

“I Love Mom”: San Diego Girls Forced to Say Goodbye During Final Visit After Judge Terminates Mother’s Parental Rights

California’s Court Crisis —It’s Extreme



JULIE M. ANDERSON HOLBURN

JUN 04, 2026



SAN DIEGO, Calif. — On June 4, San Diego mother Evelyn Lopez and her two young daughters were brought together for what family

members describe as their final visit after a San Diego Juvenile Court judge terminated Lopez's parental rights on May 26.

The final visit took place at the Sheriff's Station, located at 11486 Campo Road in Spring Valley, California, where photographs obtained by *Unveiled and Uncensored* show Malaika, who turns 5 in November, and her 3-year-old sister Xayah holding handmade pink signs bearing messages including **"I ♥ Mom"** and **"I Love Mom."**

Family members say the children were emotional as they said goodbye to the only mother they have ever known and loved.

Julie M. Anderson-Holburn is a reader-supported publication. To receive new posts and support my work, consider becoming a free or paid subscriber.

✓ **Subscribed**

The visit came just days after newly appointed San Diego Juvenile Court Judge Devon L. Lomayesva terminated Lopez's parental rights despite years of visitation records, emotional video footage, and expert testimony that supporters say documented a strong and loving bond between the children and their mother.

1. STREET ADDRESS: *Low Office of Des... 1601 Hillside Ave #202 San Diego, CA 92108*
 CITY AND ZIP CODE: *San Diego 92108*
 ATTORNEY FOR APPEAL: *Evelyn Lopez (Mother)*
 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF *San Diego*
 STREET ADDRESS: *Meadowdale Swank*
 CITY AND ZIP CODE: *San Diego 92108*
 CHILD'S NAME: *Makana & Xayah Robinson*
 NOTICE OF APPEAL-JUVENILE
 CASE NUMBER: *521339AB*

— INSTRUCTIONS —

- You or your attorney must fill in items 1 and 2 and sign this form at the bottom of the page. If possible, to help process your appeal, fill in items 3-7 on the reverse of this form.
- For most appeals, you must file a written notice of appeal within 60 days after rendition of the judgment or the making of the order being appealed or, in matters heard by a referee, within 60 days after the order of the referee becomes final. Read rule 8.406 of the California Rules of Court.
- To appeal an order transferring jurisdiction to the criminal court, you must file the notice of appeal within 30 days. Read rules 5.770(g) and 8.406(a)(4).
- To file an appeal of an order for transfer to a tribal court, you (1) may ask the juvenile court to stay (delay the effective date of) the transfer order and (2) must file the appeal before the transfer to tribal jurisdiction is finalized. Read rule 5.483 and the advisory committee comment.
- If you are not the county welfare department, district attorney, child, child's parent, or child's legal guardian, you may have a right to challenge a decision by the juvenile court, but only in very limited circumstances. You may need a court order granting you access to records in the juvenile case file. For more information, please see information on Requesting Access to Records for Persons With a Limited Right to Appeal (form JV-291-INFO). You can get form JV-291-INFO at any courthouse or county law library or online at: www.court.ca.gov/forms.

1. I appeal from the findings and orders of the court (specify date of order or describe order):
Fullback, CH, 9/20/08

2. This appeal is filed by:
 a. Appellant (name): *Evelyn Lopez*
 b. Address: *747 S. Mission Road #105*
 c. Phone number: *619-508-5004*
 d. Name, address, and phone number of person to be contacted (if different from appellant):
Fullback, CH, 9/20/08

3. I request that the court appoint an attorney on appeal. I ☒ was ☐ was not represented by an appointed attorney in the superior court.

4. Items 5-7 on the reverse are ☒ completed ☐ not completed.

5. ☐ Appellant has been granted access to specified records in the juvenile case file, and a copy of the court's order under Welfare and Institutions Code section 827(a)(1)(C), or Order After Judicial Review on Petition for Access to Juvenile Case File (form JV-574), if available, is attached.

