

I'm not a robot



Jacob savage and rachel leak

Multiple court cases were filed on various dates, involving individuals such as Angelina Mejia Patino vs Jane Doe, Lightle Jenna vs Dr. Kimberly Enderle, SANCHEZ VS HERRERA, IN RE: ALSPAUGH (Marlene Lara Alspaugh seeking to change her name to Marlene Lara Lee), and Alyssa R. Coyne vs Edmund J. Coyne. Key issues include requests for orders regarding child support, custody, and visitation in the Coyne case, as well as a petition for name change in the Alspaugh matter. Decisions made include granting the Alspaugh petition and setting a review hearing for the Coyne case to address child custody/visitation and child support issues. Mothers financial situation is stable with \$10,2020 in deposits, \$1.1 million in sellable assets, and \$1,570,900 in real property. She claims monthly expenses of \$8,738, reduced by her parents' contributions of \$3,725. Father receives \$7,000/month from the family business and dividend/interest income of \$874. He claims monthly expenses of \$11,832, plus installment payments and debts totaling \$39,218. Father proposes guideline child support of \$1,837/month but asks to deviate based on Mothers parents' contributions and his own payment for supervised visitation. The Court prepared an Xspouse calculation based on assumptions, including Fathers nontaxable income and Mother's unemployment compensation and property tax deductions. Guideline child support is calculated at \$1,777/month. Considering Father's need for supervised visitation, the parties will share add-on expenses equally, with the right to adjust in the future. The Court orders: 1) Father pays Mother \$1,777/month effective March 20, 2025; 2) Child support continues until each child reaches age 18 or graduates from high school; and 3) Uninsured medical, dental, and childcare expenses are shared equally by both parties. Training for Page 2 of 4 FL0001215 Employment Skills The parties are required to comply with the provisions of Family Code § 4063 when seeking reimbursement for uninsured medical and dental expenses. A copy of the NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES - Health-Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures is attached to the Order After Hearing. This provision also applies to childcare expenses. Counsel for Mother must prepare the order. Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which outline procedures for presenting oral argument. If a party wants to present oral argument, they must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website. They are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in their absence. Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument must appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. The guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov must be followed. Cash Flow Number of children: 0 or 1, Guideline Proposed Percent time with NCP: 1.00% or 0.00%, Combined net spendable income: \$11,818 for both scenarios. Filing status: SINGLE HH/MLA GUIDELINE Percent change: 0% for both scenarios, Number of exemptions: 1 or 2 Father's wages and salary: \$0 for both scenarios, Self-employed income: \$0 for both scenarios Total income: \$7,874 (father) + \$3,944 (mother) = \$11,818, Net spendable income: \$6,097 for both scenarios TANF CS received: \$0 for both scenarios, Other nontaxable income: \$7,000 for the first scenario and \$0 for the second Support percentage of combined spendable income: 52% for both scenarios New spouse income: \$0 for both scenarios, Add-ons: \$0 for both scenarios Employee 401(k) contribution: \$0 for both scenarios Guideline CS: \$4,777 (father) + \$1,777 (mother) = \$6,554, Total taxes: \$60 for both scenarios Marin SS paid previous marriage: \$0 for both scenarios, Adjustments to income: \$0 for both scenarios Dep. exemption value: \$0 for both scenarios SS paid previous marriage: \$0 for both scenarios Health insurance: \$0 for both scenarios Settings changed: Mother's other medical expenses: \$0 for both scenarios Proposed payment cost/benefit: \$4,777 (father) + \$1,777 (mother) = \$6,554, Property tax expenses: \$660 for the first scenario and \$0 for the second Tactic 9: Net spendable income: \$5,720 for both scenarios, Ded interest expense: \$0 for both scenarios Change from guideline: \$0 for both scenarios, Contribution deduction: \$0 for both scenarios ee wmm percentage of combined spendable income: 48% for both scenarios Misc tax deductions: \$0 for both scenarios Total: \$4,777 (father) + \$1,777 (mother) = \$6,554 Qualified business income deduction: \$0 for both scenarios, Savings: \$0 for both scenarios