

Pleading Perfect
1706 Chester Ave., Suite 360C
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Royal Legal (769-255-3425)

August 5, 2026

[CLIENT NAME REDACTED]
[MAILING ADDRESS REDACTED]
[CITY, STATE, AND ZIP CODE REDACTED]

Re: [CASE NAME REDACTED] document packet

Dear [CLIENT NAME REDACTED],

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

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

1. The packet contains duplicate versions of the Request for Order and the Request to Waive Court Fees. The copies are not identical: one Request for Order ends with an incomplete attachment reference, and one fee-waiver copy leaves the financial page blank while the other completes it. Please identify the intended final versions and remove the superseded copies so the filing packet is not internally inconsistent.
2. On the Request to Waive Court Fees, page 1 appears to select both the low-income option and the basic-needs option even though the form appears to ask for one basis. Please check which selection is intended and make the related entries on page 2 consistent with that choice.
3. The fee-waiver attachment checkbox appears selected, but the attachment number is blank on both the fee-waiver form and the attached continuation page. Adding a matching attachment number may help keep the pages connected.
4. The third-party preparation declaration identifies the client as the respondent in the caption and signature block, but the body states that the client is the petitioner. Please make the party role consistent throughout the declaration.
5. Two versions of the third-party preparation declaration appear in the packet. One is dated and one appears undated. Please keep only the intended final signed and dated copy.
6. The third-party preparation declaration uses the title wording "Inpropria Persona." That wording appears unusual, and the compensation sentence may read more clearly if "were ... fees" is revised. Please check the intended title and grammar before filing.
7. The current Request for Order appears to request custody and visitation changes, while the service proof lists several attachments and a hearing notice but does not clearly list the Request for Order itself. Please compare the proof-of-service document list with the exact papers actually served and make the description complete and consistent.
8. The proof of service uses plaintiff and defendant labels, while the family-law documents use petitioner and respondent labels. The names may still identify the same parties, but matching the role labels may reduce confusion.

9. The service address on the proof of service includes an additional street word that does not appear in the intake sheet or residence-history form. Please check the intended street address and use the same complete address wherever it is repeated.
10. The residence-history form lists the client as having lived with the child at several prior addresses, while the supporting declaration describes the client as relocating separately and trying to remain near the child. Please check whether the “person child lived with” entries accurately reflect who actually lived in each household during each period.
11. The residence-history form appears to have closely adjoining date ranges. Please recheck the start and end dates so there are no unintended gaps, overlaps, or transposed dates.
12. The custody application asks for custody to the respondent and appears to request no visitation for the other party, but the visitation schedule pages are mostly blank. This may be intentional. Please check that every selected custody and visitation box matches the exact orders described in the declaration.
13. The supplemental declaration refers to declarations from several attached witnesses. Exhibits A through D appear present, but Exhibit B appears to be an unsigned letter without a visible date or penalty-of-perjury statement. Please check whether a signed and dated final version is intended.
14. Exhibit A is handwritten and portions appear faint. Replacing it with a clearer scan or a typed, signed copy may reduce legibility questions after efilng or copying.
15. The old judgment identifies a prior custody arrangement and incorporates an attached mediation agreement. The current Request for Order summarizes the prior order using a later filing date. Please check that the date used to identify the current order is the intended date and is stated consistently.
16. The Request for Order, custody forms, fee-waiver request, declaration, and third-party declaration contain signatures and dates in some copies but not others. Please make sure the filed packet uses one consistent final set and that every intended signer signs and dates the correct version.

Pleading Perfect is happy to help you make these corrections, or you may make the corrections yourself. We can also efile the documents for you, or you may efile them directly at EFileSystem.com. Please call us at Royal Legal (769-255-3425) if you would like our help.

Sincerely,

Pamela Perez
Pleading Perfect

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

[CASE NAME REDACTED] - Checklist

- ☐ Choose the final Request for Order and fee-waiver versions and remove duplicate drafts.
- ☐ Check which fee-waiver basis should be selected on page 1.
- ☐ Add matching attachment numbers to the fee-waiver form and continuation page.
- ☐ Make the client's petitioner or respondent role consistent in the third-party declaration.
- ☐ Keep only the intended signed and dated third-party declaration.
- ☐ Check the third-party declaration title and revise the compensation sentence for grammar.
- ☐ Make the proof-of-service document list match the exact papers served.
- ☐ Make the party-role labels consistent on the proof of service and family-law forms.
- ☐ Confirm the complete service address and use it consistently.
- ☐ Check who lived with the child at each address listed in the residence history.
- ☐ Recheck the residence-history date ranges for gaps, overlaps, or transpositions.
- ☐ Confirm that the custody and visitation boxes match the requested orders in the declaration.
- ☐ Check whether Exhibit B should be signed, dated, and finalized.
- ☐ Replace Exhibit A with a clearer copy if the handwriting may be difficult to read.
- ☐ Confirm the date used to identify the prior custody order.
- ☐ Confirm that every intended signer signs and dates the same final packet.

Please note: Pleading Perfect is not a law firm, and our team members are not attorneys. This review is not legal advice. We looked only for apparent formatting, spelling, grammar, and consistency issues in the documents. We did not evaluate the legal claims, defenses, strategy, or whether the documents state or rely on the correct legal theories. Questions about legal rights, legal deadlines, legal procedures, or the legal effect of any document should be directed to a licensed attorney.