

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. AMANDA VASQUES V. ARNOLD ROSENFELD

PFL20210668

Respondent filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on September 20, 2022, requesting a modification of the August 4, 2022 custody and visitation orders. On September 21, 2022, the court denied the ex parte request. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court modify the August 4, 2022 custody and visitation orders. As the parties had been referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) within the last six months, the parties were not rereferred to CCRC. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with the RFO.

While there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served with the RFO, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on September 30, 2022. The court, therefore, finds Petitioner has notice of the requested changes and will proceed with the matter. Respondent was served by mail on September 30, 2022. Petitioner objects to Respondent's requested change but agrees to Respondent having parenting time on the weekends. Petitioner objects to the requested change as it would result in the siblings being separated from each other.

The court finds Respondent's requested modification to custody and the parenting plan would not be in the minors' best interest, as it would result in separating the siblings. There is no good cause to separate the siblings set forth in Respondent's RFO. The court finds the current order for custody and parenting time remains in the minors' best interest. The court denies Respondent's requested changes.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Order After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDER FOR CUSTODY AND PARENTING TIME REMAINS IN THE MINORS' BEST INTEREST. THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUESTED CHANGES. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDER AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. ANTONIO OLAEZ V. TANYA SARAVIA

PFL20150664

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 14, 2022, requesting the court modify the child custody and parenting time orders. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 20, 2022 and a review hearing on December 1, 2022. Respondent concurrently filed a declaration with nearly 50 pages of attachments, as well as a separate declaration requesting Minors' Counsel be removed from the case. Petitioner was personally served on October 13, 2022. Minors' Counsel was served by mail on October 23, 2022.

Respondent requests the court modify the current custody orders to allow the parties to have joint legal and physical custody of the minors. Respondent asserts Petitioner is emotionally abusive towards the minors. In her declaration Respondent has included multiple documents, which have previously been submitted to the court, regarding her participation in substance abuse treatment and testing. These documents are not current, and deal with testing and treatment from a period from 2019 to 2021. Respondent has provided no current documentation about her sobriety.

On October 11, 2022, the court issued an ex parte minute order vacating the CCRC appointment as it was calendared in error. The minute order confirmed the review hearing for December 1, 2022.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on November 1, 2022. Respondent and Minors' Counsel were served by mail on November 3, 2022. Petitioner requests the court deny Respondent's requested changes. Petitioner asserts Respondent has failed to participate in court ordered substance abuse testing and treatment. Petitioner further asserts Respondent has not participated in any supervised visitation with the minors. Petitioner requests the current orders from July 7, 2022 remain in full force and effect and the court deny the request to remove Minors' Counsel.

The court has not received a Statement of Issues and Contentions from Minor's Counsel.

Respondent has failed to demonstrate how the requested change in custody orders and parenting plan would be in the minors' best interests. Respondent has failed to regularly visit with the minors under the current court order. Respondent has not provided any documentation to demonstrate she is in compliance with the July 7, 2022 court order for her to participate in monthly substance abuse testing and provide the court, Petitioner, and Minors' Counsel with the results. The court denies Respondent's request to modify the custody and parenting plan orders.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE HOW THE REQUESTED CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS AND PARENTING PLAN WOULD BE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO REGULARLY VISIT WITH THE MINORS UNDER THE CURRENT COURT ORDER. RESPONDENT HAS NOT PROVIDED ANY DOCUMENTATION TO DEMONSTRATE SHE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE JULY 7, 2022 COURT ORDER FOR HER TO PARTICIPATE IN MONTHLY SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING AND PROVIDE THE COURT, PETITIONER, AND MINORS' COUNSEL WITH THE RESULTS. THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CUSTODY AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

PARENTING PLAN ORDERS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. BONNIE BALTAZAR V. GUY D'URSO

PFL20200128

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022. Parties were ordered to appear to select Mandatory Settlement and Trial dates. Additionally, the court received a request for oral argument. As set forth in the prior tentative ruling, oral arguments will be heard on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. BRANDON BERUMEN V. ZSANENN WARD-THOMAS

PFL20200128

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022. The court received a request for oral argument. As set forth in the prior tentative ruling, oral arguments will be heard on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. DCSS V. ERIC HILL (OTHER PARENT: ANAROSE FERRO)

PFS20150143

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 4, 2022, requesting modification of child custody and parenting time orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had been within the last six months. Other Parent was served with the RFO by mail on August 4, 2022.

