

1 Hawkins Legal, P.C.
2 Channing T. Hawkins, Esq. (State Bar No. 342977)
3 1918 Business Center Dr., Suite 250
4 San Bernardino, CA 92408
5 P: 909-890-1090 | F: (909) 521-7481
6 Email: CHawkins@hawkinslegalpc.com

7
8 Attorney for Respondent STEVEONNA EVANS
9

10 **BEFORE THE FAIRPOLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**
11 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
12

13 In the Matter of) FPPC No.: 2020-1097
14)
15 STEVEONNA EVANS) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO**
16) **VACATE DEFAULT DECISION AND**
17 Respondent,) **ORDER; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS**
18) **AND AUTHORITIES**
19

20
21 **TO THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION, RESPONDENT STEVEONNA**
22 **EVANS, BY AND THROUGH COUNSEL, WILL AND HEREBY DOES MOVE THE**
23 **COMMISSION FOR AN ORDER VACATING THE DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER**
24 **ENTERED ON MARCH 19, 2026, AND FOR AN ORDER PERMITTING RESPONDENT**
25 **TO FILE HER NOTICE OF DEFENSE.**

26 1. This motion is made pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code § 11520(c) on the grounds that
27 Respondent’s failure to timely respond was the result of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and
28 excusable neglect, and that good cause exists to vacate the default and set the matter for hearing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2. This motion is based on this Notice, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the declarations of Respondent and counsel, the exhibits filed herewith, the proposed order, the Notice of Defense submitted concurrently, and such further argument and evidence as may be presented at hearing.

DATED: April 24, 2026

HAWKINS LEGAL, P.C.



By: _____

CHANNING T. HAWKINS
Attorneys for RESPONDENT
STEVEONNA EVANS

1 Channing T. Hawkins, Esq. (State Bar No. 342977)
1918 Business Center Dr., Suite 250
2 San Bernardino, CA 92408
3 P: 909-890-1090 | F: (909) 521-7481
4 Email: CHawkins@hawkinslegalpc.com

5 Attorney for Respondent STEVEONNA EVANS

6
7 **BEFORE THE FAIRPOLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**
8 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9

10 In the Matter of) FPPC No.: 2020-1097
11)
12 STEVEONNA EVANS) **RESPONDANT MS. EVAN’S MOTION TO**
13) **VACATE DECISION AND TO ALLOW**
14 Respondent,) **RESPONDENT TO FILE A NOTICE OF**
15) **DEFENSE; POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**
16) **IN SUPPORT OF MOTION**
17)
18)

19 Respondent STEVEONNA EVANS hereby requests that the FAIR POLITICAL
20 PRACTICES COMMISSION (FPPC, “Agency” or “Commission”) vacate its decision of March 19,
21 2026, based on Respondent’s default and allow Respondent to file a Notice of Defense requesting
22 an administrative hearing in the matter. COMES NOW, Respondent STEVEONNA EVANS (“MS.
23 EVANS”) complains and alleges as follows:

24 Respondent EVANS hereby requests that the FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES
25 COMMISSION (FPPC, “Agency” or “Commission”) vacate its decision of March 19, 2026, based
26 on Respondent’s default and allow Respondent to file a Notice of Defense requesting an
27 administrative hearing in the matter. This Motion is made on the grounds of mistakes, inadvertence,
28

1 surprise, or excusable neglect by Counsel of the Respondent, the interest of justice, and protection
2 of due process, and is supported by the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and
3 the documents in the file of this matter.

4 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

5 **I. PROCEDURAL SUMMARY**

6 The Respondent has served as an elected official on the Adelanto City Council for several
7 years. During this time, Ms. Evans faced significant personal hardships, including a highly
8 publicized contentious divorce, experiences of being a victim of crime, and enduring a serious
9 illness. (*See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.*) These events caused substantial stress and disruption in her life.
10 Ms. Evans encountered a series of major personal and global challenges that directly affected her
11 ability to manage her administrative responsibilities. The global COVID-19 pandemic
12 fundamentally altered daily life, limiting her access to resources and reducing her ability to
13 communicate and seek assistance.

