

**LA COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL (DVC)
COMMITTEE ON SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT (CSI MEETING)**

**Wednesday, July 9, 2025
12:00 P.M. to 1:30 P.M. | Pacific Time (US & Canada)
Family Source Center (FSC) in Leimert Park
4305 Degnan Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90008
Room: 105/ Floor #1**

Mission Statement: To implement domestic violence laws and policies and to provide resources and problem-solving support to community partners when implementation issues and problems arise. The Committee also addresses emerging issues that impact victims of domestic violence.

[See the DVC Calendar for Meeting Information](#)

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order – Gail Pincus, Kate Forrest.
Meeting Protocols- Before we begin this meeting, please be reminded that this is an open and public meeting. Therefore, anything discussed (both verbally and within the online chat) are not protected by any type of confidentiality. Any client identifying information should not be presented. Please avoid discussion of personal cases as well. If you need additional resources, please contact the co-chairs after this meeting.
- II. Welcome and Introductions
- III. New, critical, and emerging issues
 - Committee expresses solidarity with the immigrant community and those who serve the immigrant survivor population given the current state of affairs in L.A., but there are no emergency issues specifically within the purview of this particular committee at this time
- IV. Follow up on previous agenda items
 - COPRAC amendment to Rule 7.3 re: pre-service solicitation of DVRO respondents
 - Co-Chair Forrest shares in the meeting chat the links for the proposed amendment information, <https://www.calbar.ca.gov/About-Us/Our-Mission/Protecting-the-Public/Public-Comment/Public-Comment-Archives/2025-Public-Comment/Proposed-Amended-Rule-of-Professional-Conduct-73>, and to make public comment, https://fs16.formsite.com/SB_RRC/dehslalbcl/index, before July 18, 2025
 - Committee member Seilhamer is working on writing an editorial response to the critical article written by James Ham and published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on 6/2/25. Anyone with survivor impact stories is encouraged to share with him via email bseilhamer@jenesse.org to be included in support of the amendment
 - Det. Strnad has presented a request to the Sheriff to sign off on a letter in support
 - Co-Chair Pincus suggests state-wide engagement, will reach out to a San Francisco colleague

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health – Domestic Violence Council
1000 S. Fremont Ave.-#99, A-9 East 5th floor, Alhambra, CA 91803
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/dvcouncil/>

(213) 974-2799

chernandez2@ph.lacounty.gov | lpham@ph.lacounty.gov



LA COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL (DVC)

- Bringing Family Code 3044 to Dependency/WIC
 - Committee brainstorms which stakeholders might be best to reach out to for sponsorship of a bill to add an equivalent presumption to the Welfare & Institutions Code; Co-Chair Pincus suggests Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN), Committee member James offers connection to Commission on Children & Families (including Assemblymember Isaac Bryant, who was himself a foster youth)
 - Logistics suggestions from LARP committee rep Siu-Kootnikoff are to have groundwork laid for both an outside sponsor and a legislator to carry the bill before presenting in October/November for next session
- LASD collaborations – improving responses to SB 290 requests for records, and documenting detailed service attempts
 - No specific updates at this time, but CSI will be participating in a quarterly collaborative meeting with LASD later in June and may have updates for the next meeting.
 - Committee member inquires regarding procedure for CLETS entry of restraining orders, noting several recent incidents of survivors unable to get their orders enforced when reporting a violation because their orders weren't in the system. Det. Strnad acknowledges a lag with LASD as the "gatekeeper" once they receive the orders from the court clerks, and he has requested data on this issue to assist him in approaching the executives for redress.
 - Committee member inquires about the best method for a survivor to verify whether their order is in CLETS; Det. Strnad may be able to run a limited number of checks, but give it at least a couple of days between issuance and inquiry; another committee member notes that there is currently a bill in the assembly, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB1363, aiming to develop a notification system for protected persons.
 - Committee member inquires whether survivors should be bringing their ROs directly to their nearest police station after issuance for entry, but Det. Strnad clarifies that while a station clerk can enter a proof of service if an RO is served in the field, they aren't the ones that put the orders themselves into the system.
 - **BEST PRACTICE TIP:** advise survivors to carry not only a copy of their DV-130 ROAH but also a blank DV-200 proof of personal service if the order still needs to be served – officers will do it on a call out if they encounter the restrained person, but will not generate a proof of service for the survivor.
 - Committee member reports a problem with requesting service by posting of a DVRO renewal, noting the sheriff's office first told her that wasn't applicable to renewals (incorrect), and then requiring a certified DV-210 Summons in order to post even though the judicial officer signing the order granting service by posting did not issue a DV-210 or check the section 1(b)(2) box on the DV-117 saying it was required. Lawyer members discuss that no summons is required on a renewal because jurisdiction already attached with service initial notice for underlying order, and it is concerning that sheriffs are again overreaching by questioning the order issued by the judge. However, Det. Strnad shares examples of situations in which litigants attempted to get sheriffs to serve or enforce invalid orders, noting that certified orders protect integrity of the system and ability to enforce effectively.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health – Domestic Violence Council
1000 S. Fremont Ave.-#99, A-9 East 5th floor, Alhambra, CA 91803
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/dvcouncil/>

(213) 974-2799

chernandez2@ph.lacounty.gov | lpham@ph.lacounty.gov



LA COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL (DVC)

