	1		
1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
2	COUNTY OF ORANGE, LAMOREAUX JUSTICE CENTER		
3	DEPARTMENT L11		
4	-000-		
5	ALBERT BUSHALA,) CERTIFIED COPY		
6	Petitioner,)		
7	vs.) CASE NO.: 25V000476		
8	GEORGE BUSHALA,		
9	Respondent.)		
10			
11			
12	HONORABLE CHERI PHAM, JUDGE PRESIDING		
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT		
14	APRIL 1, 2025		
15			
16			
17	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:		
18	FOR THE PETITIONER: IN PROPRIA PERSONA (ALBERT BUSHALA)		
19	FOR THE RESPONDENT: JIMENEZ LAWYERS		
20	BY: DAVID JIMENEZ ATTORNEY AT LAW		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	MARISA M. PRIBULSKY, CSR NO. 13504		
26	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER		
		- [

		2
1	SE	ESSIONS
2	APRIL 1, 2025	PAGE
3	Morning Session	5
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		





ORANGE, CALIFORNIA - APRIL 1, 2025 1 MORNING SESSION 2 -000-3 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT:) 4 5 THE COURT: This matter is Albert Bushala versus George Bushala. 6 I'm going to ask both parties to please remain 7 standing and raise your right hands. 8 THE CLERK: Do each of you solemnly state the 9 10 evidence you're about to give in the case now pending before this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing 11 12 but the truth so help you God? THE RESPONDENT: Yes. 13 THE PETITIONER: I do. 14 THE CLERK: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Counsel, your appearance. 16 MR. JIMENEZ: Yes, your Honor. 17 David Jimenez on behalf of the respondent, 18 George Bushala, Jr. 19 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Albert Bushala, the lady 20 who had her hearing right before this, Ms. Miaad Bushala, is 21 your wife; correct? 22 THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. And having heard some facts 24 from the last hearing, I understand that you have currently a 25 pending lawsuit against your brother, Mr. George Bushala, 26

```
Jr.?
 1
              THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT: And the lawsuit also names your
 3
 4
     mother --
 5
             THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: -- and your father?
 6
              THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: And the lawsuit has to do with a
 8
     trust --
 9
10
              THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: \operatorname{\mathsf{--}} that your parents have created for
11
12
     the benefit of the children, and you are disputing your
     share, meaning that the purpose of the lawsuit is to
13
     determine what your share of the trust is; correct?
14
             THE PETITIONER: No, your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I'm not here to
16
     decide your -- here.
17
              THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: The complaint your attorney filed listed
19
     declaratory relief, which is to determine your rights, breach
20
     of partnership agreement --
21
              THE PETITIONER: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: -- breach of an implied covenant and
23
24
     good faith and fair doing, brief of fiduciary duty,
     conversion, violation of Penal Code 496, possession of stolen
25
26
    property, and accounting.
```

Well, sir, before you go any further, I -- having the benefit of a little history of your family, this matter -- just for the same reason I denied your request for a temporary restraining order, sir, this matter is not -- does not belong in family court domestic violence. I am not going to have my department and this vehicle be used -- the domestic violence restraining order be used in -- somehow in leverage in a civil lawsuit between brothers.

2.4

I find that the motivation behind your request and your wife's request for restraining order against your brother is unfortunately not genuine. Okay? I don't find that there's anything here that would cause me to find that you are in fear of your life or for your safety. It is a dispute -- financial dispute between brothers and the in-laws.

I did not tell your wife this, but I mean, I found her a little bit disingenuous in terms of denying knowledge of any lawsuit when she's married to you and that the lawsuit was actually filed since October of 2024. And the fact that she has claimed to me that she had -- knows nothing about a lawsuit between the brothers is disingenuous at best. Okay?

So I can tell you right now, sir, based on your declaration -- and I don't think that you're going to be presenting anything else that can convince me because your evidence is most likely going to be the same as your wife because you were there when you and your wife and your

children visited your parents -- the same parents that you are suing, by the way. The same parents that your wife alleges that you've been visiting and have a great relationship; however, you named them as defendants.

THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. We had to as part of the partnership, but actually the lawsuit was set from my brother, George. He would not present any of the documents when he -- he sent me this settlement agreement, and I have proof here that he sent it from him and not an attorney.

He's in control of the whole estate.

THE COURT: Yeah. But why are you bringing this to $$\operatorname{\mathtt{my}}$$ attention because, sir, I am not civil court.

THE PETITIONER: Right. Okay. I'm just answering what you're saying, and my wife isn't named in the lawsuit.

THE COURT: That doesn't matter. Are you telling me as husband and wife you and your wife don't talk?

THE PETITIONER: Oh, she knows about, but she's not named in the lawsuit.

THE COURT: That's my point. That's my point. She claims she didn't know about it.