14 In December 2020, Ms. Evans was diagnosed with cervical cancer and subsequently
15 underwent surgery on June 28, 2021, resulting in a partial hysterectomy. Following the surgery, she
16 was bedridden for several weeks and required ongoing medical care, including numerous follow-up
17 appointments, all while raising her children as a single mother. In February 2023, Ms. Evans
18 remarried; however, due to a tumultuous and public relationship, she sought an annulment in
19 August 2023, which was not finalized until December 2025. (*See Exhibit B.*)

20 Throughout this time, she remained responsible for protecting her three children while
21 continuing to work and serve her community. During this period, the committee associated with her
22 campaign remained inactive after election night, with no funds received or expended. As a result, no
23 financial activity was reported. Ms. Evans was not fully aware of the implications of failing to file
24 disclosures or the requirement to formally maintain or terminate an inactive committee, especially
25 without active assistance. While she acknowledges that it was an oversight not to file the required
26 reports or close out the inactive committee, this failure was not due to malice, deception, or any
27 intent to mislead.

28

1 On March 19, 2026, the FPPC issued a Default Decision and Order finding that Ms. Evans
2 violated the Political Reform Act and imposed an administrative penalty of \$76,500 after she failed
3 to file a Notice of Defense within fifteen days of being served with the accusation. According to the
4 order, the FPPC found that Ms. Evans and her committee failed to timely file the required campaign
5 statements for 2018, 2022, and 2024. These findings relate to the Political Reform Act, which
6 mandates that candidates on the ballot, along with their controlled committees, timely file campaign
7 reports and maintain accurate records necessary for such filings. The nondisclosures in question
8 involved amounts of less than \$9,000, and there is no evidence of coercion, fraud,
9 misrepresentation, or malice.

10 Due to circumstances largely beyond her control, Ms. Evans and her committee were unable
11 to complete the required filings in a timely and adequate manner. As a pro se litigant, she was not
12 fully aware of her committee's reporting deficiencies or the procedures necessary to notify the
13 Commission of the personal challenges she faced at that time. Ms. Evans is a dedicated community
14 leader who continues to serve the public and currently holds a position on the City Council for the
15 City of Adelanto. She remains deeply committed to advocating for and supporting her community.
16 While she does not dispute that deadlines were missed, she respectfully requests that the
17 Commission consider the extraordinary personal circumstances that contributed to the
18 noncompliance. Considering these mitigating factors and consistent with comparable Commission
19 decisions in 2024, Ms. Evans respectfully requests reconsideration of a reduced penalty and the
20 opportunity for a hearing.

21 II. LAW AND ARGUMENT

22 California Government Code Section 11520 applies to respondents in administrative
23 proceedings before California agencies. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520.) Under Section 11520(b), a
24 respondent's right to request a hearing, and the agency has discretion to grant one. (Cal. Gov Code §
25 11520(a).) The respondent may also move to vacate a default decision within 7 days, and the
26 agency may grant a hearing upon a showing of good cause. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520(c).)

27 **A. The default should be set aside because Ms. Evans had good cause for her**
28 **failure to timely respond.**

1 California Government Code Section 11520(c) provides that the agency may vacate a
2 default decision and grant a hearing on good cause. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520 (c).) Good cause is
3 defined as (1) failure of the person to receive notice served pursuant to Section 11520 and (2)
4 Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. (*Id.*) After the Department issues its decision,
5 the only requirement for relief from default is that there be a “showing” of good cause. (*Id.*) But
6 even the requirement of a showing is more relaxed under the licensing law than under the Code of
7 Civil Procedure. (See *GC Bros. Entm't, LLC v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd.* (2022), 84
8 Cal. App. 5th 1019, 1032.)

9 Ms. Evans asserts that her and her committee's nondisclosure was not made in bad faith but
10 rather due to mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect. These challenges were
11 exacerbated by the unexpected COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted normal access to resources,
12 limited communication, and reduced the availability of assistance. During this period, Ms. Evans
13 was operating without legal counsel or active committee support and did not fully understand the
14 procedural requirements for maintaining or terminating an inactive campaign committee, nor the
15 consequences of failing to file a timely Notice of Defense. Importantly, the committee in question
16 had been inactive since election night and reported no receipts or expenditures following the
17 election.

