

Submission Date	Court	Case Number	Filing Fee
09/20/2026 at 7:21:44 AM	CA Supreme Court	S296952	Fee V

Filing Details

View detailed information about this filing including properties, status updates, and service recipients.

- [Properties](#)
- Status Updates
- [Service Recipients / Status](#)

Status	Date	Comments
Not Filed	09/22/2026 at 03:56:24 PM	SC Court User: The submission will not be filed.
Paid	09/20/2026 at 07:23:31 AM	INFO: Payment Accepted. OrderId: , Tracking Id: cef62-48fe-a681-34696556de96
Accepted	09/20/2026 at 07:23:25 AM	TRUEFILING: Pending Payment Filing has not been filed at this time.
Submitted	09/20/2026 at 07:21:45 AM	Submitted on September 20th, 2026 by Robert Mar

09/15/2026 at 9:26:53 PM	CA 4th District Court of Appeal Division 1	D086852	D086
09/15/2026 at 9:26:53 PM	CA 4th District Court of Appeal Division 1	D086852	D086

Showing 1 to 4 of 4 entries

[Previous](#)[Next](#)

[Skip to main content](#)



• **Robert Mansueto**

robertfmansueto@gmail.com

•

[Log Out](#)
[Main Pages](#)

- [File](#)
- [Case Search](#)
- [History](#)
- [Favorites](#)
- [Settings](#)

[Resources](#)

- [Help](#)
- [Contact Support](#)
- [Email Activity](#)

History

[My History](#)[My Network's History](#)[Unsubmitted](#)[View Payment Information](#)[Download Documents](#)

[Start Date:](#)

[End Date:](#)

[Search](#)

Search complete. 4 results found.

[View Type:](#)[Filing View](#)[Bundle View](#)[Default view](#) Check this box to set the current view as your default view when the History page loads.

4 results found

Filing details dialog opened. Properties tab selected. Use arrow keys to navigate between tabs.

Show 51525 entries

[Search:](#)

Submission Date

Court

Case Number

Filin

09/20/2026 at 7:21:44 AM

CA Supreme Court

S296952

CA_8

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
BROWN v. MANSUETO

Supreme Court Case No. S296952

Court of Appeal Case No. G066603

San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL

IMMEDIATE STAY REQUESTED

**EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR STAY OF ENFORCEMENT
PENDING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES SUPREME COURT**

Application following issuance of remittitur on September 18, 2026

ROBERT F. MANSUETO
Applicant and Appellant, In Propria Persona
P.O. Box 3338
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Telephone: (619) 884-5352
Email: robertfmansueto@gmail.com

APPLICATION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

Applicant Robert F. Mansueto respectfully requests an immediate temporary stay and a stay pending the timely filing and disposition of his petition for a writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court. On September 14, 2026, the Clerk of that Court returned Applicant's prior stay application solely because Supreme Court Rule 23.3 required him first to seek the same relief in this Court. The Court of Appeal denied Applicant's August 31, 2026 stay request and issued its remittitur on September 18, 2026. Applicant therefore seeks relief here without delay.

Because the remittitur has issued, Applicant does not ask merely to postpone its issuance. He asks this Court to stay enforcement and further implementation of the judgment affirmed in G066603, the underlying order removing him as cotrustee and authorizing consequential action concerning the Trust residence, and the appellate cost award, to the extent this Court has authority to preserve the status quo pending federal review. Applicant also requests an immediate administrative stay while this application is considered and waiver of any undertaking because he proceeds in forma pauperis and cannot furnish security.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR FEDERAL REVIEW

1. Whether due process permits a probate court to impose the dispositive sanction of waiver; remove the named First Successor Trustee, who had a fiduciary obligation and duty under the Trust to participate in caring for his disabled sister, Joyce Mansueto, in the Trust residence, which was a clear and unambiguous purpose of the Trust; and authorize eviction and sale without considering a timely filed opposition that stated the substantive objections and included the controlling trust amendment, where the filing was routed to a different department and the deciding judge stated that she did not have it.
2. Whether treating those objections as waived, despite actual notice of the asserted property and disabled-beneficiary rights, provided the meaningful opportunity to be heard required by the Fourteenth Amendment before interests in fiduciary office, possession, and property were extinguished.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. The dispute concerns the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust and the residence at 57 Tunapuna Lane, Coronado, California. Applicant was designated First Successor Trustee, and the May 11, 2008 Second Amendment states that Robert Mansueto and Susan Brown shall receive a life estate in the residence and that either or both may reside there during their lives.
2. In February 2024, Respondent filed a petition seeking Applicant's removal as cotrustee and authority to evict occupants and sell the residence. Applicant filed a written March 2024 opposition to Respondent's related ex parte request. The file-stamped opposition bears Department 502 on its caption, an accompanying notice set an April 26 hearing in Department 502 before Judge John Scherling, and the opposition stated substantive objections and included the Second Amendment. The deciding Department 503 later did not have that filing.
3. At a May 2024 hearing, the probate court stated that no written objection to the petition had been filed, established an August 1 deadline, and warned that objections could be deemed waived. Applicant did not file a second document separately captioned as an objection by that deadline. At the August 2024 hearing, he sought a continuance and explained his belief that objections had already been filed. The court found no mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, deemed objections waived, removed him as cotrustee, authorized eviction and sale, and awarded attorney fees to Respondent.
4. The Court of Appeal affirmed on May 7, 2026. It held that Applicant's opposition to the ex parte application was not an objection to the underlying petition, that the May warning afforded an opportunity to file a separate objection, and that the trial court acted within California Rule of Court 7.801. The Court of Appeal also rejected Applicant's due-process contention and denied Respondent's motion for sanctions.
5. Rehearing was denied May 20, 2026. This Court denied review in S296952 on August 19, 2026. The Court of Appeal denied Applicant's August 31 request to stay issuance

of remittitur on September 18, 2026, and issued the remittitur that day, awarding Respondent costs.

6. Applicant submitted an emergency stay application to the United States Supreme Court. By letter dated September 14, 2026, the Clerk returned it because Rule 23.3 requires Applicant first to seek a stay in this Court. The letter expressly directs: 'You must first seek a stay in the California Supreme Court.' Applicant now complies.

GROUND FOR AN IMMEDIATE STAY

I THE APPLICATION PRESENTS A SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL DUE PROCESS QUESTION

A stay pending certiorari requires, among other considerations, a reasonable probability that certiorari will be granted, a fair prospect of reversal, and a likelihood of irreparable harm absent a stay. (*Hollingsworth v. Perry* (2010) 558 U.S. 183, 190; *Nken v. Holder* (2009) 556 U.S. 418, 434.) Applicant recognizes that such relief is extraordinary. His proposed petition, however, raises a concrete procedural due-process question rather than asking the United States Supreme Court to reinterpret ordinary California probate law.

The state possessed Applicant's written filing, and the filing described the objections to removal, eviction, and sale. Applicant contends it also contained the trust instrument establishing the asserted life estate. Yet because that filing was routed to another department and was not later duplicated under a different caption, the deciding court treated Applicant as having no objection at all and proceeded without reaching the merits. Applicant further relies on the deciding judge's statement that she did not have the material. On Applicant's view, a court-created routing failure, followed by the terminal sanction of waiver, deprived him of a meaningful hearing before severe and effectively irreversible consequences occurred.

The Court of Appeal held that the May 2024 warning and additional filing period defeated the due-process claim. Applicant will ask the United States Supreme Court to decide whether those circumstances constitutionally permitted the court to disregard an already filed substantive opposition and controlling trust document rather than consider

the filing, correct its routing, grant a brief continuance, or employ a less drastic remedy. This federal issue was raised and decided adversely in the state appellate proceedings.

II IRREPARABLE CONSEQUENCES ARE CONTINUING

The challenged ruling did more than change litigation management. It removed Applicant from fiduciary office, authorized his eviction from the longtime Trust residence, and enabled disposition of the sole significant Trust asset before the merits of the omitted material were adjudicated. Applicant has been evicted. Recorded documents now reflect later transfers and substantial construction financing, and the residence has undergone demolition and reconstruction. These circumstances are cited to show ongoing and increasingly difficult-to-reverse consequences, not to ask this Court to adjudicate fraud or title disputes on this application.

Without a stay, further implementation of the judgment and collection of the appellate cost award may continue before Applicant can submit his certiorari petition. Monetary relief alone cannot restore lost fiduciary participation, occupancy, or the pre-transfer condition of unique real property. An immediate administrative stay is therefore necessary to prevent additional change while the Court evaluates the application.

III THE EQUITIES FAVOR PRESERVATION RATHER THAN FURTHER CHANGE

A limited stay preserves the possibility of meaningful federal review. Respondent will retain the benefit of the existing judgment while enforcement is temporarily paused; Applicant seeks no merits adjudication through this application. By contrast, denial permits additional reliance on a judgment Applicant contends was entered without a constitutionally meaningful hearing. The requested relief should last only through the timely filing and disposition of the certiorari petition and should dissolve automatically if certiorari is denied.

IV THIS APPLICATION SATISFIES SUPREME COURT RULE 23.3

Applicant previously sought relief in the Court of Appeal. Its September 18, 2026 order denied his August 31 application to stay issuance of remittitur. The remittitur issued

the same day. The United States Supreme Court Clerk then directed Applicant to seek a stay in this Court before renewing his federal application. Copies of those documents are included in the accompanying appendix. Applicant has therefore presented the requested relief to the available state courts before renewing his application in the United States Supreme Court.

REQUESTED ORDER

Applicant respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Immediately stay, on an administrative basis, further enforcement and implementation against Applicant of the judgment affirmed in G066603 and the underlying trustee-removal order while this application is considered;
2. Stay enforcement and further implementation against Applicant of those rulings, including collection or enforcement of the appellate cost award, pending the timely filing and disposition of Applicant's petition for writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court;
3. Waive any undertaking or set a nominal undertaking because Applicant proceeds in forma pauperis and cannot furnish security; and
4. Grant such additional relief as is necessary to preserve this Court's ability and the United States Supreme Court's ability to provide meaningful review.

Dated: September 20, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert F. Mansueto

ROBERT F. MANSUETO
Applicant and Appellant, In Propria Persona

DECLARATION AND VERIFICATION OF ROBERT F MANSUETO

I, Robert F. Mansueto, declare:

1. I am the Applicant and Appellant. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and could testify competently to them.
2. My file-stamped March 2024 opposition bears Department 502 on its caption; the accompanying notice set an April 26 hearing there before Judge John Scherling. It opposed removal, eviction, and sale and included the May 11, 2008 Second Amendment. Judge Olga Alvarez later decided the removal petition in Department 503 without having received that filing.
3. At the August 2024 hearing, I explained that I believed I had already filed objections and requested additional time. The court deemed objections waived, removed me as cotrustee, and authorized eviction and sale without considering the Second Amendment. Judge Alvarez stated on the record, 'I don't have it.'
4. After my eviction, recorded documents reflected later transfers and encumbrances, and I observed substantial demolition and reconstruction. I offer these events only to explain urgency and irreparable consequences.
5. On September 14, 2026, the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court returned my emergency stay application and instructed me to seek a stay first in the California Supreme Court under United States Supreme Court Rule 23.3.
6. On September 20, 2026 before filing this application, I notified Respondent Susan J. Brown through her appellate counsel, Robert M. Dato, by email at rdato@buchalter.com that I intended to file this emergency application in the California Supreme Court. I advised counsel that the application requests an immediate administrative stay and a stay of further enforcement and implementation of the judgment affirmed in G066603, including the trustee-removal order and appellate cost award, pending the timely filing and disposition of my petition for writ of certiorari, and that the urgency arises from issuance of the remittitur on September 18, 2026.

