needed and the intended disposition. Remove unnecessary identifiers and unrelated medical details from the public exhibit. If sealing is sought, prepare the required public-redacted and conditionally sealed versions and follow the motion/application and lodging procedure; do not file the unredacted exhibit publicly without confirming the permitted treatment.

Authority/verification: California Rules of Court, rules 2.550–2.551 require a court order to seal records and specify the redacted-version and conditional-lodging procedure. [Official rule 2.551](#)

High-Priority Issues

2. Confirmed defect — Party’s full name is inconsistent across the packet

Form/page: CH-100, pages 1 and 7; CH-109, page 1; CH-110, page 1; CH-210, page 1; CLETS-001, page 2; CM-010, pages 1–2; Exhibit 1, pages 1–3

Issue: The prepared forms identify the protected person as “Neslihan [REDACTED].” The medical record identifies her as “NESLIHAN [REDACTED],” and the handwritten CH-100 signature appears to read “Neslihan [REDACTED].”

Why it matters: An incomplete or inconsistent party name can create caption, identity, service, CLETS-entry, and enforcement confusion.

Fix: Verify the protected person’s complete legal name and whether any alternate name should be disclosed. Use one verified name consistently in every public form, caption, proposed order, and confidential law-enforcement form, while preserving the medical provider’s original record.

3. Confirmed defect — Prior-incident dates do not match the medical exhibit

Form/page: CH-100, page 3, item 7b; Exhibit 1, medical-record pages 1–3

Issue: Item 7b dates the described pushing/injury incident between [INCIDENT DATE RANGE REDACTED] and states that the injury required a hospital visit. Exhibit 1 documents an assault-related urgent-care visit on [MEDICAL DATE REDACTED], not during the stated incident date range.

Why it matters: The exhibit does not facially corroborate the incident date stated in the sworn request, which may create substantial factual confusion during judicial review.

Fix: Verify whether the medical exhibit relates to the incident described in item 7b or to a separate incident. Correct the date range or clearly describe the separate earlier incident, as supported by the client’s facts, before filing.

4. Confirmed defect — The prior-incident narrative reverses or obscures who threatened whom

Form/page: CH-100, page 3, item 7b

Issue: The narrative first states that the petitioner was injured and emotionally harmed by threats to kill her, but then says the respondent approached the petitioner after “she” brought in her dog and “threatened to kill the Respondent if her dog hurt his cat,” followed by the respondent pushing the petitioner. That wording attributes the threat to the petitioner rather than the respondent and conflicts with the opening statement.

Why it matters: The sworn allegation is internally inconsistent about the actor, target, and sequence of the alleged threat and assault.

Fix: Confirm the facts with the declarant and revise item 7b so each actor is identified by name or consistent role and the threat, target, and physical act are unambiguous. Attorney/filer should verify the legal selection or requested relief after the facts are corrected.

5. Confirmed defect — Firearms information omits the handguns disclosed on CLETS-001

Form/page: CH-100, pages 4–5, item 10; CLETS-001, page 1, item 1

Issue: CH-100 lists one scoped rifle and 10–13 additional rifles in the respondent’s bedroom. CLETS-001 states that the respondent has 11–14 rifles and “potentially additional handguns,” including weapons at another residence whose address is unknown. The handguns and possible second location are absent from CH-100.

Why it matters: Materially different weapons descriptions can create confusion in the court’s prohibited-items findings, proposed order, and law-enforcement entry.

Fix: Reconcile the client’s known information and make CH-100 and CLETS-001 consistent as to weapon types, quantity ranges, and known or unknown locations. Do not convert uncertain information into a definite fact.

6. Confirmed defect — CH-100 does not state the number of attached pages

Form/page: CH-100, page 7, item 17; packet pages 8–11

Issue: Item 17 is blank even though four pages follow the seven-page CH-100: an Exhibit 1 cover page and three medical-record pages.

Why it matters: A blank attachment count makes the signed request facially incomplete and makes it harder to confirm that the declaration includes the entire exhibit.

Fix: Enter the correct number of pages attached to CH-100 after the final exhibit set is assembled, and confirm that the signed declaration applies to the final attachment set.

7. Confirmed defect — Protected person is incorrectly entered as the lawyer

Form/page: CH-100, page 7, lawyer name and signature lines; all caption pages

Issue: “Neslihan [REDACTED]” is entered on the line labeled “Lawyer’s name (if any),” even though every lawyer field in the packet is otherwise blank and the party appears self-represented. The lawyer signature line is blank.

Why it matters: The entry may incorrectly imply attorney representation and conflicts with the rest of the packet.

Fix: If the party is self-represented, remove her name from the lawyer-only line and leave the lawyer signature area blank. If counsel exists, complete all lawyer information consistently and obtain the required lawyer signature.

8. Confirmed defect — Civil Case Cover Sheet lacks a case name and signature

Form/page: CM-010, page 1, “Case Name”; page 2, signature line

Issue: The case-name field is blank. The form is dated [SIGNATURE DATE REDACTED] and bears the printed name “Neslihan [REDACTED],” but the signature line is blank, while CH-100 was signed and dated the same day.

