

Forms Fixer
1412 17th Street., Suite 310F
Bakersfield, CA 93301
661-BELLICK (661-235-5425)

August 6, 2026

██████████

Mailing address not provided — please confirm

Re: ██████████ document packet

Dear ██████████,

We looked through the documents you sent us. A few items appear worth checking before anything is filed or signed, so we listed them below in the order that may be most helpful.

Here are the items that may be worth checking before the documents are filed or signed:

- The Notice of Lis Pendens packet appears to belong largely to a different matter. Its first two pages identify ██████████, the Estate of ██████████, case ██████████, and different property descriptions, while the remaining pages contain an unrelated criminal-motion draft involving ██████████, a stabbing, marijuana, and unfinished “RT xx” references. This material may create a serious filing or service-packet mismatch, so the intended ██████████ notice may need to replace the entire document.
- The Notice of Lis Pendens also appears internally inconsistent because ██████████ is identified as self-represented and, at the same time, as attorney for ██████████. The signature block identifies ██████████ as petitioner and special administrator. Please check which person, role, case caption, and signature block are intended.
- The proposed Order refers to approval of a Notice of Lis Pendency of Action in ██████████, but the supplied notice appears captioned for the ██████████ estate matter. The order and the notice may need to be matched to the same case before they are submitted together.
- Several documents use different versions of the defendant’s first name. The deposition materials use “██████████,” while the prepared pleadings generally use “██████████,” and one complaint paragraph uses “██████████.” The packet may be clearer if the intended name is checked and made consistent throughout.

- The Designation of Expert Witnesses lists a trial date of March 1, 2024, but the document is dated August 6, 2026. The Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement lists a different trial date of January 30, 2024 and is also dated August 6, 2026. These past and conflicting dates may create a filing question, so the current trial, conference, time, and department information may need to be confirmed.
- The Designation of Expert Witnesses begins, “TO THE COURT AND PLAINTIFF,” even though it is presented as the plaintiff’s own document. That recipient wording may be a copy-and-paste remnant and may need to identify the intended recipients consistently.
- The opening notice sentence in the Designation of Expert Witnesses appears incomplete. It says to take notice that “at the date and time indicated above” but does not finish by stating what will occur then. The sentence may need completion so the document reads clearly.
- The Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement says it is submitted through attorney , but it also says the plaintiff will no longer be represented by him and will retain new counsel. Those statements may be inconsistent as of the document’s 2026 date, so the intended representation wording and signature block may need to be checked.
- The heading “Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement of [REDACTED]’s” appears grammatically incomplete because the possessive name is not followed by another word. The title may need to be revised for clarity.
- The complaint repeatedly uses “Seconded Amended Verified Complaint.” This appears to be a wording error and may need to be changed consistently in the caption and page headings if “Second Amended” is intended.
- The complaint caption lists [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], but labels them collectively as singular “Defendant.” Please check whether the party label should be plural wherever all three are referenced.
- The complaint contains several name and spelling differences that may affect clarity: “[REDACTED]” appears in some paragraphs instead of “[REDACTED],” “[REDACTED]” appears in the prayer instead of “[REDACTED],” and “Larid’s Subdivision” appears instead of “Laird’s Subdivision.” These entries may need to match the intended names and property records.

- The legal description for the [REDACTED] property appears to give the map-recording date as August 26, 1930 in portions of the complaint, while other portions and the notice use August 25, 1930. Please check which date is intended and use the same description everywhere.
- The complaint states that the plaintiff and her family resided at [REDACTED] since 2017, but another paragraph says the plaintiff moved into that property in February 2018. The dates may need to be reconciled so the chronology is consistent.
- The complaint's paragraph numbering appears to restart at 28 and 29 when the second cause of action begins, duplicating numbers already used above. Renumbering the later paragraphs may make cross-references easier to follow.
- The complaint includes the phrase "committed by Defendant plaintiff," which appears to combine opposing party labels. Please check whether one of those words is an unintended copy-and-paste remnant.
- The complaint verification says it verifies claims including breach of contract, but breach of contract does not appear in the complaint's stated title or list of claims. The verification wording may need to match the document it accompanies.
- The complaint and verification are dated November 14, 2022, while several companion documents were prepared in August 2026. Please check whether the older complaint is intended as a reference copy or as a document to be used with the current packet.
- The discovery-response document identifies [REDACTED] as the plaintiff in the caption but as the "Defendant" beside the signature line. That role label may need to be corrected so it matches the caption.
- The discovery-response verification contains several grammar and identity inconsistencies, including "the matter stated in it are," "our own knowledge," and "we believe," even though one person is signing. It also spells Bakersfield as "Bakerfield." These entries may need proofreading and consistent first-person wording.
- The discovery-response signature date appears as only "February 2024," without a day, and the preceding date line is blank. Please check the intended execution date and complete the date and signature areas before the document is used.