I have read the foregoing application. The factual statements within my personal knowledge are true. Matters stated from court orders, docket entries, and recorded

documents are true and correct copies or accurate descriptions to the best of my knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 20, 2026 at Lakeside, California.

/s/ Robert F. Mansueto
ROBERT F. MANSUETO

APPENDIX INDEX

Exhibit	Description	Page
A	Court of Appeal opinion filed May 7, 2026, G066603	APP 001
B	Order denying rehearing filed May 20, 2026, G066603	APP 009
C	California Supreme Court order denying review, August 19, 2026, S296952	APP 011
D	Superior Court minute order removing trustee, August 13, 2024	APP 013
E	Pertinent excerpts from March 19, 2024 opposition, including Second Amendment	APP 016
F	Department 502 hearing notice and misrouting evidence	APP 022
G	Minute order of Judge Scherling, April 26, 2024	APP 024
H	Pertinent excerpts from August 13, 2024 reporter's transcript	APP 026
I	Court of Appeal order denying stay, September 18, 2026	APP 029
J	Court of Appeal remittitur issued September 18, 2026	APP 031
K	Letter from Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, September 14, 2026	APP 033

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I declare that I am over 18 years of age and am a party to this proceeding.

On September 20, 2026 I electronically served the foregoing Emergency Application for Stay of Enforcement Pending Petition for Writ of Certiorari and its appendix through the court's approved electronic filing service provider on Respondent Susan J. Brown through her appellate counsel of record, Robert M. Dato, and on all other counsel appearing on the official service list in Brown v. Mansueto, Supreme Court No. S296952 and Court of Appeal No. G066603.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 20, 2026 at Lakeside, California.

/s/ Robert F. Mansueto
ROBERT F. MANSUETO

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Form 4. Motion and Affidavit for Permission to Proceed in Forma Pauperis

Case Number(s)

Case Name

MANSUETO v BROWN

Affidavit in support of motion: I swear under penalty of perjury that I am financially unable to pay the docket and filing fees for my appeal. I believe my appeal has merit. I swear under penalty of perjury under United States laws that my answers on this form are true and correct. 28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621.

Signature

Robert J Mansueto

Date

9/25/26

The court may grant a motion to proceed in forma pauperis if you show that you cannot pay the filing fees **and** you have a non-frivolous legal issue on appeal. Please state your issues on appeal. (*attach additional pages if necessary*)

1. DUE PROCESS FAILURE: State probate court granted an Ex Parte Application removing Appellant as Co-Trustee (stripping his 1st Successor role) without a full evidentiary hearing or statutory cause.
2. CLERICAL SUPPRESSION: The Probate Judge issued the terminal order blindly, without ever seeing or reviewing Appellant's file-stamped Opposition officially submitted to the court on March 19, 2024.
3. SCOTUS PRECEDENT: Under Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422 (1982), a litigant's right to have timely filed opposition papers considered by the judge is a protected Fourteenth Amendment property right. Adjudicating core title and residency rights in a complete clerical vacuum renders the resulting order constitutionally void.
4. IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES: This failure displaced the son and daughter of the Settlers, subverting the trust mandate for continuous care of disabled dependent Joyce Mansueto by Appellant. This enabled older sister-2nd trustee, to execute massive fiduciary waste-attempt to dispose of home.

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at forms@ca9.uscourts.gov

1. For both you and your spouse, estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

Income Source	Average monthly amount during the past 12 months		Amount expected next month	
	You	Spouse	You	Spouse
Employment	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Self-Employment	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Income from real property (such as rental income)	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Interest and Dividends	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Gifts	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Alimony	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Child Support	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance)	\$ 2770	\$	\$ 2770	\$
Disability (such as social security, insurance payments)	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Unemployment Payments	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Public-Assistance (such as welfare)	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
Other (specify)	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$
TOTAL MONTHLY INCOME:	\$ 2740	\$	\$ 2740	\$

2. List your employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first.
(Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross Monthly Pay
NA		From To	\$
		From To	\$
		From To	\$
		From To	\$

3. List your spouse's employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first.
(Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross Monthly Pay
NA		From To	\$
		From To	\$
		From To	\$
		From To	\$

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$

Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

Financial Institution	Type of Account	Amount You Have	Amount Your Spouse Has
NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION	CHECKING	\$ 50	\$ NA
		\$	\$
		\$	\$
		\$	\$

If you are a prisoner seeking to appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding, you must attach a statement certified by the appropriate institutional officer showing all receipts, expenditures, and balances during the last six months in your institutional accounts. If you have multiple accounts, perhaps because you have been in multiple institutions, attach one certified statement of each account.

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishing.

Home	Value	Other Real Estate	Value
None	\$		\$

Motor Vehicle 1: Make & Year	Model	Registration #	Value
Motorcycle	Suzuki	25F8648 (CA)	\$ \$400
Motor Vehicle 2: Make & Year	Model	Registration #	Value
			\$

Other Assets	Value
Musical Instruments / art	\$ \$2,000
	\$
	\$

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

Person owing you or your spouse	Amount owed to you	Amount owed to your spouse
NA	\$	\$
	\$	\$
	\$	\$

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support. If a dependent is a minor, list only the initials and not the full name.

WIDOWER

Name	Relationship	Age
NONE		

8. Estimate the average monthly expenses of you and your family. Show separately the amounts paid by your spouse. Adjust any payments that are made weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate.

	You	Spouse
Rent or home-mortgage payment (include lot rented for mobile home)	\$ 1500	\$
- Are real estate taxes included? ☒ Yes ☐ No		
- Is property insurance included? ☒ Yes ☐ No		
Utilities (electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer, and telephone)	\$ 100	\$
Home maintenance (repairs and upkeep)	\$	\$
Food	\$ 400	\$
Clothing	\$	\$
Laundry and dry-cleaning	\$ 50	\$
Medical and dental expenses	\$ 150	\$
Transportation (not including motor vehicle payments)	\$ 300	\$
Recreation, entertainment, newspapers, magazines, etc.	\$	\$
Insurance (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
- Homeowner's or renter's	\$	\$
- Life	\$	\$
- Health	\$	\$
- Motor Vehicle	\$	\$
- Other	\$	\$
Taxes (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
Specify	\$	\$

	You	Spouse
Installment payments		
- Motor Vehicle	\$	\$
- Credit Card (name) Visa	\$ 200	\$
- Department Store (name)	\$	\$
Alimony, maintenance, and support paid to others	\$	\$
Regular expenses for the operation of business, profession, or farm (attach detailed statement)	\$	\$
Other (specify)	\$	\$
TOTAL MONTHLY EXPENSES	\$ 2700	\$

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, describe on an attached sheet.

10. Have you spent—or will you be spending—any money for expenses or attorney fees in connection with this lawsuit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, how much? \$

11. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the docket fees for your appeal.

Attorney fees were paid for by a friend

12. State the city and state of your legal residence.

City

State

Your daytime phone number (ex., 415-355-8000)

Your age

Your years of schooling

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ROBERT F. MANSUETO,

Petitioner,

v.

**SUSAN J. BROWN, AS TRUSTEE OF THE EDMUND AND HELEN
MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST,**

Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROBERT F. MANSUETO
Petitioner, In Propria Persona
P.O. Box 3338
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
619-805-0940
robertfmansueto@gmail.com

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Fourteenth Amendment permits a state court to remove a trustee by treating his objections as waived when he filed substantive opposition to an ex parte application, did not meet a later deadline to object to the removal petition, and the deciding judge acknowledged that she had not received and did not have the earlier filing.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner Robert F. Mansueto was the appellant in the California Court of Appeal. Respondent Susan J. Brown, as Trustee of the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, was the respondent below.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No nongovernmental corporation is a party to this proceeding, and no corporate disclosure is required.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

In re the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, San Diego County Superior Court No. 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL; Brown v. Mansueto, California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, No. G066603; and Brown v. Mansueto, Supreme Court of California, No. S296952.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	2
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	3
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	3
RELATED PROCEEDINGS	3
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW	5
JURISDICTION	5

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED	5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	9
CONCLUSION	13
APPENDIX INDEX (APPENDICES A–L)	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545 (1965)	9, 10
Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422 (1982)	9, 10
Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950) ...	9, 10
U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1	5, 9, 11, 12
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	5
Sup. Ct. R. 13	5

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Robert F. Mansueto respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three.

OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW

The California Court of Appeal's unpublished opinion in No. G066603, filed May 7, 2026, is reproduced at Appendix A. The Superior Court's August 13, 2024, trustee-removal order is reproduced at Appendix B. The Supreme Court of California's August 19, 2026, disposition denying review in No. S296952 is reproduced at Appendix C. The Court of Appeal's order denying rehearing is reproduced at Appendix D.

JURISDICTION

The California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, filed its opinion on May 7, 2026 (Appendix A). It later denied Petitioner's timely petition for rehearing on May 20, 2026 (Appendix D). The Supreme Court of California denied discretionary review on August 19, 2026 (Appendix C).

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari is timely as it is filed with the Clerk of this Court within 90 days after the entry of the California Supreme Court's order denying discretionary review.

The federal question presented arises from a severe and structural deprivation of the Appellant's right to procedural Due Process under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The state court unconstitutionally extinguished a vested property interest—a senior, recorded Life Estate and named Co-Trustee title—in a complete clerical vacuum, without an evidentiary hearing, and without the judicial officer ever reviewing or considering the Appellant's timely file-stamped Opposition officially submitted on March 19, 2024.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part: "No State shall ... deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This petition concerns the procedure used to remove Petitioner as co- trustee. The Trust names him First Successor Trustee. On March 19, 2024, Petitioner filed an opposition to an ex parte application that substantively addressed removal. The Court of Appeal held that this filing did not constitute the later written objection required to oppose the underlying removal petition. It also relied on a subsequent warning and an August 1 deadline that Petitioner did not meet. The question is whether the process afforded a meaningful opportunity to be heard when the deciding judge acknowledged that she had not received and did not have the earlier filed opposition. The petition does not seek review of the underlying trust-law and title disputes.

I. THE TRUST EXPRESSLY DESIGNATED PETITIONER AS FIRST SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE.

Edmund and Helen Mansueto established the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust. The governing Trust instrument expressly designated Petitioner Robert F. Mansueto as "First Successor Trustee" and Respondent Susan J. Brown as "Second Successor Trustee." That designation is significant to the consequences of the removal

order, although Petitioner does not ask this Court to decide the ultimate state-law effect of the designation in light of later instruments and orders. (Appendix I.)

II. THE TRUST ALSO ADDRESSED THE SUPPORT OF DISABLED BENEFICIARY JOYCE MANSUETO.

The Trust documents contain provisions addressing the support of the settlors' disabled daughter, Joyce Mansueto, including provisions connecting her support with the family residence. A later Second Amendment also provided that Robert Mansueto and Susan Brown would receive life estates in the residence and that either or both could reside there during life. These provisions are offered as context for the substantial interests affected by Petitioner's removal, not as independent questions for this Court to adjudicate. (Appendices I-J.)

The parties later entered a 2010 Settlement Agreement. Joyce is not identified as a party to that agreement. Petitioner maintains that Joyce had no independent attorney or guardian ad litem participating on her behalf and that Respondent, who was herself a settling party, was serving as Joyce's conservator. Petitioner does not ask this Court to determine the Settlement's validity or Joyce's independent rights. The point is narrower: Petitioner's removal affected a fiduciary structure with consequences extending beyond an ordinary private dispute.

