



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**  
San Bernardino District  
247 West 3rd St  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
sanbernardino.courts.ca.gov

## **PORTAL MINUTE ORDER**

**Case Number: CIVSB2317301**

**Date: 9/15/2026**

**Case Title: The People of the State of California, Ex Rel. et al  
-v-  
Chino Valley Unified School District**

---

**Department S28 - SBJC**

**Date: 9/15/2026**

**Time: 8:30 AM**

**Predisposition Motion re:**

---

Judicial Officer: Michael A Sachs  
Judicial Assistant: Wimala Blanchard  
Court Attendant: Mariama Perryman  
Court Reporter Rita M Cortinas CSR #7776

### **Appearances**

Attorney Delbert Tran and Edward Nugent present for Plaintiff The People of the State of California, Ex Rel., Rob Bonta  
Attorney Emily Rae present for Defendant Chino Valley Unified School District

### **Proceedings**

Stip and appointment of pro tem reporter filed  
Chino Valley Unified School District's Motion to dissolve the Court's 10/03/24 final judgment is heard.  
The Court has read and considered Motion, supporting, and responsive pleadings  
The Court recites its tentative ruling.  
Argued by counsel and submitted.  
The court reviews procedural aspects of case and addresses procedural posture and substantive issues and rulings presented in the Mirabelli /Huntington Beach and Foote matters.

### **Court Finds**

Chino Valley Unified School District's Motion to dissolve 10/3/24 final judgment and permanent injunction Findings stated on the record by the Court.  
Plaintiff to prepare Notice of ruling.  
Court's tentative ruling becomes order of the court.  
--Court denies in part, and grants in part, the motion to modify the injunction, first noting the Policy has been rescinded and the parts of the injunction addressing adult students is not challenged. The Court also notes that the judgment, as written, only precludes, as to minor children, the adoption, implementation, enforcement, or other efforts to give effect to Sections 1(a) and 1(b), "in full," and Section 5 as it relates to Sections 1(a) and 1(b).  
Nevertheless, the Court grants the motion as to potential prospective policies and conclude that, based on the holding in Mirabeli, the District is not precluded from adopting a policy addressing (as to minor students) the mandated disclosure of information upon parental request; mandated disclosures when parental objections are known; prohibiting the use of two sets of names or pronouns or other misleading conduct; or even other potential policies.  
What the other potential policies could cover and their validity are outside of the Court's current review except that, consistent with the Court's injunction, but subject to the clarification, the District is enjoined from adopting or enforcing any future policy that contains the same language at-issue in this case "in full." (10/3/24 Judgment at pp. 3-4.)

**== Minute Order Complete ==**