18 The lack of financial activity shows that the missed filings were not related to ongoing
19 campaign operations or an attempt to conceal financial conduct. Instead, the noncompliance
20 stemmed from oversight under difficult, unusual circumstances. The record further indicates that
21 there was no intent to deceive or to evade disclosure requirements. There is no evidence of fraud,
22 misrepresentation, coercion, or malice. Throughout this time, Ms. Evans faced extraordinary
23 personal hardships. (See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.) In December 2020, she was unexpectedly diagnosed
24 with cervical cancer and underwent major surgery on June 28, 2021, which resulted in a partial
25 hysterectomy. (See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.) Her recovery required weeks of bed rest, followed by
26 ongoing medical care and numerous appointments. (See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.) At the same time,
27 she experienced significant personal instability, including a divorce, and the responsibilities of
28 raising three children as a single parent. (See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.) This accumulation of

1 challenges further contributed to her inadvertent neglect. (*See* Exhibit A; Exhibit B.)

2 These circumstances substantially impaired her ability to manage administrative and legal
3 obligations. The totality of the circumstances demonstrates that the Respondent's failure to respond
4 was due to mistake, inadvertence, and excusable neglect, which are grounds expressly recognized
5 under Government Code section 11520 to vacate a default decision and grant a hearing on good
6 cause. The Respondent's nonresponse was not a result of willful inaction or strategic avoidance but
7 was instead caused by significant personal hardship, a lack of assistance, and a misunderstanding of
8 procedural obligations during an extraordinarily disruptive time. Therefore, the Commission should
9 find that Ms. Evans' experiences amounted to a good-faith cause under Section 11520 and find that
10 relief is warranted.

11 **B. The FPPC should set the default aside in consideration of all relevant mitigating**
12 **circumstances.**

13 In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular Act, the Enforcement Division
14 considers the typical treatment of violations within the Act's overall statutory scheme. (Section
15 83116(e).) Thus, the Division evaluates the facts and circumstances of the violation in context of (1)
16 the extent and gravity of the public harm caused by the violation, (2) the level of experience of the
17 violator with the requirements of the Political Reform Act, (3) penalties intention to conceal,
18 deceive, or mislead, (5) whether the violator demonstrated good faith by consulting the Commission
19 staff or any other Governmental Agency in a manner not constituting complete defense under
20 Government Code Section 83114(b), (7) whether the violation of the Act or similar laws, and (8)
21 whether the violator, upon learning of a reporting violation, voluntarily filed amendments to provide
22 full disclosure. (*Id.*)

23 Here, the underlying violations were modest. The nondisclosures involved less than \$9000
24 over the span of five years. which is relatively modest in campaign-finance enforcement terms.
25 Some required disclosures were filed within two weeks of the deadline, which further reduces the
26 seriousness of the harm.

27 Ms. Evans was functioning during an extraordinary period of illness, surgery, family
28 upheaval, and pro se status, which helps explain why administrative compliance may have lapsed

1 despite her public-service experience resulting in good cause. There is no evidence of malicious
2 intent, concealment, fraud, or misrepresentation. It is clear that Ms. Evans’s failure was due to
3 neglect and difficult personal circumstances, not an effort to hide financial activity from the public
4 or the committee. In consideration of public policy, the statutory scheme is aimed more harshly at
5 deceptive conduct than at non-deceptive reporting omissions.

6 Ms. Evans has made a good-faith effort by taking corrective action. She retained counsel, is
7 actively working to ensure future compliance, and has taken voluntary corrective steps to align her
8 filings with the Act’s requirements. Therefore, the record does not reflect any intent to conceal or
9 mislead, occurred during an exceptionally difficult period marked by serious illness, a public
10 divorce, and have taken steps to mitigate further compliance issues. (*See* Exhibit A; Exhibit B.)

11 **C. The \$76,500 penalty is arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion in light of**
12 **the record.**

13 Notwithstanding the respondent's default, the Commission, “before a proposed decision is
14 issued, has discretion to grant a hearing on reasonable notice to the parties.” (Cal. Gov. Code, §
15 11520(b).) Moreover, there is a long-standing public policy favoring the adjudication of cases on
16 the merits, and the law requires a reviewing body to scrutinize more carefully an order denying
17 relief from default than an order granting relief and permitting a case to go forward. (*GC Bros.*
18 *Entm't*, 84 Cal. App. 5th at 1031; Code Civ. Proc., § 583.130 [“Except as otherwise provided by
19 statute ... the policy favoring trial or other disposition of an action on the merits [is] generally to be
20 preferred over the policy that requires dismissal for failure to proceed with reasonable diligence in
21 the prosecution of an action”]; *see generally Elston v. City of Turlock* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 227, 233;
22 *see also Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 566; *Crown Coach Corp. v. Superior*
23 *Court* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 540, 548; *McDonough Power Equipment Co. v. Superior Court* (1972) 8
24 Cal.3d 527, 538 (dis. opn. of Peters, J.).)