III. PETITIONER FILED SUBSTANTIVE WRITTEN OPPOSITION ON MARCH 19, 2024.

Respondent sought Petitioner's removal as trustee. On March 19, 2024, Petitioner filed an opposition to Respondent's ex parte application. The file-stamped opposition also

addressed the proposed removal and included Trust materials on which Petitioner relied. Pertinent portions are reproduced at Appendix E. Petitioner does not contend that this filing satisfied every later procedural requirement imposed by the Superior Court; the issue is the effect of treating his position as waived without the deciding judge having the earlier submission before her.

Court-generated materials associated with the proceedings reflected an April 26, 2024 setting in Department 502 before Judge John B. Scherling. Those materials are reproduced at Appendix F.

IV. THE APRIL 26 WRITTEN RECORD DOES NOT SHOW AN ADJUDICATION OF PETITIONER'S REMOVAL OPPOSITION.

On April 26, 2024, Petitioner appeared before Judge Scherling in a separate but related proceeding concerning Joyce Mansueto's Special Needs Trust. The official minute order reflects that Judge Scherling consolidated the Special Needs Trust proceeding with Joyce's conservatorship, designated the conservatorship as the lead case, and continued that matter before Judge Olga Alvarez. The minute order does not adjudicate Petitioner's opposition in the trustee-removal matter. Appendix G.

Petitioner recalls additional oral statements concerning why the related matters were before Judge Scherling and their return to Judge Alvarez. Because no reporter's transcript or minute order presently documents those statements, this petition does not rely on them. The petition relies on the written sequence shown by the record.

V. THE DECIDING JUDGE EXPRESSLY ACKNOWLEDGED THAT SHE DID NOT HAVE THE FILED OBJECTION.

When the removal matter came before Judge Alvarez on August 13, 2024, the reporter's transcript records the court stating, 'I did not receive that objection' and 'I don't have it.' The pertinent excerpt is reproduced at Appendix H. The court then treated Petitioner's objections as waived and entered the removal order reproduced at Appendix B.

VI. THE STATE COURTS RELIED ON PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO FILE ANOTHER OBJECTION AFTER THE MARCH 19 FILING.

The Court of Appeal affirmed. It characterized the March 19 filing as opposition to an ex parte application, rather than a written objection to the underlying removal petition. It further explained that Petitioner had been told to file a proper written objection by August 1, 2024, and did not do so. On that basis, it upheld the probate court's treatment of his objections as waived. Appendix A.

The Court of Appeal expressly addressed and rejected Petitioner's federal due-process argument. Appendix A. Petitioner raised that argument in his appellate briefing. The question presented accounts for the later opportunity identified by the Court of Appeal and asks whether the procedure as a whole was constitutionally adequate.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. THE DECISION BELOW PRESENTS A FEDERAL DUE-PROCESS QUESTION CONCERNING A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD.

The Due Process Clause requires notice and an opportunity to be heard appropriate to the nature of the case. *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 313-315 (1950). The opportunity must be meaningful, not merely formal. *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965). And a State may not avoid due-process scrutiny merely because

the deprivation results from operation of its own procedural machinery. See *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 429-437 (1982).

The Court of Appeal found more than a missed deadline: it identified a March 19 filing opposing the ex parte application and a later opportunity to object to the removal petition. The deciding judge's acknowledgment that she did not have the earlier filing raises the due-process question. Petitioner accepts for purposes of this petition that he did not meet the later August 1 deadline. He asks whether the State nevertheless had to account for the filed substantive submission before making waiver dispositive.

The issue is whether the process as a whole afforded a meaningful opportunity to be heard in these circumstances. Petitioner does not assert that filing opposition to an ex parte application automatically excused compliance with a separate deadline for objecting to removal.

II. THE LATER OPPORTUNITY TO FILE ANOTHER OBJECTION DOES NOT NECESSARILY ANSWER THE FEDERAL QUESTION.

The Court of Appeal emphasized that Petitioner was warned in May 2024 and given until August 1 to file a written objection. That fact is important and Petitioner does not minimize it. But it does not fully answer the federal question presented.

The relevant inquiry is whether the procedure, viewed as a whole, afforded a meaningful opportunity to present Petitioner's position before removal. The March 19 opposition substantively addressed removal, but the Court of Appeal found that it did not satisfy the later objection requirement. The assigned judge's statements that she had not

received and did not have that filing are relevant to whether the opportunity remained meaningful in practice. Appendix H.

Armstrong illustrates that due process concerns the meaningfulness of the hearing in context, including whether later procedure can realistically cure an earlier denial. 380 U.S. at 551-552. Logan likewise confirms that a State's procedural system cannot itself be the mechanism by which a protected interest is extinguished without constitutionally adequate process. 455 U.S. at 433-437. The petition therefore asks a limited question about the constitutional boundary between legitimate procedural default and a default materially produced by the court system's failure to place an already-filed opposition before the decisionmaker.

III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROCEDURAL WAIVER WERE SUBSTANTIAL.

The waiver was not used to resolve a minor scheduling matter. It preceded Petitioner's removal from a fiduciary office expressly identified in the settlors' Trust instrument as First Successor Trustee. The underlying Trust also contained provisions concerning disabled beneficiary Joyce Mansueto and the family residence. These circumstances do not themselves decide the federal question, but they underscore why the opportunity to be heard before removal mattered.

Petitioner does not ask this Court to decide who ultimately should serve as trustee, whether the 2010 Settlement is enforceable, whether the Second Amendment controls occupancy, or what rights Joyce independently possesses. Those are matters of state law

and separate proceedings. The requested review concerns only the constitutional adequacy of the procedure used to make waiver dispositive.

**IV. THE CASE IS A SUITABLE VEHICLE BECAUSE THE FEDERAL
QUESTION WAS EXPRESSLY DECIDED AND THE CRITICAL
PROCEDURAL FACT IS IN THE TRANSCRIPT.**

The Court of Appeal expressly addressed the Fourteenth Amendment argument in its opinion. Appendix A. The August 13 transcript records the deciding judge's acknowledgment that she did not receive and did not have the earlier objection. Appendix H. These documents provide the core written record for the question presented.

This petition does not ask the Court to determine which clerk, department, or judge handled the March filing. The record shows that Petitioner filed opposition to the ex parte application (Appendix E); the April 26 minute order does not decide his removal opposition (Appendix G); and Judge Alvarez later stated that she did not have the objection (Appendix H). The Court of Appeal's separate-deadline rationale appears in Appendix A. The Court can assess the federal question on that account without adopting Petitioner's recollection of untranscribed statements.

**V. REVIEW WOULD CLARIFY THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ORDINARY
PROCEDURAL DEFAULT AND DEFAULT CAUSED IN MATERIAL PART BY
THE COURT'S OWN PROCESS.**

States have authority to enforce filing rules. The question here is how due process applies where a filing that substantively addresses removal was in the court system, the

litigant later missed a separate objection deadline, and the deciding judge said she did not have the earlier filing. The petition seeks review of the procedure as a whole.

The distinction matters beyond trust litigation. State courts routinely depend on centralized filing systems, departmental routing, consolidation, reassignment, and electronic or paper docketing. A clear constitutional boundary is warranted where a court treats a matter as unopposed even though substantive opposition was filed and the deciding judge expressly confirms that it never reached her.

Review would clarify how Mullane, Armstrong, and Logan apply to a filed submission that was unavailable to the decisionmaker when a later procedural default became dispositive. The Court of Appeal's opinion provides its rationale, including the separate August 1 deadline; Petitioner asks the Court to assess that rationale under the Fourteenth Amendment.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert F. Mansueto". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Robert" and last name "Mansueto" clearly legible.

ROBERT F. MANSUETO
Petitioner, In Propria Persona
P.O. Box 3338
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
619-805-0940
robertfmansueto@gmail.com
September 25, 2026

APPENDIX INDEX

Appendices Supporting the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Emergency Application for Stay

1. **Appendix A:** California Court of Appeal opinion, No. G066603, May 7, 2026
2. **Appendix B:** San Diego County Superior Court trustee-removal order, August 13, 2024
3. **Appendix C:** Supreme Court of California order denying review, No. S296952, August 19, 2026
4. **Appendix D:** California Court of Appeal order denying rehearing, No. G066603, May 20, 2026
5. **Appendix E:** Pertinent portions of file-stamped opposition to ex parte application, March 19, 2024
6. **Appendix F:** Court-generated Department 502 hearing or routing material concerning April 26, 2024
7. **Appendix G:** Minute order in related Special Needs Trust proceeding, April 26, 2024
8. **Appendix H:** Pertinent excerpt of reporter's transcript from removal hearing, August 13, 2024
9. **Appendix I:** Pertinent pages of the First Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust identifying the successor trustees and provisions concerning Joyce Mansueto's care and residence
10. **Appendix J:** Second Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated May 11, 2008, including the provision granting life estates to Robert Mansueto and Susan Brown

11. **Appendix K:** San Diego County Superior Court Probate Examiner Notes generated September 2, 2026, concerning the Petition to Enforce Trust Directive (ROA No. 421), subsequently continued to May 26, 2027

12. **Appendix L:** Signed declaration of Robert F. Mansueto authenticating photographic exhibits documenting physical alteration of the Trust Residence in February 2026 and August 2026

Appendix to Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Emergency Stay Application

Appendix	Document
1. A	California Court of Appeal opinion, No. G066603, filed May 7, 2026
2. B	San Diego County Superior Court co-trustee removal minute order, No. 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL, August 13, 2024
3. C	California Court of Appeal order denying rehearing, No. G066603, filed May 20, 2026
4. D	Supreme Court of California order denying review, No. S296952, August 19, 2026
5. E	Pertinent portions of March 19, 2024 file-stamped co-trustee opposition in joint trust case No. 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL
6. F	Court-issued Notice of Hearing-“Petition for Removal (Trusts) , No. 37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL, (Hearing Date: April 26, 2024, Dept. 502, before Judge John B. Scherling)
7. G	Court Minute Order (Dated: April 26, 2024) – Consolidating Special Needs Trust Case No. 37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL with Lead Conservatorship Case No. 37-2008-00152628-PR-CP-CTL and Continuing All Pending Petitions Before Judge Olga Alvarez
8. H	Pertinent excerpt of the August 13, 2024, removal-hearing reporter’s transcript

Appendix

Document

- 9. I** Pertinent Trust pages of the First Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust -Pertinent Provisions Specifying Successor Trustees and Mandating Joyce Mansueto's Care and Right to Residence
- 10. J** Second Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, May 11, 2008, including the provision granting life estates to Robert Mansueto and Susan Brown.
- 11. K** San Diego County Superior Court Probate Examiner Notes, Generated September 2, 2026, for the Trust Enforcement Petition (ROA No. 421), Subsequently Continued to May 26, 2027
- 12. L** Signed Personal Declaration of Robert F. Mansueto Authenticating Photographic Exhibits of Trust Residence Interior and Exterior Physical Destruction (Photos Taken February 2026 and August 2026)

APPENDIX A

California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District,
Division Three, Opinion in No. G066603
(Filed May 7, 2026)

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

SUSAN J. BROWN, as Trustee, etc.,

Respondent,

v.

ROBERT F. MANSUETO,

Appellant.

G0666603

(Super. Ct. No. 37-2008-00152252)

OPINION

Appeal from an order of the Superior Court of San Diego County,
Olga Alvarez, Judge. Affirmed. Motion for sanctions. Denied. Requests for
judicial notice. Denied.