Respondent is requesting sole physical and legal custody of the minor. Respondent asserts Other Parent is suffering mental health issues which prevent her from adequately parenting the minor. Respondent asserts Petitioner has neglected the minor's dental needs as well as failed to complete a well child exam. Respondent also states in his Declaration that Other Parent has misused her telephone calls with the minor.

Other Parent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

On September 15, 2022, the court found good cause to rerefer the parties to CCRC. Previously, in May of this year, Other Parent participated in the CCRC session, however, despite being present Respondent refused to participate in the session if his support person was not allowed into the session. Therefore, a single parent report was filed, with no agreements or recommendations.

On October 10, 2022, both parties appeared for CCRC, however, once again Respondent refused to participate in the session. As such a single parent report with no agreements or recommendations was filed. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on November 1, 2022.

Respondent's request to modify custody and parenting time for sole legal and physical custody is denied. Respondent chose not to participate in the CCRC appointment on his on request to modify the current custody and visitation orders. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO MODIFY CUSTODY AND PARENTING TIME FOR SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY IS DENIED. RESPONDENT CHOSE NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CCRC APPOINTMENT ON HIS ON REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CURRENT CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

22. MARIA VARGAS-COOK V. REILLY COOK

PFL20180521

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 12, 2022, requesting attorney fees and costs, and that Minors' Counsel speak with the family therapist. Petitioner filed a subsequent RFO on September 14, 2022, making the same requests. The September 14TH RFO was heard on October 27, 2022 and continued to January 19, 2023.

The court finds the September 12, 2022 filed RFO has been superseded by the September 14, 2022 RFO in that it makes the same requests. Therefore, the court finds the September 12, 2022 RFO to be moot.

The court affirms the current orders and confirms the hearing set for January 19, 2023.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 RFO HAS BEEN SUPERSEDED BY THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 RFO; THEREFORE, THE COURT FINDS THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 RFO IS MOOT. ALL CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE COURT CONFIRMS THE HEARING CURRENTLY SET FOR JANUARY 19, 2023. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

23. MICHAEELEN GONZALEZ V. FRANCISCO GONZALEZ

PFL20200700

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022 ordering the parties to appear to provide additional information to the court. Parties are ordered to appear on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

24. NICHOLAS CANALES V. BRENDA CANALES

PFL20090112

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022. The court received a request for oral argument. As set forth in the prior tentative ruling, oral arguments will be heard on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

25. NICOLE RILEY V. RANDY HOFF

22FL0770

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022. The court received a request for oral argument. As set forth in the prior tentative ruling, oral arguments will be heard on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

26. S.N. V. M.N.

22FL0896

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 20, 2022, requesting the court make child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 17, 2022 and a review hearing on December 1, 2022. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served with the RFO.

On October 14, 2022, the court issued an ex parte minute order rescheduling the CCRC appointment due to the unavailability of the CCRC counselor. A new appointment was set for November 4, 2022. A copy of the minute order was mailed to Petitioner on October 14, 2022.

No parties appeared for CCRC on November 4, 2022. A non-appearance report was filed on November 4, 2022.

The court finds the RFO was not properly served, and therefore, drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #26: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

27. SARAH CALLAHAN V. IAN HALL

PFL20120486

On September 19, 2022, Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency custody and parenting plan orders. On September 20, 2022, the court partially granted and partially denied the ex parte request. The court granted Petitioner sole physical custody of the minor and maintained joint legal custody. Respondent was ordered to have professionally supervised visitation the 1st, 3rd, and 5th Saturday of the month for a minimum of three hours. Respondent was ordered to confirm the parenting time 24 hours in advance.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 20, 2022, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 14, 2022 and a review hearing on December 1, 2022. Respondent was personally served with the ex parte orders, as well as the RFO and referral to CCRC on September 21, 2022. Petitioner asserts Respondent has a substance abuse problem and has not been exercising his parenting time with the minor. The last contact Petitioner had with Respondent was on October 13, 2022, when Respondent requested a visit with the minor on October 22, 2022 for his birthday. Respondent has only utilized half of his parenting time in August of 2022 and has not seen the minor since. Petitioner is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on October 14, 2022. As such, a single parent CCRC report without agreements or recommendations as filed. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on October 14, 2022.

