John N. Vega SBN 86662
Law Office of John N. Vega
306 West Second Street, Suite 300
San Bernardino, CA 92401
Telephone: (909) 889-0485
Facsimile: (909) 384-0952
E-mail: johnvega@johnvegalaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner, **Rebecca Lohman**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

OLD HISTORIC COURTHOUSE

In re the Matter of: **REBECCA S. LOHMAN** Petitioner, vs. **COREY C. LOHMAN** Respondent.	)	Case Number: **FAMSB-2207189** **SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF REBECCA LOHMAN**

I, Rebecca Lohman, declare that I am the Petitioner in this matter. If called upon to testify as to the facts set forth in this declaration, I could competently testify to them of my own personal knowledge except as to those facts stated upon information and belief and as to those facts I believe them to be true.

If required by the Court to offer my declaration in lieu of personal testimony, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §2209 and 2015.5, California Rules of Court, *Reifler v. Superior Court*, (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d 479, and *In Re Marriage of Stevenot*, (1984)154 Cal.App.3d 1051. I submit the following declaration:

I provide this supplemental declaration to provide the court with an update regarding Mr. Lohman's criminal court cases for violations of my restraining order, which highlight my need to have very strict and specific orders as part of this request to modify the restraining order.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CRIMINAL FILINGS AGAINST MR. LOHMAN FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE RESTRAINING ORDERS HEREIN

On November 24, 2025, the criminal court dismissed three criminal cases against Mr. Lohman. There were two pending cases, to be heard for pretrial and a third on calendar that date for arraignment. My understanding, from speaking to the Deputy District Attorney who appeared that date is that the action taken by the court was due to the language, and exceptions for communication allowed as part of the original orders. The Court was concerned about whether the charges were "technical violations". I am still awaiting the transcript of the proceedings.

In case MSB-25010399, Mr. Lohman filed the attached motion (**Exhibit 1**). This motion highlights two major areas of concern for me.

First, Mr. Lohman clearly had the intent to disrupt my employment by contacting Human Resources to file a complaint against me but looked for a way to argue that contacting Human Resources for the County, is different than contacting the Office of County Counsel, which is what the current restraining order prohibits him from doing.

The County's Human Resource Department is the Human Resource Department for County Counsel; there would be no reason for him to contact them outside of trying to affect my employment.

I request the court to review this motion as Mr. Lohman blatantly lies regarding this court's file. Mr. Lohman indicates that both Claudia Moon-Perez and Betty Tomomato made expert recommendations to the Family Law Court that Addison should not be left alone with Joseph Barrell. This court, unlike the criminal court, has the benefit of

reviewing the contents of these individuals reports to know, should the court review all of the pleadings, reports and materials contained in the file, that no such recommendations were ever made. The restriction on Joseph Barrell was a temporary order the Court made, pending the 730 evaluation, upon Mr. Lohman's request at the December 26, 2023, hearing.

It is concerning to me that Mr. Lohman would misrepresent to the criminal court the facts of this case and attribute false statements to professionals, all in order to bolster his argument that he was acting in Addison's best interest.

It is clear that contacting my employer to try to get me in some sort of trouble with my employer is not in Addison's best interest, particularly since I am the sole provider for Addison. It is the conduct and purposeful act of an vengeful person, looking out for his own interest, and to avoid criminal culpability for his vengeful conduct.

The recent events in criminal court highlight the need for this court to very specifically modify the restraining order.

The original restraining orders and the exceptions to communication were made at a time when Mr. Lohman and I shared custody and he had frequent weekly visits. The custody order from September of 2024 and events of the last few years demonstrate that the need for those exceptions no longer exist.

MY REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC ORDERS

Based on all of this, I am requesting the following specific orders be made as part of my request to modify so that law enforcement can easily enforce this court's orders:

1. A 100-yard stay away order from myself, Addison, my work, my home and Addison's school.

2. An order that Mr. Lohman not contact myself in any way, to include Talking Parents.

3. An order that Mr. Lohman not contact any San Bernardino County Office for personnel matters regarding myself.

4. An order that Mr. Lohman not contact our daughter Addison, excepting the 15-minute phone call, previously ordered to be conducted on Talking Parents, and supervised by myself.

5. An order that the 15-minute phone call between Addison and Mr. Lohman to take place at 7:00 p.m. on Mondays, instead of 2:00 p.m. on Sundays.

6. An order that Mr. Lohman not utilize the image or identity of our daughter in any social media, that he not identify her location or the location and identity of her school. Further that he not utilize her name or this family law case to seek funding on social media.

7. An order that Mr. Lohman not publish my identity, my employment, our daughter's identity and any other information regarding my reputation and career on social media.

The reason for my requesting a change in time for the phone call with our daughter is to alleviate the need for Mr. Lohman and I to communicate as sometimes Addison is engaged in extracurricular activities in the middle of the day on Sunday, making it difficult for her to have a call with her father.

It is my intention to demonstrate to the court by playing of the GoFundMe and Facebook publishings, that our daughter's identity is disclosed and I perceive that places our daughter at risk because of those publications.

I worry that Mr. Lohman, who is clearly looking for a way to harass me, that is not "technically" a violation, will show up at Addison's school as he has done in the past, or at public events he is aware she attends, and indicate that there is nothing in the orders of this court prohibiting him from being present.


Mr. Lohman's behaviors and arguments to the criminal court show that he is looking to exploit any sort of exception this court gives him to continue harassing me without having to face criminal consequences.

In the event the court is not inclined in making the requested changes herein regarding Mr. Lohman not making defamatory posts regarding myself on social media, I would ask that the Court consider an order protecting Addison's privacy and that he not be allowed to make public posts regarding our daughter.

Mr. Lohman shares the very specifics about Addison's elementary school, the names of teachers, and pictures of her and portrays her as a victim of sexual abuse, when this is certainly not the case. This would be so emotionally damaging to Addison should she become aware of the videos. Even if Mr. Lohman wants to defame me publicly, he should be prohibited from hurting Addison in this way. Mr. Lohman clearly does not seem to consider the impact to Addison if she views the videos posted by Mr. Lohman wherein he makes specific statements to Addison in the hopes that she is "listening".

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge under the laws of the State of California.

Date: 12/11/2025



Rebecca Lohman, Declarant

eSignature Details

Signer ID:	**mvFshdNfLcMdiYyRS8qp7UBj**
Signed by:	Rebecca Lohman
Sent to email:	rebeccalohman@gmail.com
IP Address:	172.56.180.150
Signed at:	Dec 11 2025, 2:07 pm PST