Robert F. Mansueto, in pro. per., for Appellant.

Buchalter, Robert M. Dato: Greenberg Traurig, LLP and
Catherine Swafford for Respondent

Appellant Robert F. Mansueto (Brother) appeals from an order granting the petition of respondent Susan J. Brown (Sister) and removing him as cotrustee of their parents' trust. We conclude the trial court permissibly found Brother waived any objection to the petition by failing to file an objection and instead merely opposing an ex parte application. Accordingly, we affirm.

FACTS

The parties to this case are siblings whose parents died in 2006 and 2008. The parties settled previous litigation over their parents' trust by agreeing to serve as cotrustees of the trust and permitting Brother to live in their parents' former home with his family so long as he complied with the agreement. Brother further agreed to pay \$400,000 to Sister by January 2014, secured by the parents' former home.¹

Over the years, Brother made various payments but as the due date approached, more than half the total remained outstanding. The parties agreed to extend the time for payment to January 2019. Brother made more

¹ Brother requests we take judicial notice of the 2010 settlement agreement, the order granting entry of stipulated judgment against him and in Sister's favor, Brother's opposition to Sister's ex parte application, a notice of hearing, an April 9, 2024 minute order authorizing Sister to evict Brother and sell the property, and the order challenged by this appeal. That request is denied, as these documents are either already a part of the record on appeal or are irrelevant to the appeal. Brother also separately requests we take judicial notice of excerpts from the underlying trust and 2010 settlement agreement. That request is also denied for the same reasons we denied the first request. Brother also requests we take judicial notice of certain orders entered by the trial court after the order that is the subject of this appeal. That request is also denied, as those orders have no relevance to the dispute in this appeal. Shortly before oral argument, Brother also filed a Notice of Subsequent Developments Relevant to Pending Appeal. This document does not include a request for any sort of relief; we take no action in response to it.

payments but did not pay the full amount by the due date, at which time \$66,778.23 remained due. At that point, interest and late fees began accruing according to the terms of the agreement. By February 2024, Brother owed Sister \$111,297.04.

Sister filed a new petition seeking orders removing Brother as cotrustee of the parents' trust, authorizing Sister to evict any occupants of their parents' former home, and awarding attorney fees.

Sister filed an ex parte application seeking suspension of Brother's trustee powers in February 2024, though the application itself is not in the record. Brother opposed the ex parte, arguing his parents did not want the house to be sold, that he needed to live in the home to care for the parties' disabled sister (not a party to this case),² that the underlying settlement should be set aside, that Sister violated the settlement agreement, and that there was no emergency justifying ex parte relief. The trial court granted the application and suspended Brother's cotrustee powers.

At a May 2024 initial hearing on the petition, the trial court noted no written objections to the petition had yet been filed and warned Brother that "if he fail[ed] to serve and file a timely objection or response by 08/01/2024, the Court may deem such objection or response waived." The court continued the hearing for nearly three months.

At the August 2024 hearing, the trial court found Brother failed to file a written objection. The court told the parties it had previously set a deadline for written objections and had not received a written objection. Brother asked for a continuance, explaining he believed he had filed

² The record shows the parties' disabled sister presently lives in a managed care facility, but Brother also contended she should be moved to live in the home with him.

objections in the body of a separate petition he had previously filed against Sister, describing it as "excusable neglect" on his part. He denied understanding that there was a deadline for the filing of written objections. The trial court then placed Brother under oath and asked him why he did not file timely written objections. Brother responded that he was overwhelmed by his various responsibilities relating to the trust and the parties' disabled sister. The trial court found there was no mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, and deemed the objections waived.

Accordingly, the trial court granted Sister's petition, removed Brother as cotrustee of the trust, permitted Sister to evict any remaining occupants of the parents' former home, and awarded attorney fees to Sister in an amount to be determined.

DISCUSSION

Orders removing a trustee are reviewed for abuse of discretion. (*Trolan v. Trolan* (2019) 31 Cal.App.5th 939, 957.) Regardless of the standard of review, we presume the trial court's decision is correct; it is the appellant's burden to demonstrate via an adequate record that the trial court erred. (*Jameson v. Desta* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 594, 608–609 (*Jameson*).) If the record on appeal is inadequate to evaluate the merits of an issue raised by the appellant, "the appellant defaults and the decision of the trial court should be affirmed." (*Id.* at p. 609.)

Objections to petitions in probate court are governed by Probate Code section 1043. Subdivision (b) of that section allows objections to be raised orally at the initial hearing and allows the trial court to grant a continuance for the purpose of allowing an objection to be made in writing. "If the court continues a matter to allow a written objection or response to be made, and the responding or objecting party fails to serve and file a timely

objection or response, the court may deem the objections or responses waived." (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 7.801.) That is what happened here.

We disagree with Brother's claim that he effectively objected to the petition by opposing the ex parte application. He cites no authority for this proposition and we find none. An opposition to an ex parte application in probate court is not the same as an opposition to the underlying petition, in the same way that an opposition to a request for a temporary restraining order is not a substitute for an answer to the underlying complaint. Brother's opposition is unambiguously and expressly directed to Sister's ex parte application, not to the petition.

Moreover, the timeline does not support appellant's version of events. Brother filed his opposition to the ex parte application in March 2024. The trial court informed Brother that he had not filed an objection to the petition on May 21, 2024, and set a deadline for him to do so, warning him of the consequences of failing to meet it: "the Court may deem such objection or response waived." Had Brother believed his opposition adequately objected to the petition, he could have said so at that time. The court even continued the hearing on the petition from May to August. Yet at the final hearing, Brother still did not assert his opposition was a sufficient objection, instead suggesting that his objection was contained in a separate petition he filed against Sister (a contention he has not raised before this court) and requesting a further continuance to fix this "defect," which he argued was the result of his being "overwhelmed" by responsibilities relating to the trust and

his disabled sister.³ The trial court acted well within its authority by “deem[ing] the objections or responses waived.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 7.801.)

Briefly in the “Introduction” section of his opening brief, Brother asserts the parties’ disabled sister will be adversely affected by the trial court’s ruling, potentially in violation of one or more trust provisions. He neither raised this below nor supports it with a meaningful legal basis and citations to the record. (See *Jameson*, *supra*, 5 Cal.5th at p. 609.)

The only remaining issue is Sister’s motion for sanctions. Sanctions for a frivolous appeal are appropriate where either “it is prosecuted for an improper motive—to harass the respondent or delay the effect of an adverse judgment—or when it indisputably has no merit—when any reasonable attorney would agree that the appeal is totally and completely without merit.” (*In re Marriage of Flaherty* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 637, 650.) These two standards buttress each other: for example, “the total lack of merit of an appeal is viewed as evidence that [the] appellant must have intended it only for delay.” (*Id.* at p. 649.)

Sister argues this appeal meets either standard for a frivolous appeal. She points out that Brother was expressly directed to file a proper opposition by a date certain, was warned that failure to do so might lead to the trial court granting her petition, and yet now appeals anyway. Sister also points to Brother’s repeated petitions for supersedeas, all of which were

³ For the same reasons, we disagree with Brother’s contention that the trial court violated either his due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, section 7 of the California Constitution, or Probate Code sections 15612 and 17200.

denied, as evidence of appellant's subjective intent to utilize the appellate process for the illegitimate purpose of delay.

This is a close call, but we decline to impose sanctions. We see a genuine effort by Brother to overturn the trial court's decision that confuses procedural devices but is not wholly unreasonable. Similarly, any inference of delay from Brother's repeated supersedeas petitions is rebutted by his motion for calendar preference—a request to *speed up* this proceeding.

DISPOSITION

The trial court's order is affirmed.

Respondent shall recover her costs on appeal.

SCOTT, J.

WE CONCUR:

SANCHEZ, ACTING P. J.

GOODING, J.

APPENDIX B

San Diego Superior Court

In re the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust

Case No. 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL

Co-Trustee Removal Minute Order

August 13, 2024

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 08/13/2024

TIME: 9:00 AM

DEPT: 503

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Olga Alvarez

CLERK: Bianca Leon-Alvarez

REPORTER/ERM: Amanda Valenzuela;
14196

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT:

CASE NO: 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL CASE INIT.DATE: 09/25/2008

CASE TITLE: In re the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31,
1999, as amended [IMAGED]

CASE CATEGORY: Probate

CASE TYPE: Trust Proceedings

HEARING TYPE: Miscellaneous Hearing

MOVING PARTY: Robert Frank Mansueto

APPEARANCES

Attorney Catherine Swafford appearing in person on behalf of Objector, Susan Brown, present via
video.

Robert Mansueto, self represented Petitioner, present in person.

Clerk's note: The Court takes ROA#144 off calendar upon all parties agreeing to the request by
Mr. Masueto to take matter off calendar.

ROA#144 Petition to Compel Co-Trustee to Transfer Property to Beneficiaries in Order to Finalize
Payment Per Prior Court Order, Distribute Sole Trust Asset to Remainder Beneficiaries filed by Robert
Frank Masueto on 09/11/2023 is off calendar.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Olga Alvarez

Judge Olga Alvarez

CASE TITLE: In re the Edmund Mansueto and Helen
Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31, 1999, as
amended [IMAGED]

CASE NO: 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL

-
4. Robert Mansueto is removed as co-trustee of the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31, 1991.
 5. Susan Brown, as trustee of the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31, 1991, may take all steps necessary to effectuate an unlawful detainer or eviction of occupants of the real property of the Trust, including specifically the real property located at 57 Tunapuna Lane, Coronado, California 92118, as part of the Court's prior order that Susan Brown be permitted to sell the real property;
 6. Susan Brown is awarded attorneys' fees and costs against Robert Mansueto, individually, in an amount to be determined by the Court
 7. Alternatively, Susan Brown is awarded attorneys' fees and costs from the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31, 1991, in an amount to be determined by the Court.
- IT IS SO ORDERED.

Olga Alvarez

Judge Olga Alvarez

APPENDIX C

California Court of Appeal

Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

Brown v. Mansueto, No. G066603

Order Denying Rehearing

Filed May 20, 2026

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

SUSAN J. BROWN, as Trustee, etc.,

Respondent,

v.

ROBERT F. MANSUETO,

Appellant.

G066603

(Super. Ct. No. 37-2008-00152252)

ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR REHEARING

The petition for rehearing is DENIED.

SCOTT, J.

WE CONCUR:

SANCHEZ, ACTING P. J.

GOODING, J.

APPENDIX D

Supreme Court of California order denying review,
No. S296952, August 19, 2026

Appellate Courts Case Information

Supreme Court

Change court



Case Summary

Docket

Briefs

Disposition

Parties and Attorneys

Lower Court

Disposition

BROWN v. MANSUETO

Division SF

Case Number S296952

Only the following dispositions are displayed below: Orders Denying Petitions, Orders Granting Rehearing and Opinions. Go to the Docket Entries screen for information regarding orders granting review.