25 Lastly, Ms. Evans has been penalized a total of \$76,500 for her violations, which is grossly
26 disproportionate and not in the interest of justice. Ms. Evan's violations stem from a lack of
27 reporting for amounts less than \$9,000. There is no evidence of intent to deceive, fraud, or
28 concealment. The facts indicate that the committee was inactive after election night and that no

1 funds were received or expended. Ms. Evans acknowledged the reporting failures as oversights, not
2 acts of malice. Moreover, Ms. Evans has taken corrective steps by retaining counsel, addressing the
3 issue, and is actively seeking to cure the noncompliance.

4 The record reflects serious illness, surgery, recovery, victim of a crime, divorce, single
5 parenting, and pandemic-related disruption. (See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.) Those circumstances
6 explain why filing obligations may have been missed and why she lacked the bandwidth to manage
7 committee administration. As such, a sanction should be calibrated to misconduct, not imposed
8 mechanically without accounting for extraordinary life events. In the cases cited in Exhibit One in
9 support of the Default Decision and order, all of the respondents were penalized less than \$6000.
10 (See *In the Matter of Sandy Genis for Costa Mesa City Council 2016 and Sandy Genis*, FPPC No.
11 18/1359; *In the Matter of Pham for Assembly 2018, Long Pham, and Mary Pham*, FPPC No.
12 18/56; *In the Matter of Pham for Assembly 2018, Long Pham, and Mary Pham*, FPPC No.18/569
13 (fining the respondent \$5,000 for failing to maintain records for over \$20,000 in unverified
14 expenses..))

15 Ms. Evans' nondisclosure of her records is disproportional to the violation fee. In *Pham*, the
16 respondent failed to report over \$20,000 in expenditures, yet was penalized only \$ 5,000. In this
17 instance, the recordkeeping violations were uncovered during an audit, which revealed that the
18 respondents failed to substantially comply with the Act's disclosure and recordkeeping
19 requirements. However, unlike in Ms. Evans' case, *Pham* demonstrated intentional violations of
20 the Act by concealing contributor information, resulting in a lack of records for significant
21 campaign contributors.

22 The purpose of the Political Reform Act is to promote transparency and compliance, not to
23 impose career-ending penalties when the facts show limited amounts, no deceit, and significant
24 mitigating circumstances. A reduced sanction would still uphold the reporting rules while avoiding
25 a punishment that far exceeds any meaningful deterrent purpose and fulfils regulatory objectives.
26 Thus, under California's strong policy favoring merit-based adjudication, the committee should not
27 let the default penalty remain unchanged. The modest dollar amounts, the absence of deceptive
28

1 intent, the corrective actions taken, and the substantial personal hardships all support the case for a
2 materially reduced penalty and an opportunity for Ms. Evans to be heard.

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 For each and all the foregoing stated reasons, Respondent respectfully requests that the
5 decision based on default be vacated and that Respondent be granted a fair hearing pursuant to Cal.
6 Gov. Code § 11520(c) and that Respondent's Notice of Defense submitted herewith be deemed filed
7 and served in Order to give fair notice of the hearing.

8
9 DATED: April 24, 2026

10
11 HAWKINS LEGAL, P.C.

12
13 

14
15 By: _____

16 CHANNING T. HAWKINS
17 Attorneys for RESPONDENT
18 STEVEONNA EVANS
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**
2 **STEEVONNA EVANS’S MOTION TO VACATE DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER**
3 **AND TO DEEM NOTICE OF DEFENSE FILED**
4

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 Respondent Steevonna Evans respectfully requests that the Commission vacate the Default
7 Decision and Order entered on March 19, 2026, and permit Respondent to file her Notice of
8 Defense and proceed to an administrative hearing. The applicable statute authorizes relief from
9 default upon a showing of good cause, including mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable
10 neglect. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520 (c).)

11 Here, Respondent’s failure to timely respond was not willful, strategic, or undertaken in bad
12 faith. Rather, it occurred during an extended period of extraordinary personal hardship, medical
13 treatment, family instability, and pandemic-related disruption, compounded by the absence of active
14 committee support and counsel. The interests of justice, due process, and the strong policy favoring
15 decisions on the merits support vacating the default and allowing the matter to be heard.

