

High Priority

1. Confirmed defect — Lisa [REDACTED]'s age conflicts with her stated date of birth

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 1, item 1(b); CLETS-001(1).pdf, p. 2, item 3.

Issue: Both forms state age 65, while CLETS-001 gives a date of birth of [REDACTED]. On the July 13, 2026 signing date, that date of birth corresponds to age 64.

Why it matters: Conflicting identifying information can cause inaccurate court and law-enforcement records.

Fix: Verify Lisa's date of birth. If [REDACTED] is correct, change her age to 64 on both forms; if the date of birth is incorrect, correct it and make the age consistent throughout the packet.

2. Confirmed defect — Christopher's protected-person identity is inconsistent

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 6, item 8; DV-110(1).pdf, p. 1, item 3; CLETS-001(1).pdf, p. 2, item 4.

Issue: DV-100 and DV-110 identify Christopher as "Christopher [REDACTED]," age 41; CLETS-001 identifies him as "Christopher [REDACTED]," with a date of birth of [REDACTED]. On July 13, 2026, that date of birth corresponds to age 42.

Why it matters: The spelling and age differences create uncertainty about the identity of the additional protected person and may lead to an inaccurate protective-order registry entry.

Fix: Verify Christopher's legal name spelling, date of birth, and current age, then use the same verified information on DV-100, DV-110, and CLETS-001.

3. Verification required — The most-recent-abuse narrative lacks incident-specific facts

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 3, item 5(f), with supporting materials at pp. 14–46.

Issue: The narrative alleges electronic spying and harassment but does not describe a specific act on May 19, 2026, the precise conduct observed, any exact words or communications, or the facts connecting Ramon [REDACTED] to the described device activity. It also does not identify which attachment pages support which assertion.

Why it matters: The judge uses item 5 to understand what happened on the stated date. General conclusions without observable facts or clear exhibit references may not give the court enough information to evaluate the request.

Fix: Obtain Lisa's facts without speculation: the date and approximate time, location and device, what she directly saw or heard, any exact words or communications, how she identified Ramon as the actor, what Christopher personally observed, and the specific exhibit pages that support each fact. Revise item 5(f) only from verified client information.

Authority/verification: [California Courts — Fill out forms to ask for a domestic violence restraining order](#)

4. Verification required — The stated most-recent date conflicts with the frequency statement

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 3, items 5(a) and 5(g); p. 13 signature dated July 13, 2026.

Issue: Item 5(a) identifies May 19, 2026 as the most recent abuse, while item 5(g) says the conduct occurred "Every to every other day since early November of 2025." Without an end date, the frequency statement reads as continuing after May 19 and through the later signing date.

Why it matters: The internal chronology is unclear and may undermine the accuracy of the most-recent-incident description.

Fix: Confirm whether any alleged conduct occurred after May 19, 2026. If yes, update the most-recent date and describe that incident; if no, revise the frequency statement to include the accurate ending date.

Authority/verification: [California Courts — Fill out forms to ask for a domestic violence restraining order](#)

5. Confirmed defect — The additional-pages count is blank

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 13, item 32; attached pp. 14–46.

Issue: Item 32 does not state the number of additional pages even though 33 attachment pages follow the 13-page DV-100.

Why it matters: The omission makes the signed request’s attachment count incomplete and makes it harder to confirm that the filed packet contains every intended page.

Fix: After the evidence packet is finalized, enter “33” in item 32, or enter the revised final count if pages are added or removed, and verify that every attachment page is present before signing or resubmitting.

Authority/verification: [Judicial Council form DV-100](#)

6. Confirmed defect — The exhibit packet is not presentation-ready and contains a duplicate image

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, pp. 15–17 and 19–46; duplicate image on PDF p. 24.

Issue: The message screenshots on pp. 15–17 are sideways, and many photographs on pp. 19–46 are sideways, undated, and uncaptured. The packet has no concise exhibit index or page-level explanation connecting the material to item 5. Page 24 repeats the same photograph twice.

Why it matters: The current presentation makes the material difficult to read and does not show who created it, when it was created, what it depicts, or how it relates to the alleged incident.

Fix: Rotate each page for normal reading; add a concise exhibit index and captions identifying date, source, person or object depicted, and relevance; cite the applicable exhibit pages from item 5; and remove the repeated image on p. 24 if the duplication was unintended. Confirm all descriptions with Lisa and do not infer missing facts.