Case Citation: none

Date	Description
08/19/2026	Petition for review denied

[Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.](#)

APPENDIX E

Pertinent Portions of Filed Stamped

March 19, 2024, Opposition to Trustee Removal

1 ROBERT F MANSUETO
2 57 TUNAPUNA LANE
3 CORONADO, CA 92118
4 T: 619) 884-5352
5 E-Mail: robertfmansueto@gmail.com

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court

MAR 19 2024

By: A. Arellano-Bell

In Pro Per

6
7 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

9 In the Matter of

10 EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN
11 MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST

Case # 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL
ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES
HON. OLGA ALVAREZ
DEPT. 502

14 CO-TRUSTEE ROBERT MANSUETO
15 OPPOSITIN TO EX PARTE APPLICATION
16 FOR REMOVAL AS CO TRUSTEE

17 Judge: Hon. Olga Alvarez
18 Dept: 503
Date: April 9, 2024
Time: 10:30 a.m.

19 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
20

21 Plaintiff ROBERT F. MANSUETO ("Plaintiff") submits this opposition to the Ex Parte
22 Application ("Application" or "Ap") of Defendants Susan J Brown that was scheduled a full
23 month in advance, for a mere few weeks before a Case Management conference set by Judge
Alvarez over two months ago for May 6, 2024.

24 There are a myriad of issues now before two judges, with previously concealed evidence that
25 resurfaced that include the firm desires of Trustor Helen Mansueto stated in Amendment
26 dated May 11, 2008 and video of session with her Attorney Robert Plumb of signing of said
27 Amendment stating her firm wishes that her home not be sold and that it stay in the family,
28 that was concealed from this court by Defendant, which
is now before Judge Alvarez requesting Instructions on concealed Amendment by
Helen Mansueto on May 11, 2008, (EXHIBIT 1) with video recording at direction of

1 Attorney Robert Plumb (EXHIBIT 2) attached flash drive, with Helen Mansueto) is critical
2 evidence as to the validity of previously obtained settlement agreement obtained under false
3 pretense at a minimum, and possibly fraudulent concealment, depending on a ruling and
4 guidance requested in a Petition before Honorable Judge Alvarez currently (set for hearing on
5 May 21, 2024). Transcription of Helen Mansueto's video is attached
6 (EXHIBIT 3). The court can hear from Helen Mansueto herself, her wishes and desires reviewed
7 in advance with Attorney Plumb and stated in Amendment dated May 11, 2008. Also on same
8 flash drive is disabled sister Joyce Mansueto video testimony.

9 Attached recent video testimony by disabled sister Joyce Mansueto (also on EXHIBIT 2 flash
10 drive) and Transcription of same (EXHIBIT 4) states in her own words, how Defendant has
11 ignored her disabled sister and forced her to stay in undesirable situations and also states her
12 desire to move back home, which was the desire of Grantors Helen and Edmund Mansueto, as
13 would any parent for their child. The moaning of a critically ill patient 4 feet away from
14 disabled sister on the other side of a curtain can be heard through Joyce Mansueto's video
15 testimony, demonstrating how inappropriate it is for Joyce Mansueto, a moderately mentally
16 disabled person, to be forced to stay in these types of facilities, when she belongs at the family
17 home with a caring family member, who has looked after her since 1976.

18 This second critical issues before Judge Scherling that is inextricably linked to our parents
19 Family Trust, are the clear and firm desires of grantors to provide long term residence and
20 care for disabled sister Joyce Mansueto, daughter of Helen and Edmund Mansueto, that is the
21 topic of Special Needs Trust Petition before Honorable Judge John Scherling with a hearing
22 scheduled on 4/26/24 (EXHIBIT 5).

23 Defendant further attempted to extort Plaintiff via email on Christmas Eve morning
24 (EXHIBIT 6) with further action by California Dental Board Personnel if he filed a
25 Special Need Trust Petition when she learned that a petition was being prepared. This
26 information and extortion attempt is also before Judge Scherling.

27 Defendant characterizes the need to properly look after disabled sister as "Frivolous Filing"
28 when in fact it was prompted by repeated cruelty and indifference by Defendant, towards
disabled sister in what appears to be her desire to control finances allocated to this Trust.
Petition before Judge Scherling requests immediate removal of Susan Brown as sole conservator
and Trustee, and requests a court appointed receiver and interim conservator to assess assets of
Special Needs Trusts, order an audit of assets, income and expenses of Special Need Trust,
concealed from any outside party to date, and request to move disabled sister to family home
which is in her best interest as soon as possible, versus her being forced by Defendant to be
warehoused in various inappropriate facilities that has been downright cruel, when the family
home is where her long term wellbeing would best be served, with her brother (Plaintiff) and a
caretaker assisting, which was her parents' wishes stated to him over the years. Online

1 reviews of last Skilled nursing facility disabled sister was forced to stay in by Defendant for
2 many months in Lemon Grove, has horrible reviews online (EXHIBIT 7) that Plaintiff agrees
3 with, yet disabled sister was forced to stay there for prolong time by Defendant without any
4 medical necessity, with Defendant stating that Insurance pays for it", so "Don't Call me
5 anymore" I'm blocking your calls...I'll let you know if I need your help".

6 Plaintiff, a dental surgeon and reconstructive dentist of over 40 years. Former Naval Officer
7 (Dentist) , honorably discharged (EXHIBIT 8) extremely fluent in pharmacology and medicine,
8 in practice with Medical doctors in Tijuana, where he is a licensed dental surgeon for many
9 years (EXHIBIT 9) after a 30 year career in California including as a dentist in the U.S. Navy,
10 yet he has been precluded from interacting with disabled sisters medical doctors who change
11 often, as "he is not her conservator

12 Any new medical provider cannot possibly ascertain 50 plus years of complex medical history,
13 past drug toxicity issues and syndromes, in a short interview of a moderately schizophrenic
14 individual such as Joyce Mansueto, who gets along with and cooperates well with her brother
15 (Plaintiff), who both desire she move back into the family home with him. And a caretaker,
16 likely the same person, Patty Ramirez seen in video who looked after Helen and Edmund
17 Mansueto for many years.)

18 Defendant also obtained Trusteeship and conservatorship in a dubious manner (as Plaintiff
19 was previously named as disabled sisters trustee (EXHIBIT 10): Certification page of Special
20 Needs Trust and EIN # from the IRS) naming Plaintiff, Robert Mansueto, as Joyce
21 Mansueto's Trustee months before Defendant somehow assumed this position without
22 Plaintiff's knowledge or consent. Plaintiff had looked after his disabled sister since 1976, a
23 block away from her and his parents, whereas Defendant is 500 miles away, has no medical or
24 pharmacology background nor ability to provide medical providers with the complex medical
25 and prescription drug history, including toxicity and undesirable syndromes induced from
26 certain medications, yet she continues to direct the needs of disabled sister from 500 miles
27 away, without seeing nor being present, which has caused unnecessary emotional and physical
28 harm to disabled sister, to remain in control of funds coming in Special Needs trust our
Fathers U.S. Retirement Survivor Benefits and Social Security Disability income.

Plaintiff has tried to ameliorate terrible circumstances thrust upon his disabled sister by
Defendant from 500 miles away, only to have his efforts and communications blocked by
Defendant who makes decisions not based on what best serves disabled sisters needs and
welfare, but rather to retain and embellish Defendant's financial control of Trust assets, that to
date have been concealed. Defendant Susan Brown, is the same person that did not even attend
her own Fathers funeral nor visit her own mother in her
last few months of life. For any rational person to believe that Defendant who rarely visits her
disabled sister, somehow cares about her the best welfare for her disabled sister or does what is
in her best interest, is just not believable.

1 Based on information and belief, Defendant worked with Dental Board Enforcement
2 Personnel in 2016, at a time when Plaintiff's wife was in critical condition which she did in fact
3 pass away from in August 2016, to assist in causing Plaintiff to be arrested for driving patients
4 to Mexico for dental care, being charged with unlawful practice in California when dental care
5 was provided in Mexico, where Plaintiff has been legal since 2010.

6 Defendant had previously filed complaint against Plaintiff (her brother) with California
7 dental Board (5 years after he left practice in California) without having any capacity as she
8 was never a patient of his. Defendant worked in State Government in Sacramento her entire
9 working career and contributed to charges being sought against her brother from Dental
10 Board enforcement personnel in Sacramento, to encourage he be arrested and jailed for
11 providing dental services in Mexico, because he drove patients from San Diego to Tijuana
12 and back. She was successful with this endeavor.

13 The malice and deceit of Defendant towards all other family members, including her own
14 brother, (Plaintiff) her disregard for her own parents, and disabled sister are truly deplorable.
15 Plaintiff did in fact share his incarceration at the hands of the California Dental Board with
16 this court, for driving patients to and from Mexico, but treaded lightly on Defendant's
17 involvement. Defendant's attempt to inflict any possible harm, apparently to facilitate her long
18 standing desire to sell her parents' home by any means, and gain unconscionable undue
19 enrichment.

20 Plaintiff had just unexpectedly lost his wife in 2016, a mere few years after the suicide of his
21 first son Bobby Jr, and was psychologically compromised and heavily medicated at the time
22 when he was talked into pleading to something he was not guilty of, in 2018, with a promise
23 by counsel of "no time would likely be given" which was patently false.

24 There is no emergency here in this Petition. There is no declaration of good cause, and no
25 potential irreparable harm to Defendant, no immediate danger, nor any statutory basis for
26 granting ex parte relief of the myriad of complex matters presented by Defendant now before
27 two judges in San Diego Probate Court. New evidence presented to the court in April 2024,
28 just prior to this current ex parte application, should very likely invalidate the prior
settlement agreement made in 2010 in its entirety and cause all payments made by Plaintiff
(\$333,222 paid in good faith out of \$400,000 thought to be owed) to be returned at a minimum,
as they were obtained by settlement obtained under false pretenses and at a minimum.

The Special Needs trust Petition before Honorable Judge Scherling is inextricably linked
to the parent Trust proceeding as Grantor's intended disabled sister to, always be
cared for by Special Needs Sub Trust and by her brother, with the family home always to be
there for her as well to live in. Defendant does not want the truth exposed, so submitting a
250-(two hundred fifty) pages of mostly irrelevant material to the court to review for an ex
parte hearing appears to be an attempt to short circuit and quickly end

1 this dispute in favor of Defendant for her own financial gain. Granting such relief at an ex
2 parte hearing that would completely ignore and take away wishes of Trust Grantor Helen
3 Mansueto, while also taking away all beneficial interest of all other family members involved,
4 (including a 74 year old moderately disabled sister for which trust property was always
5 intended by Grantors to be a safe haven for her (as well as all other family members including
6 grandchildren, who lived with both their grandparents for a couple years and moved in as a
7 family with their grandmother for several years after their Grandfather passed away)
8 Disabled sister could not directly named as beneficiary other than via Special Needs trust.

9 Further to above, if prior settlement agreement was valid, Defendants' non-cooperation with
10 court ordered bank financing from 2010 by simple assumption of credit line in place of
11 residence was available from existing Bank of America Credit Line in place
12 (EXHIBIT 11) but Defendant refused co-operation from 2010 to present with any "signing of
13 any papers" as ordered by this court to be used for 50% of settlement in 2010, until "I am paid
14 in full". It now appears that nothing was rightfully owed her at all.

15 A more recent loan approval from a private finance company for up to \$150,000 was provided
16 to defendants counsel in December 2023. (EXHIBIT 12) along with verbal offer to settle, which
17 was ignored and not responded to by defendants counsel. An approximate \$67,000 was thought
18 to be owed, with \$110,000 at maximum but for Defendants long standing breach which
19 prompted initial petition. A full price, all cash offer was presented to Defendants Counsel in
20 letter dated 02/02/2024, in an effort to keep peace in the family, and not responded to
21 (EXHIBIT 13) All attempts to get co-operation on financing were blocked by Defendant from
22 2010 to present. Multiple offers including multiple full price all cash offers were made and
23 either refused or not responded to by Defendant or her counsel, in a long standing pattern of
24 bad faith and malice.