16 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

17 Government Code section 11520 governs default in administrative proceedings before state
18 agencies. If a respondent fails to appear or file a timely response, the agency may issue a default
19 decision, but the respondent may seek relief by showing good cause. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520 (c).)
20 Good cause includes “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.” (*Id.*) California courts
21 construe relief-from-default provisions liberally in favor of allowing matters to be decided on the
22 merits where possible. (See *GC Bros. Entm’t, LLC v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd.*
23 (2022), 84 Cal. App. 5th 1019, 1032.) In the administrative context, the showing required for relief
24 is not intended to be as rigid as in ordinary civil default practice. (*Id.*)

25 **III. ARGUMENT**

26 **A. Respondent Has Shown Good Cause Under Government Code Section 11520.**
27
28

1 The record supports a finding of good cause because Respondent’s failure to respond was
2 the result of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect rather than a willful decision to
3 ignore the proceeding. (Cal. Gov. Code § 11520 (c).)

4 Respondent has explained that during the relevant period she was coping with:

- 5 • serious medical issues, including cervical cancer and surgery;
- 6 • significant recovery and continuing treatment;
- 7 • domestic and family instability;
- 8 • responsibility for raising her children as a single parent; and
- 9 • the broader disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

10 These facts are material because they bear directly on whether the failure to act was intentional or
11 the product of circumstances that reasonably interfered with Respondent’s ability to manage the
12 matter. The declarations show no willful failure to respond, not a conscious choice to default.
13 Therefore, Respondent has shown good cause.

14 **B. Respondent’s Failure Was Not Willful.**

15 A failure is not willful when it arises from misunderstanding, lack of sophistication, medical
16 hardship, or other circumstances showing absence of deliberate disregard. (*Diaz v. Grill Concepts*
17 *Services, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 859, 868.)

18 Respondent’s evidence reflects exactly that. The committee had been inactive since election
19 night, with no receipts or expenditures. Respondent did not intend to conceal active campaign
20 activity or frustrate the Commission’s oversight. Rather, she misunderstood the continuing reporting
21 and termination requirements applicable to an inactive committee and lacked the assistance
22 necessary to navigate the compliance process during a period of severe personal hardship. There is
23 no indication of fraud, deception, concealment, or tactical delay. On this record, the default resulted
24 from neglect under extraordinary circumstances, not a willful refusal to participate. Therefore the
25 respondent’s nondisclosure was not willful.

26 **C. The Interests of Justice Favor Vacating the Default and Allowing a Hearing on the**
27 **Merits.**

28

1 The Commission should also consider the strong public policy favoring resolution of matters
2 on their merits rather than by default.. (*GC Bros. Entm't*, 84 Cal. App. 5th at 1031; Code Civ. Proc.,
3 § 583.130) That principle applies with particular force where:

- 4 1. the respondent promptly seeks relief;
- 5 2. the respondent offers a substantial explanation for the default;
- 6 3. there is no showing of prejudice from setting aside the default; and
- 7 4. the underlying dispute involves regulatory compliance rather than intentional misconduct.

8 Here, Respondent has already taken corrective action, retained counsel, and seeks only the
9 opportunity to be heard. Denying that opportunity would impose a severe consequence without
10 affording adjudication on the merits.

11 **D. The Requested Relief Is Consistent with the Proportionality of the Underlying Conduct.**

12 While the Commission need not decide the merits of the alleged violations at this stage, the
13 proportionality of the underlying penalty underscores why a hearing should be granted. The
14 reported amounts were modest, the committee was inactive, and there is no evidence of
15 concealment or misuse of funds. Respondent has also cited comparable Commission matters in
16 which substantially lower penalties were imposed for more serious reporting issues.

17 Those circumstances excuse noncompliance, and reinforce that this is not a case of
18 deliberate evasion. A hearing would permit the parties to develop the full factual record and allow
19 the Commission to impose any appropriate sanction based on the merits rather than on default.

20 **IV. CONCLUSION**

21 For the foregoing reasons, Respondent Steveonna Evans respectfully requests that the
22 Commission:

- 23 1. vacate the March 19, 2026 Default Decision and Order;
- 24 2. deem the accompanying Notice of Defense filed; and
- 25 3. set the matter for hearing on the merits.

26 //

27 //

28

1 DATED: April 24, 2026

2

3

HAWKINS LEGAL, P.C.