THE PETITIONER: She knows about it, but she was not involved because he was saying $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

THE COURT: No, sir. My only point being is that -the fact that -- I just want you to relay to your wife that
in my denying --

THE PETITIONER: Okay.

THE COURT: -- her request, I didn't find her 1 credible. 2 THE PETITIONER: I'll do that. 3 THE COURT: Just the fact that she denied something 4 5 she actually had knowledge for. THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: As far as you're concerned, sir, are you 7 going to give me something that would prove to me your 8 brother-in-law attacked you and you deserve a restraining 9 10 order in family court? THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. THE PETITIONER: I have video. I have proof. 13 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to indulge you a little 14 bit here. Go ahead. 15 THE PETITIONER: Okay. Well --16 THE COURT: Do you have a diagram too? Is that --17 THE PETITIONER: Yes, ma'am. Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: A diagram of a room? 19 THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: No, no. What I would like to do is I 21 would like you to summarize your version of the incident 22 first before you present any exhibits or diagram. Go ahead. 23 24 THE PETITIONER: I was -- on February 6th, 2025 I was invited out, my wife and ${\ensuremath{\text{I}}}$, by my father to come out and 25 visit with him. We were sitting in the room $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ in the family 26

room. I'm sitting next to my father -- I have my diagram.
I'll show you the diagram later.

2.1

My father is sitting next to me, my 98-year-old father, and my wife is sitting next to my father. Back to the right is a neighbor standing right -- to my right. As we're sitting there having a conversation, all of a sudden I look across the room and in comes George, Jr., my brother, looking like a rage. His eyes are just, like, bulging like a Hulk. He's just coming like he wants to attack me. I can tell something was wrong by his facial expressions and his eyes. My heart starts pounding.

I don't know. Did he snap? Does he have a gun? I could tell he's upset. He's just storming at me. He comes around the corner. There's a sofa. And then, shockingly, he stops and goes right over my --

(Reporter clarification.)

THE PETITIONER: He stands right over my wife, right in her face. He's almost nose to nose with to her. Would you like me to say the exact words what was going on and the video will prove it?

THE COURT: Okay.

THE PETITIONER: He says, "Get the fuck out of here, you fucking bitch. You're not allowed here. I don't want you, you fucking bitch. Get out of here. Get the fuck" -- just cussing from head to toe screaming. I mean like a 10. He's just going on and on right to her face. And then my dad

starts to defend us. Then George, Jr., starts to yell at my dad. Fortunately by the grace of God, my wife is able to grab her cell phone sitting right there. She turns on the cell phone and starts taking video.

2.1

So he drops from a 10 to a 4. In the video you'll see that. And then he starts prowling the room like a pit bull. I'm sitting there very calm. You'll see everything. It's all right here. And he starts disturbing our peace. I would be very careful how to deal with him. He's very strong. He's a great football player, great athlete, great wrestler through high school football, and he has a hairpin trigger. He had that his whole life. I would never ever go up against him in a fight.

One thing, if we did, we could have fell on my father and he could have died. He's sitting right next to us. I have a very, very loving relationsip with my father. We're extremely close.

THE COURT: Okay. Be that as it may, do you think that your brother had any reason to be angry with you and your wife?

THE PETITIONER: No, your Honor. He -- on Christmas we sent texts. We're business partners. We've been --

THE COURT: Okay. I beg to differ. In your lawsuit against your brother, George, Jr. "engages in his own manipulations and misappropriation of the partnership assets."

THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Oh, yeah, he has no reason to be angry 2 with you. 3 4 THE PETITIONER: No. 5 THE COURT: No, no. Would you like to be accused of manipulation and misappropriation? 6 THE PETITIONER: Yes. My father told me. My father 7 8 told me, yes. THE COURT: Would you like to be accused of that 9 10 yourself? THE PETITIONER: If I was doing it, that's bad on 11 12 ${\it me.}$ THE COURT: Yeah. But how would you feel? How 13 would you feel? Would you be angry? Would you be upset even 14 if it's true? Yes or no? 15 THE PETITIONER: No, I wouldn't be. 16 THE COURT: Oh, really? 17 THE PETITIONER: Not if I'm doing something that's not right, no, not at all if I got caught. Absolutely. 19 THE COURT: You would have accepted responsibility? 20 THE PETITIONER: Yes, correct, because he's in 21 charge of all the banking. He's in charge of all the 22 banking, your Honor, but that has nothing to do with this. 23 24 We talked --THE COURT: Not only did you accuse your brother of 25 26 manipulation and misappropriation, you accuse your sister and her husband of taking advantage of your elderly parents. Oh, $$\operatorname{my}.$$

1 2

2.4

THE PETITIONER: Yes, your Honor. That was because my brother, George, we were aligned. We were aligned as a partnership our whole lives.