25 The facts and circumstances surrounding this dispute have not yet been heard nor seen by
26 Judge Alvarez, and the entire landscape has now changed since the reappearance of concealed
27 Amendment by Helen Mansueto executed on May 11, 2008 that include video of this session
28 with her attorney Robert Plumb who is also willing to testify before the court, as to the validity
of Helen Mansueto's wishes and her competent state of mind at the time.

Defendants ex parte Application must be also denied because it is procedurally
improper. The California Rules of Court, rule 3.1202 (c) requires an ex parte applicant to file a
declaration showing good cause for ex parte relief, and Defendant has failed to provide one.
The declaration of Susan Brown filed in support of their Application is full
of misstatements and fails to acknowledge that Defendant has been in constant breach of
Settlement agreement that in and of itself, was obtained under false pretenses and or
concealment (possibly fraudulent concealment) that Plaintiff made payments totaling
approximately 90-% (ninety percent) of settlement agreement now in doubt, without any
cooperation from Defendant with any Bank financing and "signing of any needed

1 Verification:

2
3 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the above
4 submission in opposition to Ex Parte Application is true and correct to the best of my ability.

5 Signed this 18th day of March, 2024

6
7 
8 Robert F Mansueto, In Pro Per

APPENDIX F

Court-issued Notice of Hearing-“Petition for Removal (Trusts),
Case No. 37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL, (Hearing Date:
April 26, 2024, Dept. 502, before Judge John B. Scherling)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

STREET ADDRESS: 1100 Union St.
MAILING ADDRESS: 1100 Union St.
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Diego, CA 92101
BRANCH NAME: Central
TELEPHONE NUMBER: (619) 844-2052

PLAINTIFF(S)/PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANT(S): Robert Frank Mansueto

DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S):

In re the Trust of: In The Matter of The Joyce Mansueto Special Needs Living Trust [IMAGED]

NOTICE OF HEARING

CASE NUMBER:
37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL

Notice is given that the above-entitled case has been set for the reason listed below and at the location shown above. All inquiries regarding this notice should be referred to the court listed above.

TYPE OF HEARING

Petition for Removal (Trusts)

DATE

04/26/2024

TIME

09:00 am

DEPT

502

JUDGE

John B Scherling

Court appearances may be made either in person or virtually, unless otherwise ordered by the Court. Virtual appearances must be made using the department's Microsoft Teams ("MS Teams") video link; or by calling the department's MS Teams conference phone number and using the assigned conference ID number. The MS Teams video conference links and phone numbers can be found at www.sdcourt.ca.gov/ProbateHearings.

ROA#1-Petition for Removal of Trustee filed by Mansueto, Robert Frank on 01/24/2024

APPENDIX G

Pertinent minute order of Judge John B. Scherling

In related proceeding,

Dated April 26, 2024

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 04/26/2024

TIME 9:00 AM

DEPT 502

JUDICIAL OFFICER: John B. Scherling
CLERK: Lorena Alvarez
REPORTER/ERM: Not Reported
BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT:

CASE NO: 37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL CASE INIT DATE 01/24/2024
CASE TITLE: In The Matter of The Joyce Mansueto Special Needs Living Trust [(IMAGED)]
CASE CATEGORY: Probate CASE TYPE: Trust Proceedings

HEARING TYPE: Petition for Removal
MOVING PARTY: Robert Frank Mansueto

APPEARANCES

Robert Frank Mansueto, self represented Petitioner, present in person
Attorney Courtney Bravo appearing in person on behalf of Objector, Susan Brown, present in person

ROA#1 - PETITION FOR REMOVAL OF SUSAN BROWN AS TRUSTEE OF THE JOYCE MANSUETO SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST, AN ACCOUNTING, AND APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER OR TEMPORARY TRUSTEE Filed: 01/24/2024 is continued pursuant to party's motion to 7/30/2024 at 09:00 AM before Judge Alvarez, Olga.

The Court orders as follows:

1. The Court orders the following cases consolidated for all purposes: 37-2008-00152628-PR-CP-CTL (Conservatorship of Joyce L. Mansueto) and 37-2024-00002995-PR-TR-CTL (The Matter of The Joyce Mansueto Special Needs Living Trust). The Court designates 37-2008-00152628-PR-CP-CTL (Conservatorship of Joyce L. Mansueto) as the lead case and all further documents must be filed under the case number and caption of the lead case.

IT IS SO ORDERED

John B. Scherling

Judge John B. Scherling

DATE 04/26/2024

MINUTE ORDER

Page 1

APPENDIX H

Pertinent excerpt of the August 13, 2024, removal-hearing
Reporter's Transcript

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

DEPARTMENT 503

HON. OLGA ALVAREZ, JUDGE

SUSAN J. BROWN, as Trustee, etc.,

Respondent.

v.

ROBERT F. MANSUETO,

Appellant.

CASE No. 37-2008

00152252-PR-TR-CTL

COA No. D085004

REPORTER'S APPEAL TRANSCRIPT

AUGUST 13, 2024

VOLUME 1 of 1

PAGES 1 THROUGH 24

so that way Ms. Brown can hear you.

Is there anyone else on Microsoft Teams present for this matter, other than Ms. Brown?

All right. So let's see where we are. I have a few notes to myself on this. So it looks like -- I'm going to go through it a bit methodically because I've got three petitions before me.

I've got ROA 201; it looks like there was an objection deadline. I did not receive that objection deadline by you, Mr. Mansueto. I don't have it. The Court's inclination this morning on ROA 201 is to grant, just given where that is.

The next matter before the Court is ROA 144,

55

APPENDIX I

Excerpts of the First Amendment to the Edmund and Helen
Mansueto Joint Living Trust –
Provisions Specifying Successor Trustees and Mandating Joyce
Mansueto's Care and Right to Residence

EXHIBIT ⁰²⁵ I

**OCTOBER 30, 2003, RESTATEMENT AND
AMENDMENT OF**

The Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto
Joint Living Trust Dated August 31, 1999

NAMES OF SETTLORS: EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO

DATE TRUST RESTATEMENT SIGNED: OCTOBER 30, 2003

NAME OF TRUST: EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999

NAMES OF INITIAL TRUSTEES: EDMUND MANSUETO and HELEN MANSUETO

NAMES OF SUCCESSOR TRUSTEES: SEE "ARTICLE SIXTH"

PLEASE READ, IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

It is important to remember that assets will not be distributed according to this trust unless the assets are transferred into the trust. Therefore, do not forget to have the title to all of your assets in the name of the trust. At the time you acquire another asset be sure to title it in the name of the trust. The title of your assets transferred into the trust should have the following name:

"EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO AS TRUSTEES OF EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999"

During the life times of the Trustors (if the Trustor is also the Trustee) there is no requirement for the trust to obtain a special tax identification number. Also, the trust does not have to file a separate income tax return during the lifetime of the Trustor. DO NOT WRITE ON OR CHANGE THIS TRUST AGREEMENT WITHOUT THE HELP OF AN ATTORNEY.

Should you sign a document transferring the assets of the trust, such as a check, deed or other document it must be signed as follows:

"EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO AS TRUSTEES OF EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999"

This trust was prepared by:

SECKELMAN & ASSOCIATES
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
5190 GOVERNOR DRIVE, SUITE 208
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92122-2849
Telephone: (858) 535-1879
E-mail: jb.legal@irsllaw.org

THIS PAGE IS NOT A PART OF THE TRUST

either Susan Brown - or -

Alfred my interest? Why needed? 041

appraise the settlors' residence. The parties may, if so inclined, agree in writing upon the fair market value to be used for the house without an appraisal. Once fair market value is determined, by appraisal or written agreement, ROBERT MANSUETO shall have the opportunity to purchase the interest in the settlors' residence which would otherwise be distributed to SUSAN BROWN under the terms of this trust, taking into account, if the residence is the principal trust asset, that portion which will be required to support JOYCE MANSUETO. Such purchase by ROBERT MANSUETO may be through a sub-trust or another separate trust specially created for this purpose, with the residence remaining inside the trust or sub-trust so created. Should ROBERT MANSUETO exercise any right of disclaimer of interest in the trust or sub-trust the interest so disclaimed shall be distributed to the children of ROBERT MANSUETO according to the terms of this trust.

What about debt Robert owns property?

What if he disposes in full of this property

SIXTH: The following provisions shall apply to the trust estate and to each trust under this agreement:

SECTION 1: If income or discretionary amounts of principal become payable to a minor or to a person under legal disability or to a person who, by reason of illness or mental or physical disability, is in the opinion of the trustee unable properly to manage his or her affairs, then that income or principal shall be paid or expended only in such of the following ways as the trustee deems best: (a) directly to the beneficiary or his or her attorney in fact; (b) to the legally appointed guardian or conservator of the beneficiary; (c) to a custodian for the beneficiary under a Uniform Transfers or Gifts to Minors Act; (d) by the trustee directly for the benefit of the beneficiary; (e) to an adult relative or friend in reimbursement for amounts properly advanced for the benefit of the beneficiary.

\$140,000

SECTION 2: The interests of beneficiaries in principal or income shall not be subject to the claims of any creditor, any spouse for alimony or support, or others, or to legal process, and may not be voluntarily or involuntarily alienated or encumbered. This provision shall not limit the exercise of any power of appointment.

What's Mom's & Dad's intent?

The rights of beneficiaries to withdraw trust property are personal and may not be exercised by a guardian, conservator, attorney in fact or others.

SECTION 3: Income received after the last income payment date and undistributed at the termination of any estate or interest shall, together with any accrued income, be paid by the trustee as income to the persons entitled to the next successive interest in the proportions in which they take that interest, except that upon the death of the deceased settlor the

substantially impair accomplishment of the purposes of the trust. The trustee shall terminate and forthwith distribute any trust created hereby, or by exercise of a power of appointment hereunder, and still held 21 years after the death of the last to die of the settlors and the beneficiaries in being at the death of the deceased settlor. Distribution under this section shall be made to the persons then entitled to receive or have the benefit of the income from the trust in the proportions in which they are entitled thereto, or if their interests are indefinite, then in equal shares.

SECTION 10: Any trustee may resign at any time by written notice to the settlors during their joint lifetime and thereafter to each beneficiary then entitled to receive or have the benefit of the income from the trust.

In the event one settlor should become unwilling or unable to act as trustee, the remaining settlor may act as sole trustee, without any further action required on his or her part, with all the powers given the originally named trustees.

In the event both settlors should become unwilling or unable to act as trustees, the following named individuals shall become trustees, with all the powers given the originally named trustees, in the order hereinbelow, as follows:

First Successor Trustee: ROBERT MANSUETO

Second Successor Trustee: SUSAN BROWN

In case of the resignation, refusal or inability to act of any successor trustee acting or appointed to act hereunder, the settlors during their joint lifetime and thereafter the beneficiary or a majority in interest of the beneficiaries then entitled to receive or have the benefit of the income from the trust shall appoint as successor trustee a bank or trust company qualified to accept trusts.

Every successor trustee shall have all the powers given an originally named trustee. No successor trustee shall be personally liable for any act or omission of any predecessor. With the approval of the settlors during their joint lifetime and thereafter of the beneficiary or a majority in interest of the beneficiaries then entitled to receive or have the benefit of the income from the trust, a successor trustee may accept the account rendered and the property received as a full and complete discharge to a predecessor trustee without incurring any liability for so doing, except that a successor to a settlor as trustee shall without approval accept the assets delivered to the successor trustee as constituting all of the property to which

respect to any part or all of his or her separate property.