4

5



6

By: _____

7

CHANNING T. HAWKINS

8

Attorneys for RESPONDENT

9

STEVEONNA EVANS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **DECLARATION OF STEVEONNA EVANS IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT’S MOTION**
2 **TO VACATE DEFAULT DECISION AND TO ALLOW RESPONDENT TO FILE A**
3 **NOTICE OF DEFENSE**
4

5 I, Steveonna Evans, declare as follows:
6

7 1. I am the Respondent in this matter and I submit this declaration in support of my request
8 that the Fair Political Practices Commission vacate the default decision entered against me and
9 allow me to file a Notice of Defense so that this matter may be heard on the merits. I have personal
10 knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would
11 testify competently to them.

12 2. I respectfully request relief from the default decision because my failure to timely
13 respond was not willful. It occurred during an unusually difficult period marked by serious
14 personal, medical, and family hardships, as well as confusion about the administrative process and
15 my reporting obligations.

16 3. During the relevant period, I was serving in public office while also dealing with
17 substantial personal disruption. I experienced a highly stressful divorce, and the ongoing
18 responsibility of raising my children as a single parent.

19 4. In December 2020, I was diagnosed with cervical cancer. On June 28, 2021, I underwent
20 surgery, including a partial hysterectomy. My recovery required weeks of bed rest and continuing
21 medical follow-up. These health issues significantly affected my ability to manage paperwork,
22 communications, and administrative responsibilities.

23 5. The COVID-19 pandemic further disrupted normal routines and access to support. During
24 this period, it was more difficult to maintain regular communication, obtain assistance, and keep up
25 with administrative obligations.

26 6. My campaign committee had been inactive after election night. There were no campaign
27 receipts or expenditures after that time, and I did not believe the committee was actively operating.
28 I now understand that reporting and termination obligations still existed, but at the time I did not

1 fully appreciate the legal consequences of leaving the committee inactive without completing the
2 required filings.

3 7. Due to my personal circumstances, health issues, and lack of legal guidance at the time, I
4 did not understand the urgency and procedural requirements for responding as I should have. My
5 failure to respond was due to mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect, not an intent
6 to ignore the Commission or evade the process.

7 8. I did not act in bad faith. I did not intend to deceive, conceal, or mislead anyone. There
8 was no effort to hide financial activity, because there was no ongoing campaign activity after the
9 election and no campaign funds were received or expended during the relevant time.

10 9. I understand that campaign reporting obligations are important and that the Political
11 Reform Act requires compliance. I regret that the required filings were not made on time and that
12 my committee was not properly closed or maintained in compliance with the Act.

13 10. Since becoming aware of the default and the resulting penalty, I have taken this matter
14 seriously and have sought legal assistance so that I can address the issue properly and ensure future
15 compliance.

16 11. I respectfully ask the Commission to consider the extraordinary circumstances that
17 affected my ability to respond, including my cancer diagnosis, surgery, recovery, family instability,
18 and the disruptions caused by the pandemic. I also ask that the Commission consider that the
19 underlying amounts at issue were limited and that there was no intent to conceal information or
20 misuse campaign funds.

21 12. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
22 foregoing is true and correct.

23 Executed on April 24, 2026, at San Bernardino,
24 California.

25
26
27
28

1 Channing T. Hawkins, Esq. (State Bar No. 342977)
1918 Business Center Dr., Suite 250
2 San Bernardino, CA 92408
3 P: 909-890-1090 | F: (909) 521-7481
4 Email: CHawkins@hawkinslegalpc.com

5 Attorney for Respondent STEVEONNA EVANS

6 **BEFORE THE FAIRPOLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**

7 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

8
9 In the Matter of) FPPC No.: 2020-1097
10)
11 STEVEONNA EVANS) **NOTICE OF DEFENSE**
12)
13 Respondent,)

14 _____
15 **NOTICE OF DEFENSE**

16 Respondent Steveonna Evans hereby gives notice that she intends to contest the allegations in the
17 above-captioned matter and requests that the matter be set for hearing.

18
19 Executed on Apr 2026, at San Bernardino, California.

20
21 HAWKINS LEGAL, P.C.