- TRO application training program – funding? volunteers?
 - Co-Chair Pincus thinks Survivor Justice Center may be offering a training, but Co-Chair Neshkes of SJC is not in attendance, we will follow up to find out details for next meeting.
- Utilization of court tech – electronic recording in lieu of court reporters; bench officers denying LACC appearances; pro bono justice portal access.
 - One positive report of judicial officers preemptively offering electronic recording for custody hearing when no court reporter was available, and no reports of recent denials of recording or remote appearance.
 - Jenesse Center’s application for the justice partner portal family law case access was approved, implementation pending; other survivor service organizations who offer legal services are encouraged to apply as well even if they are not traditional legal aid providers.
- Matters not on posted agenda to be presented and placed on a future agenda.
- Judicial Council form update needed: Judicial officer brought to CSI co-chairs’ attention problem with DV-130 not providing for possibility of alternative service. Court may grant alternative service at the TRO stage on the DV-117 form, and service of the DV-109/-110 by another means will be valid, but if the restrained party is not present, the only options currently for service of the final order after hearing are by mail (if the terms of the final order are the same as the TRO except for the expiration date) or personal service (if any terms of the final order differ from the TRO); the same manner of alternative service that was valid for the TRO should be a viable option for the DVRO. Co-Chair Neshkes has connected with a contact at Judicial Council and will report back next meeting on any progress.
- Safe At Home challenges: organizations report receiving conflicting information on signature requirements for applications to the address confidentiality program, some being told wet-ink signatures must be submitted by mail and others being told they must use DocuSign. Co-chair Forrest will reach out to contact at SAH for clarification, but enrolling agency staff are also encouraged to attend their upcoming trainings and open forums for direct support. To sign up to receive announcements for these events, email EAInquiries@sos.ca.gov with the subject line “Training List,” and include in the body of the message your name, title, email, and agency name.
- Rejections by clerks: Committee member shares issue of DVRO filing rejected for alleged lack of jurisdiction. Fact pattern: survivor has a confidential address through Safe at Home, which all government agencies are required by law to accept as a participant’s legal residential address, but it is a Sacramento address, and the address of the respondent was unknown (*or intentionally omitted as a safety measure to prevent pre-service solicitation); rejecting JA suggested a motion to seal the pleadings with the actual address on them, which is not a reasonable solution. Lawyer member notes this is a venue question, not jurisdiction, but as for what to do about it, committee members discuss listing a city name and/or zip code for the respondent sufficient to establish assignment to an LASC court without a specific street address, or attach a sworn declaration from petitioner to the FAM-020 attesting to being a Los Angeles County resident and filing at Central District.
 - ➔ **BEST PRACTICE TIP:** Committee members report having better success overturning rejections when escalating to the supervising clerk at the courthouse you are trying to file at, who tend to be more receptive than the JAs [Elkie Harris, who presented at the 6/5 DV convening, is the “bigshot of clerks” and helpful to the community].

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health – Domestic Violence Council
1000 S. Fremont Ave.-#99, A-9 East 5th floor, Alhambra, CA 91803
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/dvcouncil/>

(213) 974-2799

chernandez2@ph.lacounty.gov | lpham@ph.lacounty.gov



LA COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL (DVC)

- V. Next steps, action items, and confirm agenda items for next meeting.
- Co-Chair Pincus will reach out to contact at ICAN regarding FC3044 to WIC project and northern California allies re: COPRAC amendment
 - Co-Chair Forrest will correspond with committee member James to collaborate on FC3044 to WIC project, and with Co-Chair Neshkes to inquire about SJC trainings
 - Det. Strnad will follow up on LASD endorsement of COPRAC amendment
- VI. Public Comments: not to exceed two minutes per person and must be on items of interest which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Council.
- DV-205-INFO clarification: Committee member re-raises a prior discussion of concern over the way the form, “What if the Person I Want Protection From is Avoiding (Evading) Service?” is drafted, reporting that self-represented litigants still do not understand exactly how to request alternative service. Form states: “Be ready to explain why you think the restrained person is avoiding service. If you have people who will help you prove this to a judge, bring them to your court hearing or have them write a statement that describes what they witnessed. Form MC-030 may be used for this purpose.” Recap of prior discussions: we could request Judicial Council develop a corresponding request form that would be used in conjunction with the DV-117 order allowing alternative service, but committee does not want to advocate for this because it adds an additional burden on SRLs – the law says the determination is to be made at the hearing, no written application is required. Nonetheless, committee members do report success utilizing the DV-115 request to continue section 4(c) “other reason” to explain the need for alternative service. There is no current specific proposal to place on a committee agenda.
 - Committee member expresses concern over lack of public alert system for LACC outages: public notices are posted on court website for building closures or major disruptions such as power outages, but not for remote appearance platform problems, which prejudices litigants who were counting on appearing remotely and cannot make it into the courthouse on short notice, with possible risk of case dismissal for non-appearance; additionally, even if they try calling the courtroom, some JAs have stated a policy of not answering their phones during morning court session.
 - ➔ **BEST PRACTICES TIP:** if clients are considering appearing remotely for a hearing, make sure they have the LACC tech support line, (213) 830-0400
- VII. Reminder to complete our DVC Monthly Meeting Evaluation Survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/C8MC8V9>
- VIII. Next meeting is scheduled for July 9, 2025, at FSC in Leimert Park.
- IX. Adjournment

ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS:

American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters, auxiliary aids and services, or reasonable modifications to attend Domestic Violence Council meetings and access to policies and/or procedures (i.e., to assist members of the disability community who would like to request a disability-related accommodation), will be made available if the request is made at least five (5) business days before the meeting. Late requests will be accommodated based on feasibility. Please direct all requests to: dvc@ph.lacounty.gov or call **213-974-2799** (Monday thru Friday; 9am-5pm.)

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health – Domestic Violence Council
1000 S. Fremont Ave.-#99, A-9 East 5th floor, Alhambra, CA 91803
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/dvcouncil/>

(213) 974-2799

chernandez2@ph.lacounty.gov | lpham@ph.lacounty.gov