THE COURT: You need not say anymore. Sir, even if I found that your brother got angry, screamed profanities or said some things that he shouldn't have said on that day, it's an isolated incident completely justified by what has been going on between you and him and your sister and your parents.

In your lawsuit you may not have accused your parents of misappropriation, but you're alleging that your parents are elderly, pretty much saying they didn't know what they were doing, that because -- as a result, the trust has been mismanaged and fell into the hands of your manipulating sister and brother; right? Why you smiling?

THE PETITIONER: No, you're right. I'm not smiling. You're right. That's exactly what's happening, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is all motivated by this lawsuit by your claim to the family trust. It is a dispute between siblings. And my point being, even if your brother had gotten angry that day, after reading this complaint against him, his sister, your parents, he had every right to be angry. Okay? And so I'm going to chalk it up to it being an isolated incident that is completely justified under the

circumstances; and therefore, I cannot determine that he was 1 2 the aggressor. If he did that out of no reason whatsoever 3 4 unprovoked, then perhaps there might be a chance for you, but 5 based on what I have heard from your wife in the prior hearing and from you and from reading this complaint that you 6 have against the rest of your biological family --7 THE PETITIONER: Uh-huh. 8 THE COURT: -- I don't find enough evidence, so 9 10 therefore, I'm going to deny your request. I don't care what recording you have. Even if he's shouting verbal abuse or 11 12 profanities, like I said, it's an isolated incident completely justified; and therefore, under the law by a 13 preponderance of the evidence, I cannot find that you have 14 met your burden of proof. 15 Your request is denied and unlike your wife --16 please don't argue with me. 17 THE PETITIONER: Yes. THE COURT: That is my decision. 19 THE PETITIONER: Yes. 20 THE COURT: I know you're not going to be happy. So 21 22 be it. THE PETITIONER: Can I ask a question? 23 24 THE COURT: No, you can't. THE PETITIONER: How do I visit my parents now? How 25

do I visit them? We have a great relationship, my parents

26

and I. 1 THE COURT: Sir, I'm not prohibiting you from 2 visiting your parents. You're the one who's trying to 3 prohibit him. So you two fight it out in probate court, 4 5 trust court, civil court. Let the civil court decide. Not here. All right? You're free to go, sir. 6 7 THE PETITIONER: Thank you. THE COURT: Both sides are free to go. And I 8 know -- request for attorney's fees, not here. Save it for 9 10 the civil suit. MR. JIMENEZ: Understood. I didn't say that. I 11 12 just want for the record to show that we did file declarations in opposition. If you want to look at them, I'd 13 appreciate that, but we did file third-party witnesses, 14 Sylvia, the mother --15 THE COURT: One of the defendants. 16 MR. JIMENEZ: Yes. 17 THE COURT: The mother-in-law? 18 MR. JIMENEZ: The mother-in-law. 19 THE COURT: Who wants to see her grandchildren, who 20 is happy to see Albert and his wife? 21 MR. JIMENEZ: Not limited to that, but she felt that 22 23 George at the time was protecting her because what he didn't 24 hear as he asked George is that he came there because his mother called him crying and upset because they were in the 25 room, that Albert and Miaad were there. They had gotten past

26

security guards at the gate by calling the police. The sheriff came out, forced the guards to let them into the house. Came into the house.

George came over because he was upset and heard his mom shaking and crying. Caretaker provides a declaration saying that Sylvia, the mother, when they're there, doesn't want to see him. She's hiding in her bedroom. So George comes over because his mother calls him. The caretaker calls him, says, "Come over." He gets there. She's shaking.

She's crying. You have that from third-party witnesses, so his reaction as the son is to going to go tell them to get out. He yelled and he cussed. No one disputes that, but that's what happened.

THE COURT: I thank you for that history. Perhaps I should have let you give me that a little -- those facts in the last hearing as well because perhaps sister-in-law should have heard that as well, but that's neither here nor there. I thank you for that, and I wish this family the best of luck. I -- just please relay to Sylvia, your mother, how much I feel for her --

THE RESPONDENT: Thank you, your Honor.

All right. Both sides are free to go. Thank you. (Proceedings concluded.)

2.4

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
4	COUNTY OF ORANGE)
5	
6	I, Marisa M. Pribulsky, CSR NO. 13504, official
7	court reporter in and for the Superior Court of the State of
8	California, County of Orange, do hereby certify that the
9	foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 17 inclusive, is a true
10	and correct transcription of my shorthand notes, and is a
11	full, true, and correct statement of the proceedings had in
12	said cause.
13	Dated this 16th day of July, 2025.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Marisa M. Pribulsky
19	- The table 171. I talled the
20	MARISA M. PRIBULSKY, CSR NO. 13504
21	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	