6. ☐ Termination of parental rights ☐ Appointment of guardian ☐ Planned permanent living arrangement

7. The order appealed from was made under Welfare and Institutions Code (check all that apply):
 a. ☐ Section 305.5 (transfer to tribal court)
☐ Granting transfer to tribal court ☐ Denying transfer to tribal court
 Dates of hearing (specify):
 b. ☐ Section 360 (declaration of dependency) ☐ Removal of custody from parent or guardian ☐ Other orders
☐ with review of section 300 jurisdictional findings
 Dates of hearing (specify):
 c. ☒ Section 366.26 (selection and implementation of permanent plan)
☒ Termination of parental rights ☐ Appointment of guardian ☐ Planned permanent living arrangement
 Dates of hearing (specify):
5/26/20, 5/11/26, 5/13/26, 5/16/26, 4/26/26, 4/15/26, 3/2/26
 d. ☐ Section 366.28 (order designating a specific placement after termination of parental rights in which a petition for extraordinary writ review that substantively addressed the specific issues to be challenged was timely filed and summarily denied or otherwise not decided on the merits)
 Dates of hearing (specify):
 e. ☐ Section 388 (request to change court order)
 Dates of hearing (specify):
 f. ☐ Other appealable orders relating to dependency (specify):
 Dates of hearing (specify):
 g. ☐ Section 725 (declaration of wardship and other orders)
☐ with review of section 601 jurisdictional findings ☐ with review of section 602 jurisdictional findings
 Dates of hearing (specify):

Lopez Notice of Appeal. May 29, 2026.

On May 29, Lopez and her attorney filed an appeal challenging the ruling and seeking further review of the court's decision.

The developments have intensified public scrutiny of California's family and dependency court system and raised renewed questions about secrecy, due process, family separation, and governmental accountability.

Read more: [Despite County Records Acknowledging Strong Maternal Bond and Expert Warnings of Harm, San Diego Judge Terminates Mother's Parental Rights in Sealed Dependency Proceedings](#)

["The Bond Doesn't Exist": San Diego Juvenile Court Blocks Press Access in Contested Termination-of-Parental-Rights Case Involving Two Toddler Sisters](#)

According to records reviewed by *Unveiled and Uncensored*, San Diego County visitation reports repeatedly described Lopez as loving, nurturing, emotionally attentive, and appropriately bonded with her daughters. Yet the same dependency system ultimately sought and obtained an order permanently severing her parental rights.

Photographs from the final visit have quickly become symbolic of the central dispute surrounding the case: whether a court should permanently sever a parent-child relationship when county records, visitation observations, emotional video footage, and expert testimony documented an ongoing maternal bond.

For supporters of the family, the image of two young girls holding signs reading “I Love Mom” outside a Sheriff’s station only days after their mother’s parental rights were terminated raises broader questions about family preservation, judicial decision-making, and the extraordinary power dependency courts exercise over the lives of children and families.

How to Help

In addition to pursuing an appeal, family members say they are actively seeking legal representation to explore potential civil claims against San Diego County and Child Welfare Services arising from the handling of the case.

They are asking attorneys, civil rights organizations, legal advocacy groups, and others willing to assist with the matter to contact the family regarding potential representation, appellate support, or further legal review.

For now, Evelyn Lopez’s fight to remain connected to her daughters continues in California’s appellate courts. While appellate proceedings can take years to resolve, those close to the case hope additional media attention and legal scrutiny will bring greater examination of what they believe are profound questions involving family preservation, due process, governmental accountability, and the dependency system’s extraordinary power to permanently separate children from their biological families.

As Lopez's appeal moves forward, those questions are now likely headed to California's appellate courts.

This ongoing series on the California family and probate court and CPS corruption crisis—and the broader nationwide family court crisis—aims to bring national attention to systemic failures and to advocate for meaningful reform and accountability.

This article is investigative reporting intended for public-information and public-interest purposes only. It does not constitute legal advice, and nothing herein should be relied upon as a substitute for consultation with a licensed attorney or qualified legal professional. References to laws, court proceedings, or legal processes are presented for journalistic and informational purposes.

The time for action is now. Lawmakers, the media, and the public must act together to demand justice, accountability, and protection for families and children.

Are you committed to protecting America's children and restoring integrity to our legal system?

Contact your legislative representatives. Speak out. Reach out to media outlets. And vote.

Find your state and federal legislative representatives [HERE](#).

Find out what your legislators are doing on a weekly basis [HERE](#).

Whistleblowers and victims of family court, CPS, probate court, IDEA/ADA or foster care corruption anywhere in the U.S.—please contact this reporter at juliea005@proton.me or rjh.investigative.reports@gmail.com.

Together, we can ignite a national movement and create lasting change.