The court grants Petitioner's requests with the following modifications: Petitioner shall have sole physical custody; the parties shall maintain joint legal custody, with Petitioner having final decision making authority; parties shall use the talkingprents.com or similar application to communicate about the minors needs, including education and health decisions; if Respondent fails to respond to Petitioner about any joint legal custody issues within 72 hours, Petitioner may make any necessary decisions; Respondent shall have professionally supervised parenting time the 1st, 3rd, and 5th Saturday of the month for a minimum of three hours; parties may mutually agree in writing to a non-professional supervisor. Respondent shall not transport the minor.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #27: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUESTS WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: PETITIONER SHALL HAVE SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY; THE PARTIES SHALL MAINTAIN JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY, WITH PETITIONER HAVING FINAL DECISION MAKING AUTHORITY; PARTIES SHALL USE THE TALKINGPRENTS.COM OR SIMILAR APPLICATION TO COMMUNICATE ABOUT THE MINORS NEEDS, INCLUDING EDUCATION AND HEALTH DECISIONS; IF RESPONDENT FAILS TO RESPOND TO PETITIONER ABOUT ANY JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY ISSUES WITHIN 72 HOURS, PETITIONER MAY MAKE ANY NECESSARY DECISIONS; RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED PARENTING TIME THE 1ST, 3RD, AND 5TH SATURDAY OF THE MONTH FOR A MINIMUM OF THREE HOURS; PARTIES MAY MUTUALLY AGREE IN WRITING TO A NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR. RESPONDENT SHALL NOT TRANSPORT THE MINOR. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

28. STACEY VALIENTE-KEATES V. SELAH VALIENTE-KEATES

22FL0868

The court previously issued a tentative ruling on November 16, 2022. The court received a request for oral argument. As set forth in the prior tentative ruling, oral arguments will be heard on December 1, 2022 at 1:30 pm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

29. STACY PURDY V. RYAN PURDY

PFL20150937

On September 6, 2022, Respondent filed an ex parte request for emergency custody orders. On September 15, 2022, the court held a hearing on the ex parte requests. Both parties appeared for the hearing. The court ordered the current custody and parenting plan orders remained in full force and effect. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 12, 2022. The minor was to be made available to the counselor at the counselor's request. The court continued the review hearing set from October 20, 2022 to December 1, 2022. The non-custodial parent was ordered to have telephonic contact with the minor daily at 7:00 pm. The calls were to be 10 minutes each.

Only Respondent appeared for the CCRC appointment on October 12, 2022. As such a single parent report with no agreements or recommendations was filed. A copy was mailed to the parties on October 14, 2022. Petitioner's copy was returned to the court as undeliverable.

The court is concerned about Petitioner's lack of participation in CCRC. The court needs additional information from the parties prior to ruling on the matter. Parties are ordered to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #29: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

30. T.F. V. D.G.

22FL0897

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Paternal Relationship on September 20, 2022. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing the Summons was served. Petitioner also filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 20, 2022, requesting the court make child custody and child support orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 20, 2022 and a review hearing on December 1, 2022. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served with the RFO or referral to CCRC.

Both parties appeared at CCRC on October 20, 2022 and informed the counselor they had reconciled and were not seeking orders or recommendations at this time. A letter to the court summarizing the appointment was filed on October 20, 2022.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #30: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

31. JULIE JEAN SCHUMANN V. JACOB MICHAEL SCHUMANN

22FL0361

On September 15, 2022, Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration and a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for spousal support and attorney's fees. The RFO, the Income and Expense Declaration, and other required documents, were served on September 20th. Petitioner is requesting guideline spousal support as well as attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,435. Though her request for attorney's fees is somewhat unclear, qualifying it with the fact that the requested attorney's fees are only "should the matter go to litigation." Petitioner filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on November 17, 2022.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on November 21st along with Respondent's Declaration in Opposition to Petitioner's Request for Order for Support. Both documents were served via mail the same day. Respondent is requesting an order for Petitioner to seek full-time work and income to be imputed to her based on the results of a vocational evaluation. By way of a separate RFO, Respondent has requested a vocational assessment and a return for reassessment of support after the completion of the vocational evaluation. Respondent opposes Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and he asks that the court use his base pay to calculate support with overtime and bonuses, should the court choose to consider them, to be on an Ostler/Smith basis.