- The discovery-response title refers to requests for admission, production demands, and form interrogatories, but the document does not identify individual request numbers or show separate responses in the supplied pages. Without deciding what content is legally needed, the title and included pages may be worth checking to make sure no response pages or attachments were omitted.
- The deposition notice spells the city as “MacFarland,” while the complaint and other property descriptions generally use “McFarland.” The city name may need to be made consistent for both property addresses.
- The deposition notice is undated and unsigned, and it describes an in-person location and a 12:30 p.m. start, while the certified transcript describes a remote deposition beginning at 12:41 p.m. These differences may be understandable in a prior record, but the packet may be clearer if the notice is treated as supporting material and not mistaken for a current filing.
- The attorney billing sheet lists a total of \$5,325 for attorney time and \$600 for paralegal time. The line-item arithmetic appears to support those totals, but the sheet does not show a combined total. Please check whether a combined amount is intended before the sheet is sent or relied upon.
- The reporter’s invoice uses “[REDACTED]” instead of “[REDACTED]” and says “Questions or Inquires” instead of “Questions or Inquiries.” These small proofreading items may be worth correcting if the invoice will be reproduced or attached.
- The reporter’s invoice displays a full tax identification number. Because that information may be sensitive, it may be worth checking whether the invoice should be kept out of any public filing or service packet, or whether a version with that number concealed should be used.
- No mailing address for [REDACTED] appears in the materials reviewed. Please confirm the current mailing address so the recipient information and any related mailing or service materials can be completed consistently.

Please note: Forms Fixer is not a law firm, and our team members are not attorneys. This review is not legal advice. We looked only for apparent formatting, spelling, grammar, and consistency issues in the documents. We did not evaluate the legal claims, defenses, strategy, or whether the documents state or rely on the correct legal theories. Questions

about legal rights, legal deadlines, legal procedures, or the legal effect of any document should be directed to a licensed attorney.

Forms Fixer is happy to help you make these corrections, or you may make the corrections yourself. We can also efile the documents for you, or you may efile them directly at EFileSystem.com. Please call us at 661-BELLICK (661-235-5425) if you would like our help.

Sincerely,

Mitch Bellick
Forms Fixer

P.S. I thought a checklist might help you, so I've added one at no extra charge.

██████ - Checklist

- ☐ Replace the supplied Notice of Lis Pendens with the intended ██████ document and remove the unrelated █████-estate and criminal-motion pages.
- ☐ Check █████'s stated role, representation status, and signature block in the Notice of Lis Pendens.
- ☐ Match the proposed Order to the correct █████ notice.
- ☐ Make the defendant's first name consistent as Ann, Anna, or Anna Marie/Maria throughout the packet.
- ☐ Confirm the current trial, settlement-conference, time, and department information in the 2026 documents.
- ☐ Check the intended recipient wording in the Designation of Expert Witnesses.
- ☐ Complete the opening notice sentence in the Designation of Expert Witnesses.
- ☐ Confirm the intended attorney-representation wording in the Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement.
- ☐ Complete or revise the possessive title of the Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement.
- ☐ Check whether "Seconded Amended" should read "Second Amended" throughout the complaint.
- ☐ Make the complaint's collective defendant label singular or plural as intended.
- ☐ Correct the apparent █████, █████, and Laird spelling differences in the complaint.
- ☐ Confirm whether the map-recording date is August 25 or August 26, 1930.
- ☐ Reconcile the 2017 and February 2018 occupancy dates for █████.
- ☐ Renumber the duplicated complaint paragraphs beginning with the second cause of action.

- ☐ Correct the combined “Defendant plaintiff” wording in the complaint.
- ☐ Make the complaint verification’s list of claims match the complaint title.
- ☐ Confirm whether the November 2022 complaint is a reference copy or part of the current packet.
- ☐ Change the discovery-response signature role from Defendant if Plaintiff is intended.
- ☐ Correct the pronoun, grammar, and Bakersfield spelling issues in the discovery verification.
- ☐ Complete the discovery-response execution date and signature areas.
- ☐ Check whether any request-by-request discovery response pages or attachments are missing.
- ☐ Make the McFarland city spelling consistent in the deposition notice and property descriptions.
- ☐ Treat the undated deposition notice as supporting material unless a current version is intended.
- ☐ Check whether a combined attorney-and-paralegal billing total should be added.
- ☐ Correct the punctuation in [REDACTED]’s name and the word “Inquiries” on the reporter’s invoice.
- ☐ Keep the invoice’s full tax identification number out of a public packet or use a concealed copy after checking with the filer.
- ☐ Provide and confirm [REDACTED]’s current mailing address.