Authority/verification: [California Courts — Fill out forms to ask for a domestic violence restraining order](#)

7. Verification required — A required Kern paid-preparer declaration may be missing

Form/page: SUBMIT folder, all six PDFs; no separate paid-preparer declaration was found.

Issue: Kern County Local Rule 6.1.1 requires a self-represented party who uses a paid nonattorney third party to type or prepare pleadings to submit a declaration identifying the preparer and compensation paid. The packet contains no such declaration, but the reviewer cannot determine whether a paid preparer was used.

Why it matters: If the rule applies, omitting the declaration creates a local filing-compliance defect.

Fix: Confirm whether any typing service, legal document assistant, paralegal, or other nonattorney was paid to prepare the papers. If yes, add the declaration with the preparer’s name, DBA, registration number, address, telephone number, and compensation paid; if no paid third party was used, no correction is needed.

Authority/verification: [Kern County Superior Court Local Rules, effective January 1, 2026 — rule 6.1.1](#)

8. Verification required — The PDFs do not meet Kern’s technical requirements if they will be e-filed

Form/page: All six PDFs in SUBMIT; 65 pages total.

Issue: Each PDF is image-only and produced no usable searchable text. The 46-page DV-100 PDF also has no PDF bookmarks. The filing method is not documented in the folder.

Why it matters: Kern County Local Rule 1.10(i) requires e-filed PDFs to be text-searchable and to comply with applicable bookmark and exhibit requirements.

Fix: Confirm the filing method. If e-filing, OCR every PDF, verify that text search works on each page, add accurate bookmarks for the DV-100 and exhibit divisions, and validate the final PDFs before upload. If filing on paper, this e-filing correction does not apply.

Authority/verification: [Kern County Superior Court Local Rules, effective January 1, 2026 — rule 1.10\(i\)](#)

Medium Priority

9. Confirmed defect — The police-response question is unanswered

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 3, item 5(e).

Issue: None of the three responses—"I don't know," "No," or "Yes"—is selected for whether police came.

Why it matters: Item 5 is incomplete and the court cannot tell whether law enforcement responded to the stated incident.

Fix: Confirm the answer with Lisa and select exactly one response. If police provided an emergency protective order, also include the requested order information in item 3.

Authority/verification: [Judicial Council form DV-100](#)

10. Confirmed defect — Lisa's telephone number is inconsistent

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 1, item 1(d); CLETS-001(1).pdf, p. 2, item 3; FW-001(6).pdf, p. 1, item 1.

Issue: DV-100 and CLETS-001 list [REDACTED], while FW-001 lists [REDACTED].

Why it matters: An inconsistent contact number can prevent reliable court contact and creates uncertainty about which number is correct.

Fix: Verify Lisa's current safe telephone number and make it consistent on every form on which she chooses to provide it.

11. Confirmed defect — DV-110 omits the known firearms-status response

Form/page: DV-110(1).pdf, p. 1, item 2; compare DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 6, item 9, and CLETS-001(1).pdf, p. 1.

Issue: The DV-110 line for firearms, firearm parts, or ammunition is blank even though DV-100 and CLETS-001 both state "I don't know." DV-110 expressly directs the filer to include the information from DV-100 item 9.

Why it matters: Leaving the line blank creates an avoidable cross-form inconsistency in information relevant to the temporary order and law-enforcement entry.

Fix: Confirm the current response with Lisa and enter the same verified status on DV-110—for example, "Unknown" if that remains accurate.

Authority/verification: [Judicial Council form DV-110](#)

12. Verification required — The fee-waiver forms appear unnecessary for this DVRO filing

Form/page: FW-001(6).pdf and FW-003(6).pdf.

Issue: The SUBMIT packet includes a fee-waiver request and proposed fee-waiver order, but California Courts states there is no fee to file domestic-violence restraining-order papers. No separate fee-bearing filing purpose is identified.

Why it matters: Submitting unnecessary forms can confuse the filing packet and add confidential financial material that is not needed for the requested relief.

Fix: Confirm whether a separate fee-bearing request requires a waiver. If not, remove FW-001 and FW-003 from this filing. If they are required for a separate purpose, keep them with that filing and complete any filer-required fields when the case information is available.

Authority/verification: [California Courts — File your forms to ask for a domestic violence restraining order](#)

13. Verification required — Confidential-document handling is not established

Form/page: CLETS-001(1).pdf, pp. 1–2; FW-001(6).pdf, p. 1; filing disposition is not shown in SUBMIT.

