

Jesus [REDACTED] v. Jessica [REDACTED]

Critical Issues

1. Verification required — Confirm that the filed complaint and clerk-issued summons were the documents actually served

Form/page: SUM-130(3), pages 1–2; UD-100(3), pages 1–4; CM-(1) and CM-010(3), pages 1–2; pos summons(1), pages 1–4

Issue: The uploaded SUM-130 has no case number, clerk issuance date, deputy signature, or seal. The uploaded complaint and both cover-sheet copies also have blank case-number fields. In contrast, both completed POS-010 proofs state case number [REDACTED] and say that a summons, complaint, and cover sheet were served on [REDACTED]. The packet therefore does not contain the court-issued summons or a reliably identified copy of the filed complaint and cannot establish that those were the copies served.

Why it matters: Service of an unissued summons, or service of papers that cannot be matched to the filed case, may impair jurisdiction and later default or judgment proceedings.

Fix: Obtain the filed complaint and the clerk-issued summons for case [REDACTED] from the court record and compare them with the server's actual service set. Replace the blank drafts in the working packet with those copies. If the issued summons and filed complaint were not the papers served, attorney/filer should verify the required corrective service and proof procedure.

Authority/verification: [Current SUM-130 form information.](#); [Current POS-010 form information.](#)

High-Priority Issues

2. Confirmed defect — The complaint contradicts its attached proofs about service of the three-day notice

Form/page: UD-100(3), page 3, item 10a(3), and pages 8–9 (Exhibit 3 proofs of service)

Issue: Item 10a(3) checks both that a copy was given to a person found residing at the premises and that no person of suitable age or discretion could be found there. The attached proofs instead state that the notice was posted after no suitable person could be found and then mailed; they do not state that a copy was handed to a resident.

Why it matters: The verified complaint alleges a service act that the supporting proofs do not establish, creating a material inconsistency in the notice predicate for the eviction.

Fix: Do not alter the filed complaint. Compare the filed pleading and the server's facts, then use the procedurally proper corrected or amended filing, if required, so item 10 accurately describes the service actually completed. Attorney/filer should verify the corrective procedure.

Authority/verification: [Code of Civil Procedure section 1162.](#); [Current UD-100 form information.](#)

3. Confirmed defect — The unknown-occupant proof misstates how the summons notice was completed

Form/page: pos summons(1), page 4, item 6

Issue: For the proof naming “Unknown Occupants,” item 6d is checked as service “on behalf of” an unspecified person and Code of Civil Procedure section 415.46 is checked, but the blank after “on behalf of” is not completed. Item 6c, “as occupant,” is not checked. The companion SUM-130 draft also leaves all “Notice to the Person Served” boxes blank.

Why it matters: The proof does not clearly establish that the summons notice was completed for an occupant, which may impair reliance on the CP10.5 prejudgment-claim procedure against unnamed occupants.

Fix: Have the process server compare the proof with the summons actually served and the facts of service. If supported by those facts, prepare and file a corrected proof that accurately identifies the occupant capacity and completes every applicable item. Do not change the server’s signed proof without the server’s review and signature. Attorney/filer should verify compliance with section 415.46.

Authority/verification: [Code of Civil Procedure section 415.46](#); [Current POS-010 form information](#).

4. Verification required — Verify timely filing of both proofs of service of summons

Form/page: pos summons(1), pages 1–4

Issue: The proofs show service on [REDACTED]; the Jessica [REDACTED] proof was signed [REDACTED] and the unknown-occupant proof was signed [REDACTED]. Neither copy bears a court filing endorsement, and the packet contains no [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] filing confirmation or docket showing that the proofs were filed.

Why it matters: Kern Local Rule 3.15.2(a) requires a proof of service or an application for service by posting and mailing to be filed within 20 days after filing the unlawful-detainer complaint unless a responsive pleading has been filed.

Fix: Check the docket for case [REDACTED] and confirm the complaint filing date, whether a response was filed, and the filing date of each POS-010. If the proofs were timely filed, place the filed copies or confirmation in the packet. If not, attorney/filer should determine the corrective filing needed and address any related court deadline or order.

Authority/verification: [Kern County Superior Court Local Rules effective January 1, 2026, rule 3.15.2\(a\)](#).

5. Confirmed defect — An unrelated client’s filing confirmation is mixed into the packet

Form/page: NoticeofE-FilingConfirmation Joseph [REDACTED](1), pages 1–2

Issue: This document belongs to Joseph [REDACTED] v. Lorena [REDACTED], case [REDACTED] in the Mojave branch. The remaining case documents concern Jesus [REDACTED] v. Jessica [REDACTED], case [REDACTED] in Bakersfield.

Why it matters: A wrong-case document can be filed or served accidentally and discloses another client’s case information to the wrong recipient.

Fix: Remove the Joseph [REDACTED] filing confirmation from every [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] filing, service, client, and working set, and return it to the correct client file.