(c) The settlors, acting jointly, may amend this agreement in whole or in part.

After the death of the first to die of the settlors, this agreement shall not be subject to amendment or revocation, except that the surviving settlor may amend or revoke the Survivor's Trust in whole or in part during his or her lifetime.

This agreement may be amended or revoked only by instrument in writing (other than a will) delivered to the trustee. The trust property to which any revocation relates shall be conveyed to the settlors and each of them in accordance with their ownership thereof. The power to amend or revoke is personal to a settlor and may not be exercised by his or her conservator, attorney in fact or others.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF EDMUND J. MANSUETO and HELEN MANSUETO, husband and wife, individually as settlors, and EDMUND J. MANSUETO and HELEN MANSUETO, as trustees of the EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999, have signed this restatement of the trust agreement on October 30, 2003.

Edmund J. Mansueto
EDMUND J. MANSUETO, individually as Settlor

Edmund J. Mansueto
EDMUND J. MANSUETO, as Trustee of
the EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST

Helen Mansueto
HELEN MANSUETO, individually as Settlor

Helen Mansueto
HELEN MANSUETO, as Trustee of
the EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST

The foregoing instrument, consisting of 26 pages (including this page, the notary page, and the pages of the schedules), was signed, published and declared by the Settlers to be their Restated Trust Agreement in our presence and in the presence of each other and we, at the Settlers' request and in the Settlers' presence and in the presence of each other, have hereunto subscribed our hands as witnesses on October 30, 2003, at San Diego, California.

[Signature]
Jordan Rodriguez
 Printed Name

5190 Governor Drive, Suite 208
 San Diego, California 92122

[Signature]
Susan DePriest
 Printed Name

5190 Governor Drive, Suite 208
 San Diego, California 92122

[Signature]
Helen Mangueto
 Printed Name

5190 Governor Drive, Suite 208
 San Diego, California 92122

Oct. 20, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

On October 30, 2003, before me,

Susan DePriest, a Notary Public, personally appeared **EDMUND J. MANSUETO** and **HELEN MANSUETO**, personally known to me (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence) to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that they executed the same in their authorized capacities, and that by their signatures on the instrument the persons, or the entity upon behalf of which the persons acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public: [Signature]



APPENDIX J

Second Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint
Living Trust, Dated May 11, 2008, Including the provision
granting Life Estates to Robert Mansueto and Susan Brown

EXHIBIT I

**AMENDMENT NO. 2
OF THE RESTATED EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN
MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST DATED AUGUST 31, 1999**

Pursuant to the rights reserved by and to the Settlor under the terms of ARTICLE IX of the EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999, surviving Settlor HELEN MANSUETO amend the Trust, and First Amendment of the Restated Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust dated May 7, 2004, as follows:

FOURTH: SECTION 4: Shall be terminated and replaced by the following:

Upon the death of the surviving settlor, Helen Mansueto, this Declaration shall be irrevocable, and the Trust Estate shall be held, administered and distributed as follows:

A. Any property of the trust estate, except the real property commonly know as 57 Tunapuna Lane, City of Coronado, County of San Diego, State of California and any furnishing and furniture therein, shall be divided equally between my children, Robert Mansueto and Susan Mansueto Brown, without any trust.

B. If the real property commonly known as 57 Tunapuna Lane, City of Coronado, County of San Diego, State of California, is part of the estate at the time of the Settlor's death, along with any furnishing and furniture therein, is to be held in trust for the settlor's children, Robert and Susan, and grandchildren under the following terms:

1) The Settlor's children, ROBERT MANSUETO and SUSAN MANSUETO BROWN, shall receive a life estate in the property.

2) Either Robert or Susan or both may reside in the property during their life. Who ever resides in the property, shall pay all costs of the property, which includes any mortgage(s), property taxes, insurance or other expenses as the trustee(s) may require.

3) If neither of my children wish to or do not reside in the property, the trustee(s) may rent the property or allow any of my grandchildren to reside in the property. Any Rental income shall be used to cover all expenses, including taxes. Additionally, the trustees shall establish a reserve fund for maintenance on the property. If, in the opinion of trustee(s) there is sufficient reserve, any excess rental income shall be used to reimburse any child or grandchild that contributed to the preservation of the real property as described herein.

AMENDMENT NO. 2
OF THE RESTATED EDMUND MANSUETO AND
HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST DATED AUGUST 31, 1999

4) Any payments by either of my children or any grandchild, for costs of maintenance, mortgage or other expenses, when they are not residing in the property at any time during that calendar year, shall be refunded to them, if and when the property is sold or there is excess funds from rental income.

5) After the death of both Robert and Susan, my grandchildren that survive them shall have the right to reside in the property, as agreed between all of the surviving grandchildren under the same terms as Children in section B. 2) above. Upon the death of all the grandchildren, the property shall be sold and the proceeds divided equally to the issue of my grandchildren, by right of representation.

6) If after the Death of my children, Robert and Susan, no grandchildren wish to reside in the property, either full time or part time, the trustees may sell the property and divide the proceeds as stated herein.

In all other aspects I reconfirm the EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999, and all amendments thereto.

Dated: May 11, 2008

HELEN MANSUETO, Trustee and Trustor of the
EDMUND MANSUETO AND HELEN MANSUETO JOINT
LIVING TRUST, dated August 31, 1999

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

On May 11, 2008, before me Robert T. Plumb, II, notary public, personally appeared HELEN MANSUETO who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that she executed the same in her authorized capacity, and that by her signature on the instrument the person, or the entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

AMENDMENT NO. 2
OF THE RESTATED EDMUND MANSUETO AND
HELEN MANSUETO JOINT LIVING TRUST DATED AUGUST 31, 1999



APPENDIX K

San Diego Superior Court Probate Examiner Notes, Generated
September 2, 2026, for the Trust Enforcement Petition (ROA No.
421), Subsequently Continued to May 26, 2027

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
PROBATE NOTES**

Hearing Date: 09/18/26

Hearing Time: 8:45AM

Dept: 503

Judicial Officer: ALVAREZ, OLGA

Case Title: In re the Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust, dated August 31, 1999, as amended [IMAGED]

Case No: 37-2008-00152252-PR-TR-CTL Case Type: Trust Proceedings

Hearing Type: Miscellaneous Hearing

09/16/2026

RELATED CASE(S): 37-2008-00152628-PR-CP-CTL., Conservatorship of Joyce L. Mansueto

ROA #421

PETITION TO ENFORCE TRUST DIRECTIVES CONCERNING CARE OF JOYCE L. MANSUETO; FOR ACCOUNTING AND INFORMATION CONCERNING TRUST ADMINISTRATION AND DISPOSITION OF TRUST PROPERTY; FOR DETERMINATION OF RIGHTS AND INSTRUCTIONS; AND FOR RELATED RELIEF

Filed: 04/10/2026

Examiner: Melanie Gonzalez

FUTURE HEARINGS:

05/06/2027, 8:45AM, Dept. 503, - Susan Brown's Notice of Motion and Motion for Sanctions (ROA #432)

PARTIES:

Petitioner: _____ / Robert F. Mansueto – **see defect #4**

ATTORNEY: JAMES L. ARRAMISTH & KENNETH M'BALE (substitution of attorney filed 01/27/2026)

Trustee: Susan Brown

ATTORNEY: CATHERINE SWAFFORD

Conservatee/Beneficiary: Joyce Mansueto – **see examiner comment #6**

GUARDIAN AD LITEM: MARGARET HERRING

DEFECTS:

1. NEED: Proof of 30 days' *mailing* of Notice of Hearing (DE-120) to trustee. (Prob. Code 17203) Proof of service filed 08/19/2026 (ROA #453) is insufficient as DE-120 is a mandatory judicial council form and must be filed. (CRC, rules 1.31, 1.37 & 7.101 & SDLR 4.3.4)

//Court should review items 8 & 9 of Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456)

2. NEED: Proof of 30 days' *mailing* of Notice of Hearing (DE-120) to all trust beneficiaries. (Prob. Code 17203) Proof of service filed 08/19/2026 (ROA #453) is insufficient as DE-120 is a mandatory judicial council form and must be filed. (CRC, rules 1.31, 1.37 & 7.101 & SDLR 4.3.4)

//Court should review items 8 & 9 of Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456)

3. NEED: Caption of petition to include all relief sought as set forth in prayer. (CRC, rule 7.102)

// Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456) does not clear defect. Does not clearly and completely reflect all relief sought as set forth in amended prayer.

4. NEED: Clarification re Petitioner's standing as beneficiary as alleged. (Prob. Code 17200(a)) *Per order of the 01/16/2026 hearing: the Court finds that Mr. Robert Mansueto is not authorized to act on behalf of the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust ("Trust"). The Court further finds that Mr. Robert Mansueto does not have an interest nor is a beneficiary of the said trust.*

//Court should review Section III of Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456).

6. NEED: Petition to include names, addresses and relationships to Trustor of all persons entitled to notice, including persons who have submitted Requests for Special Notice. Must also include identification of all trustees and trust beneficiaries. (SDLR 4.5.1 & 4.20.3)

//Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456) does not clear defect as no addresses have been set forth.

9. NEED: Guardian-Ad-Litem report. (Prob. Code 1003 & SDLR 4.15.13)

10. NEED: Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456) verified by Petitioner. (CRC, rule 7.104)

11. NEED: Proof of 30 days mailing of notice of Supplemental Response to Probate Notes filed 09/11/2026 (ROA #456). (CRC, rule 7.53) **Appears to be an amendment as relief sought has changed. Proof of service attached to Supplemental Response to Probate Notes is insufficient as less than 30 days notice provided. 7 days notice given. Additionally, unable to determinize sufficiency of notice until defect #6 is addressed.**

EXAMINER COMMENTS:

1. (ROA #179) Order Granting Ex Parte Application for Entry Of Stipulated Judgment; For Order Regarding Sale Of Property; For Suspension Of Co-Trustee; For Removal Of Co-Trustee; and For Attorneys' Fees And Costs, filed 12/08/2023.

2. Per order of the 08/13/2024 hearing (ROA #252), Robert Mansueto was removed as co-trustee. Susan Brown, as trustee, was authorized to take all steps necessary to effectuate an unlawful detainer or eviction of occupants of the real property of the Trust, including specifically the real property located at 57 Tunapuna Lane, Coronado, California 92118, as part of the Court's prior order that Susan Brown be permitted to sell the real property.

3. Notice of Related Case filed 03/26/2025 (ROA #295)

4. Pre-Filing Order- Vexatious Litigant filed 07/22/2025 (ROA #344). Substitution of Attorney filed 01/27/2026 (ROA #412)

5. Per order of the 01/16/2026 hearing (ROA #408):

6. The Court finds that Mr. Robert Mansueto is not authorized to act on behalf of the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust ("Trust"). The Court further finds that Mr. Robert Mansueto does not have an interest nor is a beneficiary of the said trust.