Why it matters: An incomplete caption and unsigned cover sheet may cause correction or delay at case initiation.

Fix: Complete the case name using the verified party names and have the proper party or attorney sign before filing. Confirm the filing copy contains the signature permitted by the filing method.

Authority/verification: CM-010 is the current Judicial Council civil case cover sheet for a new civil case. [Official CM-010 form page](#)

9. Confirmed defect — Kern civil-harassment law-enforcement form is missing

Form/page: Entire packet; Kern local form KERN-0029

Issue: The packet is prepared for the Bakersfield Metropolitan Division but does not include KERN-0029, Civil Harassment Law Enforcement Information. The current local form states that a filer at the Bakersfield-Metro location must complete and submit it with CH-100, CH-109, and CH-110.

Why it matters: The missing local companion form may delay routing of the temporary order and law-enforcement information.

Fix: Complete the current KERN-0029 (revised August 22, 2023) and include it in the submission set, or confirm directly with the Metropolitan civil filing office that the form is not required for this filing.

Authority/verification: Kern Superior Court lists KERN-0029 as its current local Civil Harassment Law Enforcement Information form. [Kern local forms page](#)

Medium-Priority Issues

10. Confirmed defect — Additional-protected-person yes/no question is unanswered

Form/page: CH-100, page 1, item 3a

Issue: [ADDITIONAL PROTECTED PERSON] is listed as an additional protected person, but neither “Yes” nor “No” is checked in response to whether protection is requested for another family or household member.

Why it matters: The unchecked gateway question conflicts with the completed list and may create uncertainty about whether protection is actually requested for him.

Fix: Check “Yes” if protection is requested for [ADDITIONAL PROTECTED PERSON]; otherwise remove the additional-person entry and reconcile CH-110 and CLETS-001.

11. Confirmed defect — Protected person’s age is omitted from CH-100

Form/page: CH-100, page 1, item 1a; CLETS-001, page 2, item 3

Issue: CH-100 leaves the age field blank, while CLETS-001 states an age and gives a [DATE OF BIRTH REDACTED] date of birth.

Why it matters: The blank is avoidable and leaves inconsistent completeness across forms that request the same identity information.

Fix: After verifying the date of birth and filing date, enter the correct age on CH-100.

12. Verification required — Relationship description is inconsistent

Form/page: CH-100, page 2, item 4; CH-110, page 1, item 2

Issue: CH-100 describes John [REDACTED] as a tenant whom the protected person and her husband allowed to stay in their house. CH-110 describes the relationship as “Roommate.”

Why it matters: Different relationship descriptions can create factual ambiguity about the parties’ household arrangement and may affect how the court understands the request.

Fix: Confirm the accurate relationship and use a consistent, factually precise description throughout the packet. Attorney/filer should verify the legal selection or requested relief if the corrected relationship changes the governing restraining-order procedure.

13. Verification required — CH-210 should not be included as an ordinary initial-filing form

Form/page: CH-210, pages 1–2

Issue: CH-210 states that it is completed only if ordered by a judge. The official Judicial Council description says it is used when a judicial officer permits special service. The packet contains no order or other indication that special service has been authorized.

Why it matters: Submitting or serving the summons prematurely may confuse the initial packet and the authorized service method.

Fix: Exclude CH-210 from the initial filing and service sets unless a judicial officer has authorized the special service procedure. If authorization already exists, retain the authorizing order and complete only the filer fields the form directs.

Authority/verification: The Judicial Council describes CH-210 as a form used only after judicial permission for special service. [Official CH-210 form page](#)

Correction Checklist

- ☐ The medical exhibit's public, redacted, confidential, or conditionally sealed disposition has been verified and unnecessary sensitive information has been removed from the public filing.
- ☐ The protected person's complete legal name has been verified and used consistently throughout the packet.
- ☐ The prior-incident date has been reconciled with the [MEDICAL DATE REDACTED] medical record or the earlier incident has been separately identified.
- ☐ The item 7b narrative clearly identifies who made each threat and who committed each physical act.
- ☐ The firearms descriptions in CH-100 and CLETS-001 agree as to rifles, possible handguns, quantities, and locations.
- ☐ CH-100 item 17 states the correct final number of attached pages.
- ☐ The protected person's name has been removed from the CH-100 lawyer-only line unless counsel actually represents her.
- ☐ CM-010 contains the verified case name and the required signature.
- ☐ Current KERN-0029 has been completed and included, or the Metropolitan civil filing office has confirmed it is unnecessary.
- ☐ CH-100 item 3a has been answered consistently with the request to protect [ADDITIONAL PROTECTED PERSON].
- ☐ The protected person's verified age has been entered on CH-100.
- ☐ The tenant/roommate relationship description has been verified and made consistent.
- ☐ CH-210 has been excluded unless a judicial officer authorized its use for special service.