Total taxes: \$60 for both scenarios, Required union dues: \$0 for both scenarios 9 Dep. exemption value: \$0 for both scenarios, Mandatory retirement: \$0 for both scenarios Releases withholding allowances: \$0 for both scenarios, Hardship deduction: \$0 for both scenarios Net wage paycheck: \$0 for both scenarios Other GDL deductions: \$0 for both scenarios, Child care expenses: \$0 for both scenarios Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed cs FC: \$4,055 (father) + \$1,777 (mother) = \$5,832. Checking: ON Per child information: DOB, Timeshare cce(F), cce(M) Add-ons Payor Basic CS Payor Pres CS Payor All children: 0-99, Father's payment: \$4,077 Superior Court of California, County of Marin, File number: 25CV-0206829, In Re: Monson Tentative Ruling on Petition for Change of Name: Petitioners seek to change the last name of their minor children. No proof of publication has been submitted. The Court requires a Certificate of Publication from the publishing newspaper before the Petition may be granted. Motion to Compel Compliance with Discovery Responses and Request for Monetary Sanctions SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA, File number: 2024CUBC025281 by CourtCall, call in no later than 8:20 a.m. If you want to appear by CourtCall, make arrangements with them by 4:00 p.m. the day before your scheduled hearing. They won't consider requests made on the day of the hearing. Don't expect any exceptions. For Zoom appearances, all lawyers appearing by Zoom must send an email to Courtroom20@ventura.courts.ca.gov with a copy to everyone involved no later than 3:00 p.m. the day before the hearing. Include "ZOOM APPEARANCE ON (DATE OF HEARING)" in the subject line. The email should identify who will make the appearance. You'll get your login info in reply to your email. If you're using Zoom, log in by 8:20 a.m. The Court will transfer you when it starts. Make sure your name and case name are on your Zoom profile. Days prior to the hearing, the defendant submitted unverified responses with objections. Then, on November 8, 2025, Judge Matthew Guasco ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, granting them a motion to compel and imposing sanctions against the defendant. The court ordered the defendant to provide verified responses without objection by December 6, 2024. However, the defendant failed to comply with this order, leading the plaintiffs to file a motion for sanctions on December 17, 2024. On February 3, 2025, the court granted the plaintiffs' motion, ordering the defendant to provide the previously ordered responses by February 17, 2025. The court also warned the defendant that failure to obey discovery orders may result in additional monetary, evidentiary, issue, or terminating sanctions. Despite this warning, the defendant failed to comply with the order. On February 20, 2025, the defendant submitted further responses and agreed to produce certain documents, but did not actually do so. The plaintiffs filed a motion on March 27, 2025, seeking monetary sanctions against the defendant. The court found that the defendant had violated two court orders mandating the production of requested documents and failed to demonstrate substantial justification for its actions. As a result, the court awarded monetary sanctions in the amount of \$1,260.00 in favor of the plaintiffs, jointly and severally, and against the defendant, FCA, US LLC, and its attorneys, Ongaro P.C., jointly and severally. The court also ordered that said sanctions be paid to counsel for the plaintiffs on or before May 28, 2025. See v. Wilson Motion for Admission of Counsel Pro Hac Vice — Hearing Required The motion was not filed and served within the time prescribed by the operative Rule of Court, and no order shortening time was sought or granted. Furthermore, there is no declaration or affidavit attesting to prior applications for appearance pro hac vice in California within the preceding two years, as required by rule 9.40(d). The California State Bar typically confirms its lack of objection to such applications, and in their absence, the moving papers are deemed sufficient for consideration. In Re: Souter Petition for Change of Name The Court has reviewed the petition and found that all procedural requirements of CCP § 1275 et seq. have been satisfied, with one minor exception: Petitioner failed to sign the Declaration at page 2 of the Petition. The Court will proceed in accordance with the remaining requirements, including swearing in the Petitioner and verifying their status regarding the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Review Hearings - Orta, Greter vs Garcia, Migdalia - Reph, Aydan vs INSTALLERS, INC. - PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC vs Lopez, Beatrice Jacob Savage, 24, is embroiled in controversy after an alleged explicit video of him and his ex-girlfriend Rachel Weaver surfaced on social media platforms like X (formerly Twitter) and Reddit. The video, which has gone viral, shows moments meant to be private and has sparked widespread reactions. Jacob, who boasts over 837k TikTok followers, was previously engaged to Christen Whitson but the couple announced their engagement recently. Jacob has two children, one of whom he shares with Christen. Rachel Weaver is his ex-girlfriend, with whom he had a brief relationship before she discovered she was pregnant with his child. TikTok creator Jacob Savage and his ex-girlfriend Rachel Weaver are at the center of a heated controversy surrounding an allegedly explicit video that has gone viral on social media platforms like Twitter and Reddit. The video, which showcases intense emotions and engaging dialogue, has garnered millions of views, sparking mixed reactions from viewers. While some have been drawn in by the raw emotions displayed, others have expressed concerns over the content's graphic nature. As the debate rages on, details about Jacob Savage, a 22-year-old TikTok star born in Florida, continue to emerge. With over 837k followers on the platform and more than 60m likes on his videos, Savage has built a significant online presence. The controversy surrounding him and Rachel Weaver has only added fuel to the fire. Jacob Savage and Rachel Weaver's Leaked Video Sparks Drama On Social Media Fixed iFrame TikTok stars Jacob Savage and Rachel Weaver have been at the center of a huge controversy after a leaked video surfaced online. The drama began when the video, which allegedly shows the two engaging in explicit activities, hit social media platforms like Twitter and Reddit. Fans were left stunned, wondering if Savage had cheated on his current fiancée, Christen Whitman. The timing of the scandal is what makes it even more shocking. Just a few days before the video surfaced, Savage proposed to Whitman, making their relationship seem rock-solid. However, just as quickly, the controversy erupted. Fans have been discussing the video and speculating about its origins, with some suggesting it might be from Savage and Weaver's time together before their breakup. Others believe it could be an old video that somehow resurfaced. The drama goes beyond the leaked video, with a history of tension between the two women. Rachel Weaver and Christen Whitman were once friends but things turned sour when Weaver found out about Whitman's pregnancy earlier this year. The situation escalated further when Weaver posted sarcastic comments on her Snapchat, sparking online buzz. Despite their past issues, both women appeared to have put their differences aside at one point, even making a TikTok video together. The drama surrounding Jacob Savage, Rachel Weaver, and Christen Whitman has intensified after a scandalous video emerged. The complicated web of relationships between the trio is under scrutiny once more. Can they reconcile or has this marked the end of their tumultuous journey? Let's delve into the history of Jacob and Rachel's relationship, which began on TikTok in early 2021. They initially gained popularity together, but their romance soon hit rocky terrain. Despite rumors of breakups, they remained together, even welcoming a son, Grayson. However, they officially parted ways in mid-2022. Post-split, both Jacob and Rachel seemed to move forward with their careers and co-parenting. Jacob later started dating Christen, having a son named Sutton. Although the exes maintained a cordial co-parenting dynamic, tension still brewed between Weaver and Whitman. The latest scandal has only further complicated matters. Questions abound: did Jacob cheat? Is this an old video being misinterpreted? Only time will reveal what unfolds. Stats for fans curious about Jacob Savage (25, 5'10", 175 lbs) and Rachel Weaver (25, 5'7", 130 lbs): both have amassed significant wealth through sponsored content, brand deals, and collaborations. Jacob's estimated net worth is around \$500,000, while Rachel's is approximately \$300,000. Will this scandal mark the end of Jacob and Christen's engagement? Where does Rachel stand amidst the drama? Only time will tell. A seasoned Research Specialist with a knack for crafting compelling, meticulously researched content that effectively engages and educates audiences. (Note: I used the "WRITE AS A NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER (NNES)" method to rewrite the text)