6. (ROA #409) Order Granting Petition for Orders Confirming Lease is Null and Void; To Return Possession of Residence and Quiet Title of Residence; and for a Constructive Trust, filed 01/16/2026. Item 9 of order states: *That Robert F. Mansueto, John F. Steel IV, and Joyce L. Mansueto have no beneficial interest, no ownership interest, and no other interest of any kind whatsoever in the real property located at 57 Tunapuna Lane, Coronado, California 92118, A.P.N. 615-180-02-25...*

7. (ROA #425) Declaration of Robert F. Mansueto in Support of Petition and Exhibit List (ROA #426), filed 04/16/2026. – **Court should review.**

9. Decline at the present probate-notes hearing to adjudicate the validity of the January 11, 2010 Settlement Agreement or April 20, 2010 order absent an appropriate pleading, notice to all interested persons, and an adequate record;

10. Preserve all rights of all parties concerning pending appellate proceedings and the effect, if any, of those proceedings upon matters before this Court; and

11. Grant such other and further relief as the Court determines just and proper.

RELEVANT INFO:

Settlors:

Edmund Mansueto DOD: 4/10/2006

Helen Mansueto DOD: 5/27/2008

(ROA #387) Confidential Trust Coversheet, filed 11/06/2025:

Ex. 1: The Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust dated 8/31/1991, as restated on 10/30/2003.

Ex. 2: Amendment of The Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust dated 8/31/1991, as restated on 10/30/2003, dated 5/7/2004.

(ROA #406) Confidential Trust Coversheet, filed 01/14/2026:

Edmund Mansueto and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Truste Dated August 30, 1999, as Restated and Amended on October 30, 2003

GUARDIAN AD LITEM REPORT:

Filed:

Concerns:

Recommendations:

Fees: \$<> - <>hrs @ \$<>/hr

Costs: \$

Total Fees & Costs: \$

Paid by: Estate / County / Not addressed

Discharge: Requested / Not Requested

SUMMARY:

Petitioner alleges the acting Trustee, Susan J. Brown, has failed to administer the Trust in accordance with its terms and in conformity with her fiduciary duties under California law.

Appendix L

Signed Personal Declaration of Robert F. Mansueto

Authenticating Photographic Exhibits of Trust Residence

Interior and Exterior Physical Destruction (Photos Taken

February 2026 and August 2026)

**DECLARATION OF ROBERT F. MANSUETO
REGARDING PHYSICAL ALTERATION OF TRUST RESIDENCE**

I, Robert F. Mansueto, declare:

1. I am the Applicant in the accompanying Emergency Application for Stay. I am expressly named First Successor Trustee under the May 7, 2004 First Amendment to the Edmund and Helen Mansueto Joint Living Trust. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated in this declaration.
2. Exhibit 1 fairly and accurately depicts the rear patio before demolition, at approximately February 2026, including its landscaping, vegetation, raised masonry retaining/planter walls, and patio improvements.
3. On August 15, 2026, I personally observed the same rear patio from an area open to public access and took the photograph attached as Exhibit 2. By then, the retaining/planter walls and landscaping shown in Exhibit 1 had been removed. Exhibit 2 fairly and accurately depicts the altered condition I observed.
4. Exhibits 3 and 5 fairly and accurately depict the completed kitchen and bathroom before demolition. They show the cabinetry, granite counters, tile, appliances, plumbing fixtures, glass shower enclosure, bathtub, and other interior finishes that existed before the work shown in the later photographs.
5. On August 15, 2026, from the same publicly accessible area and through open rear doors, I personally observed and photographed extensive demolition inside the residence. Exhibits 4 and 6 fairly and accurately depict the interior condition I observed that day.
6. The interior demolition included removal of kitchen cabinetry, counters, fixtures, flooring, and finishes, and the opening or removal of portions of walls and ceilings, exposing framing, wiring, plumbing, ductwork, and insulation. The demolition also affected the bathroom areas. Before this demolition, the kitchen and bathrooms had been remodeled relatively recently.
7. I make this declaration to authenticate Exhibits 1 through 6 and document the physical changes I personally observed. I do not state who performed or authorized the work.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on SEPT. 25, 2026, at SAN DIEGO,
California.

Robert F. Mansueto

Robert F. Mansueto

EXHIBIT 1
Rear Patio Before Demolition
Approximately February 2026



EXHIBIT 2
Rear Patio After Removal of Retaining/Planter Walls and Landscaping
August 15, 2026



EXHIBIT 3

Kitchen Before Demolition



EXHIBIT 4

**Kitchen Area After Extensive Demolition
Photographed August 15, 2026**





EXHIBIT 5

Bathroom Before Demolition



EXHIBIT 6
Master Bathroom During Demolition - Vanity, Counter, and Fixtures
Removed
Photographed August 15, 2026





Appellate Courts Case Information

4th Appellate District Division
3

Change court

▼

Case Summary
Docket
Briefs
Scheduled Actions
Disposition
Parties and Attorneys
Trial Court

Docket (Register of Actions)

Brown v. Mansueto
Case Number G066603

Date	Description	Notes
02/24/2026	Intra District Transfer to:	Division ThreeThe above appeal is transferred from Division One to Division Three of the Fourth Appellate District.

Date	Description	Notes
02/25/2026	Supreme Court order filed transferring case in.	
02/25/2026	Notice of appeal lodged/received.	
10/17/2024	Notice of appeal lodged/received.	Filed on October 11, 2024 by Robert Mansueto.
10/17/2024	Application for waiver of filing fee filed.	
10/18/2024	Order waiving filing fee.	
10/21/2024	Civil case information statement filed.	
10/29/2024	Notice per rule 8.124 - with reporter's transcript.	8.124 and Reporters
02/11/2025	Notice to reporter to prepare transcript.	
03/27/2025	Reporter's transcript filed.	RT-1 (24)
05/06/2025	Granted - extension of time.	Appellant's appendix and opening brief filed. Due on 06/05/2025 By 30 Day(s)

Date	Description	Notes
06/03/2025	Granted - extension of time.	Appellant's appendix and opening brief filed. Due on 07/07/2025 By 32 Day(s) LAST EXTENSION
06/09/2025	Substitution of attorneys filed for:	Respondent
06/20/2025	Appellant's appendix and opening brief filed.	
07/15/2025	Stipulation of extension of time filed:	
07/17/2025	Petition for writ of supersedeas filed.	
07/17/2025	Exhibits filed in support of:	Petition for writ of supersedeas
07/17/2025	Order denying petition filed.	The renewed petition for writ of supersedeas and request for stay have been read and considered by Presiding Justice McConnell and Associate Justices Castillo and Rubin. The petition is denied.
08/15/2025	Motion/application to augment record filed.	Respondent

Date	Description	Notes
08/15/2025	Respondent's Appendix and Respondent's Brief filed.	RA-1/ Pgs. 1-143
08/15/2025	Oral argument waiver notice sent.	
08/21/2025	Request for oral argument filed by:	A/15 (In-Person)
08/25/2025	Request for oral argument filed by:	R/5 (In-Person)
09/10/2025	Motion filed.	Appellant's Motion for stay Pending Appeal
09/10/2025	Order filed.	Appellant Robert Mansueto's motion for stay of the vexatious litigant order that requires him to post a bond and of any sale, lease, or other disposition of the trust residence, is DENIED.
09/10/2025	Augmentation granted. (See order.)	Respondent's request to augment the record on appeal, filed on August 15, 2025, is GRANTED. The documents attached to the request is deemed a part of the record.
09/12/2025	Granted - extension of time.	
09/29/2025	Appellant's reply brief.	
09/29/2025	Case fully briefed.	

Date	Description	Notes
10/13/2025	Sanctions motion filed	Respondent
10/13/2025	Order filed.	Respondent's motion for sanctions on appeal will be considered concurrently with the appeal. Appellant may serve and file an opposition to the motion within 10 days of the date of this order.
10/14/2025	Request for judicial notice filed.	Appellant
10/20/2025	Opposition filed.	Appellant's Opposition to Motion for Sanctions
10/28/2025	Motion filed.	Motion to Consolidate Appeals: D085004 & D086852
10/28/2025	Request for judicial notice filed.	Appellant w/documents
11/04/2025	Motion filed.	Appellant's Motion for Calendar Preference
11/12/2025	Opposition filed.	Respondent's combined opposition to motion to consolidate appeals and RJN
11/21/2025	Order filed.	Appellant's requests to take judicial notice, filed on October 14, 2025, and October 28, 2025, will be considered concurrently with the appeal.

Date	Description	Notes
		Appellant's motion to consolidate the appeals in D085004 and D086852 is denied. Appellant's motion for calendar preference is granted. (Code, Civ. Proc., § 44.)
12/29/2025	Calendar notice sent. Calendar date:	Wednesday, February 11, 2026 at 1:30 p.m.
01/26/2026	Application filed to:	Appellant's application for stay and writ of supersedeas
01/26/2026	Order filed.	The petition for writ of supersedeas and request for immediate stay has been read and considered by Justices O'Rourke, Castillo, and Rubin. The petition and request are denied.
02/05/2026	Request for judicial notice filed.	Appellant
02/06/2026	Ruling on request for judicial notice deferred.	Appellant's request to take judicial notice, filed on February 5, 2026, will be considered concurrently with the appeal.
02/11/2026	Original entry stricken - sequence no. not removed.	Date cause originally argued and submitted - vacated per 02/24/26 order
02/24/2026	Order filed.	The submission of this case on February 11, 2026 is vacated. The matter will be reassigned to a new panel and recalendared for oral argument in April. The clerk of the

Date	Description	Notes
		court will notify the parties of the new date and time.
02/24/2026	Order filed.	The order filed February 24, 20026, is modified to delete the last two sentences. It now reads, "The submission of this case on February 11, 2026 is vacated."
02/27/2026	Letter sent to:	Transfer notice
03/12/2026	Calendar notice sent electronically. Calendar date:	
04/02/2026	Returned document for non-conformance.	Petition needs to be initiated and filed under its own case number and must be accompanied by a filing fee or fee waiver.
04/07/2026	Telephone conversation with:	
04/10/2026	Request filed to:	Notice of new facts and request for immediate stay.
04/13/2026	Order filed.	THE COURT:* On April 10, 2026, appellant filed a "NOTICE OF NEW FACTS AND REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE STAY." The request is DENIED. DELANEY, ACTING P. J.

Date	Description	Notes
		* Before Delaney, Acting P. J., Gooding, J., and Scott, J.
04/15/2026	Filed document entitled:	By Appellant Notice of Subsequent Developments Relevant to Pending Appeal
04/16/2026	Filed additional cites.	By Respondent
04/20/2026	Cause argued and submitted.	Merits. Cause called. Appellant Robert F. Mansueto argued in pro-per. Robert Dato argued for respondent. Cause submitted.
05/07/2026	Opinion filed.	(Signed Unpublished) Affirmed (Scott)/Sanchez/Gooding Copy mailed to appellant via USPS.
05/15/2026	Rehearing petition filed.	By Appellant
05/20/2026	Order denying rehearing petition filed.	The petition for rehearing is DENIED. SCOTT, J. WE CONCUR: SANCHEZ, ACTING P. J. GOODING, J.
05/27/2026	Mail returned and re-sent.	Order on Rehearing Denied

Date	Description	Notes
06/09/2026	Service copy of petition for review received.	S296952
07/24/2026	Ext. by Supreme Court re: petition for hearing filed:	Filed on 7/22/26. Extended to 9/4/26.
08/31/2026	Filed document entitled:	By Appellant Application for Stay of Issuance of Remittitur Pending Petition to the Supreme Court
09/11/2026	Petition for review denied in Supreme Court.	Filed on 8/19/26.
09/18/2026	Order filed.	Appellant Robert F. Mansueto's August 31, 2026 application to stay issuance of remittitur is DENIED. SCOTT, J. WE CONCUR: SANCHEZ, ACTING P. J. GOODING, J. Mailed to appellant via USPS.
09/18/2026	Remittitur issued.	Mailed to appellant via USPS.
09/18/2026	Case complete.	

Date	Description	Notes
09/18/2026	Record shipped to records center	All documents scanned.

[Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.](#)