6. Confirmed defect — Three filing PDFs contain damaged data streams, and one duplicate cover sheet is unreadable

Form/page: CM-010(3), pages 1–3; CM-(1), pages 1–3; SUM-130(3), pages 1–2

Issue: PDF validation produced damaged-Flate-stream errors for all three files. CM-010(3) renders most page content as black or missing in a standard PDF renderer. CM-(1) contains the same extracted cover-sheet content and renders visibly, but it also produces a stream error. SUM-130(3) renders visibly but produces a stream error.

Why it matters: A corrupted or unreadable PDF may be rejected, render differently in the e-filing system, or reach the clerk without legible content.

Fix: Regenerate one clean CM-010 PDF and a clean SUM-130 PDF from the source forms, visually inspect every page in a second PDF viewer, and use only the clean files. Delete the corrupted duplicate CM-010(3) from the submission set.

Medium-Priority Issues

7. Confirmed defect — The complaint omits the notice’s election of forfeiture

Form/page: UD-100(3), page 3, item 9d; page 4, item 20e; page 6 (Exhibit 2 notice)

Issue: The attached three-day notice states that the landlord “declares the forfeiture” of the rental/lease agreement. UD-100 item 9d, stating that the notice included an election of forfeiture, is unchecked, and prayer item 20e requesting forfeiture is also unchecked.

Why it matters: The verified pleading does not accurately report the attached notice and may request relief that differs from the notice’s stated consequence.

Fix: Attorney/filer should verify the intended legal selection and requested relief. Do not alter the filed complaint; use the procedurally proper correction or amendment, if required, so the notice allegation and prayer are internally consistent.

Authority/verification: [Current UD-100 form information](#).

8. Verification required — Blank duplicate notice and proof drafts conflict with the completed, post-service record

Form/page: 3 day pay or quit(2), page 1; POS(4), page 1; compared with UD-100(3), pages 6, 8, and 9

Issue: The standalone three-day notice is unsigned and undated even though the complaint exhibit contains a signed notice dated [REDACTED]. The standalone proof for unknown occupants has no property address, service date, method, mailing date, server name, or signature even though the complaint exhibit contains a completed proof dated [REDACTED].

Why it matters: Using or circulating the blank drafts after service could create uncertainty about which notice was operative and which proof documents the completed service.

Fix: Classify these Word files as superseded drafts and exclude them from filing, service, and client-final sets unless a new notice and new service are intentionally being prepared. Retain the completed April 2026 documents as the operative record. Attorney/filer should verify before issuing any new notice.

9. Confirmed defect — The unlawful-detainer-assistant disclosure contains a name error and conflicting suite numbers

Form/page: UD-100(3), page 4, item 22; SUM-130(3), page 2, item 4; headers on UD-100, CM-010, and SUM-130

Issue: UD-100 item 22 identifies the assistant as “Victor [REDACTED],” while SUM-130 identifies “Victor [REDACTED].” The formal assistant disclosures use [REDACTED], while the repeated Bakersfield Paralegal header uses [REDACTED].

Why it matters: The paid-assistant disclosure should consistently identify the registrant and registration address.

Fix: Confirm the exact registered name and current registration address, correct the source data for future forms, and have the attorney/filer determine whether the filed complaint requires a corrected or amended disclosure.

Low-Priority Issues

10. Confirmed defect — The proofs contain address and document-name typographical errors

Form/page: pos summons(1), pages 1 and 3, items 2f and 4

Issue: Both proofs spell the city as “Bakersfild” in item 4 and spell “Possession” as “Possesion” in the listed title “Prejudgment Claim of Right to Possesion.”

Why it matters: The errors are unlikely to obscure the intended address or document but reduce precision in the record of what was served.

Fix: Have the process server correct and re-sign a replacement proof if a corrected proof is otherwise being prepared; correct the source template for future proofs.

Correction Checklist

- ☐ Confirm that the actual court-filed complaint and clerk-issued summons for case [REDACTED] were served, and replace the blank drafts with those copies.
- ☐ Correct the complaint’s contradictory description of service of the three-day notice through the procedurally proper filing.
- ☐ Have the process server correct the unknown-occupant POS-010 capacity and section 415.46 entries if the service facts support correction.
- ☐ Verify on the docket that both POS-010 proofs were filed within the applicable Kern County deadline.
- ☐ Remove the Joseph [REDACTED] filing confirmation from every [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] packet.
- ☐ Regenerate clean, validated CM-010 and SUM-130 PDFs and delete the corrupted duplicate cover sheet.
- ☐ Reconcile the notice’s election of forfeiture with UD-100 items 9d and 20e through the proper filing procedure.
- ☐ Mark the blank notice and blank notice-service proof as superseded drafts and exclude them from final sets.
- ☐ Correct the assistant’s name and verify the correct registration suite number in all disclosures.
- ☐ Correct “Bakersfild” and “Possesion” in any replacement proofs prepared by the process server.