Issue: CLETS-001 is marked confidential and states “Do not file this form” and “Do not place in court file.” FW-001 is also marked confidential. The folder does not show whether these documents will be separated from public and service copies or given the required confidential e-filing designation.

Why it matters: Incorrect handling could disclose protected personal information or place a confidential form in the public court file.

Fix: Before submission, keep CLETS-001 and any retained FW-001 out of the respondent’s service/public copy set. Give CLETS-001 to the clerk as directed. If e-filing, apply the court’s confidential-document security designation and verify the disposition before upload.

Authority/verification: [Judicial Council form CLETS-001](#); [Kern County Superior Court Local Rules, effective January 1, 2026 — rule 1.10\(j\)](#)

14. Verification required — Respondent identifying information is incomplete or possibly malformed

Form/page: CLETS-001(1).pdf, p. 1, item 1; DV-110(1).pdf, p. 1, item 2.

Issue: CLETS-001 includes a driver’s-license number but omits the issuing state. DV-110 gives the respondent’s street address as “[REDACTED],” which may contain a duplicated directional suffix.

Why it matters: Complete, accurate identifying and address information supports law-enforcement matching and service and should not be corrected by guesswork.

Fix: Verify the driver’s-license issuing state and the exact street address from reliable client information. Add the state and correct the address only if the verified information confirms a change.

15. Verification required — The safety of Lisa’s disclosed address and contact information must be confirmed

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 1, items 1(c)–1(d).

Issue: DV-100 contains Lisa’s residential address, telephone number, and email address. The form explains that the respondent will use the mailing address for papers and that optional contact information should be blank or replaced with safe contact information if the filer does not want the respondent to have it.

Why it matters: Because the allegations include stalking and surveillance, unintended disclosure of home or contact information could create a safety and privacy risk.

Fix: Confirm with Lisa that every disclosed address and contact method is safe for Ramon to know. If not, use a permitted safe mailing address and leave optional contact fields blank or provide safe alternatives before service.

Authority/verification: [Judicial Council form DV-100, p. 1 instructions](#)

Low Priority

16. Confirmed defect — The abuse narrative contains proofreading errors

Form/page: DV-100 Merged [REDACTED], L(1).pdf, p. 3, items 5(f)–5(g).

Issue: The text includes “Additionally, He,” “multiples times,” and “Every to every other day,” as well as a semicolon followed by an unnecessary capital letter.

Why it matters: Grammar and usage errors reduce clarity in the packet’s central factual narrative.

Fix: After the facts are verified, revise the affected phrases without changing substance—for example, “Additionally, he,” “multiple times,” and “Every day to every other day since early November 2025”—and perform a final proofread.

Final Correction Checklist

- ☐ 1. Verify Lisa [REDACTED]'s date of birth and make her age consistent on DV-100 and CLETS-001.
- ☐ 2. Verify Christopher's legal name, date of birth, and age and standardize all three forms.
- ☐ 3. Add client-verified, incident-specific facts and precise exhibit references to DV-100 item 5(f).
- ☐ 4. Reconcile the May 19, 2026 incident date with the stated frequency and correct the chronology.
- ☐ 5. Enter the final number of attached pages in DV-100 item 32 and verify the attachment count.
- ☐ 6. Rotate, index, caption, and cross-reference the exhibits and remove the unintended duplicate on p. 24.
- ☐ 7. Confirm whether a paid nonattorney prepared the packet and add the Kern rule 6.1.1 declaration if required.
- ☐ 8. Confirm the filing method and, if e-filing, OCR and bookmark the PDFs and validate text search.
- ☐ 9. Confirm whether police came and complete DV-100 item 5(e).
- ☐ 10. Verify Lisa's safe telephone number and make it consistent across the packet.
- ☐ 11. Carry the verified firearms status from DV-100 into DV-110 item 2.
- ☐ 12. Remove FW-001 and FW-003 unless a separate fee-bearing filing requires them.
- ☐ 13. Separate CLETS-001 and FW-001 from public/service copies and verify confidential submission treatment.
- ☐ 14. Verify and complete the respondent's driver's-license state and exact street address.
- ☐ 15. Confirm that Lisa intentionally provided safe address, telephone, and email information for the served form.
- ☐ 16. Proofread DV-100 items 5(f)–5(g) and correct grammar without changing the verified facts.