22
23 
24 By: _____

25 CHANNING T. HAWKINS
26 Attorneys for RESPONDENT
27 STEVEONNA EVANS
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. My business address is 1918 S Business Center Dr, San Bernardino, CA 92408. On April 24, 2026, I served the following documents:

- NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO VACATE DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER;
- MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
- DECLARATIONS OF STEVEONNA EVANS AND CHANNING T. HAWKINS;
- REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT OF EXHIBIT A and B;
- MOTION TO VACATE ORDER;
- NOTICE OF DEFENSE

These documents were served on the interested parties in this action as follows:

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

By the following means:

- BY MAIL
- BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE
- BY PERSONAL SERVICE
- BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

SERVICE LIST

Fair Political Practices Commission
Attn: Angela J. Brereton
1102 Q Street, Suite 3050
Sacramento, California 95811
ABrereton@fppc.ca.gov

1 Fair Political Practices Commission
2 Attn: Dave Bainbridge
3 1102 Q Street, Suite 3050
4 Sacramento, California 95811
5 dbainbridge@fppc.ca.gov.

6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true
7 and correct.

8 Executed on April 24, 2026.

9 
10
11 Jasmine Marchbanks

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Respondent requests that the Commission issue a protective order and/or direct that the identified exhibits and any referenced portions of the default decision be filed under seal or maintained as confidential because they contain confidential personal and medical information, the public disclosure of which would invade privacy and is unnecessary to adjudicate the motion. Redaction is not practicable or would not adequately protect the privacy interests at issue.

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT B

DV-200

Proof of Personal Service

Clerk stamps date here when form is filed.

1 Name of Party Asking for Protection:
Stephanne Evans

2 Name of Party to Be Restrained:
Samuel Tucker

3 Notice to Server

The server must:

- Be 18 years of age or older.
- Not be listed in items 1 or 8 of form DV-100, Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order.
- Give a copy of all documents checked in 4 to the restrained party in 2 (you cannot send them by mail). Then complete and sign this form, and give or mail it to the party in 1.



Fill in court name and street address:

Superior Court of California, County of
Superior Court of California
County of San Bernardino
235 East Mountain View Street
Barstow, CA 92311
Barstow District

Court clerk fills in case number when form is filed.

Case Number:

FAMBA 2301835

4 I gave the party in 2 a copy of all the documents checked:

- a. DV-109 with DV-100 and a blank DV-120 (Notice of Court Hearing, Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order; blank Response to Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order)
- b. DV-110 (Temporary Restraining Order)
- c. DV-105 and DV-140 (Request for Child Custody and Visitation Orders, Child Custody and Visitation Order)
- d. FL-150 with a blank FL-150 (Income and Expense Declaration)
- e. FL-155 with a blank FL-155 (Financial Statement (Simplified))
- f. DV-115 (Request to Continue Hearing)
- g. DV-116 (Order on Request to Continue Hearing)
- h. DV-130 (Restraining Order After Hearing)
- i. Other (specify):

5 I personally gave copies of the documents checked above to the party in 2 on:

a. Date: 12/26/24 Time: 2:30 a.m. p.m.

b. At this address: [Redacted] State: CA Zip: 92301
City: Adelanto

6 Server's Information

Name: Kathleen M. Grant
Address: [Redacted]
City: [Redacted] State: CA Zip: 92301
Telephone: [Redacted]

(If you are a registered process server):

County of registration: _____ Registration number: _____

7 Server's Signature

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the information above is true and correct.

Date: [Redacted]
[Redacted] Kathleen Grant [Redacted]
Type or print server's name Server to sign here

6 Has the person in 2 abused you in a different way from the abuse you described in 5? If yes, describe below.

a. Date of abuse (give an estimate if you don't know the exact date): Aug 2023 & December 15, 2024

b. Did anyone else hear or see what happened on this day?
 I don't know No Yes (If yes, give names): [REDACTED]

c. Did the person in 2 use or threaten to use a gun or other weapon?
 No Yes (If yes, describe gun or weapon): _____

d. Did the person in 2 cause you any emotional or physical harm?
 No Yes (If yes, describe harm):
Threatened to call CPS. Threatening to ruin my career

e. Did the police come? I don't know No Yes (If the police gave you a restraining order, list it in 4.)

f. Give more details about how the person in 2 was abusive on this day. Details can include what was said, done, or sent to you (examples: text messages, emails, or pictures), how often something happened, etc.
Verbal + emotional abuse by threatening to drop me
has off at CPS while I was out of town. He
made threat same thing (to all them) taking videos videos
and threatening to send them to coworkers

g. How often has the person in 2 abused you like this?
 Just this once 2-5 times Weekly Other: _____
Give dates or estimates of when it happened, if known:
Aug 2023, Dec 15, 2024

This is not a Court Order.