The court does not feel that imputing income is appropriate at this time. If a vocational evaluation is done Respondent may renew his request at that time. However, it is warranted to impute Petitioner with the financial contributions her parents make to her monthly expenses which, she estimates, is approximately \$1,750.

Utilizing the figures outlined in the attached DissoMaster report, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$2,521 per month. The court adopts the attached DissoMaster report and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$2,521 per month as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. The court orders the temporary spousal support order effective October 1, 2022. Spousal support payments are subject to the attached overtime and bonus tables.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$7,563 through and including December 1, 2022. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$1,000 on the 15th of each month (with a final payment of \$563) until paid in full (approximately 8 months). If a payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full, with legal interest within five (5) days of the date the missed/late payment was due.

On the issue of attorney's fees, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." *In Re Marriage Of Keech*, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866(1999). This assures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. It "is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party," but rather "parity." *Alan S. v Superior Court*, 172 Cal. App. 4th 238,251(2009). The award must be just and reasonable; in determining what is just and reasonable, the court can take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 1, 2022

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

present the party's case adequately. The court must consider the assets, debts, earning ability, ability to pay, and the age and health of each party (*In re Marriage of McLain*, 212 Cal. Rptr. 3d 537 (2017)), as well as the impact of the fee award on the payor taking into account any orders for support. *In Re Marriage Of Keech, supra*, at 860.

While it is evident that Respondent's monthly income is greater than that of Petitioner's, that alone is not sufficient to justify an award of attorney's fees. Respondent's monthly expenses well exceed that of Petitioner's. So too does his debt. Moreover, both parties have a significant amount of money in cash, checking, and other deposit accounts which may be used to pay for attorney's fees. Accordingly, Petitioner's request for attorney's fees is denied.

TENTATIVE RULING #31: THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$2,521 PER MONTH. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED DISSOMASTER REPORT AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,521 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THE COURT ORDERS THE TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDER EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2022. SPOUSAL SUPPORT PAYMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED OVERTIME AND BONUS TABLES. THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,563 THROUGH AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 1, 2022. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$1,000 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH (WITH A FINAL PAYMENT OF \$563) UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 8 MONTHS). IF A PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL, WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS OF THE DATE THE MISSED/LATE PAYMENT WAS DUE. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THESE MATTERS WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07

ATTORNEY (NAME AND ADDRESS): EDC Court California ATTORNEY FOR: Husband	TELEPHONE NO: Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
DISSOMASTER REPORT 2022, Monthly	CASE NUMBER:

Input Data	Husband	Wife	Guideline (2022)	Cash Flow Analysis	Husband	Wife
Number of children	0	0	Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
% time with Second Parent	0%	0%	Husband	9,802	Payment (cost)/benefit	(2,521) 2,521
Filing status	MFJ->	<-MFJ	Wife	2,800	Net spendable income	7,281 5,321
# Federal exemptions	1*	1*	Total	12,602	% combined spendable	57.8% 42.2%
Wages + salary	13,148	0	Support (Nondeductible)	Total taxes	3,186	452
401(k) employee contrib	1,052	0	SS Payor	Husband	Comb. net spendable	12,602
Self-employment income	0	1,502	Alameda	2,521	Proposed	
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	2,521	Payment (cost)/benefit	(2,521) 2,521
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Proposed, tactic 9		Net spendable income	7,281 5,321
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	SS Payor	Husband	NSI change from gdl	0 0
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Alameda	2,521	% combined spendable	57.8% 42.2%
Ordinary dividends	0	0	Total	2,521	% of saving over gdl	0% 0%
Tax. interest received	0	0	Savings	0	Total taxes	3,186 452
Social Security received	0	0	No releases		Comb. net spendable	12,602
Unemployment compensation	0	0			Percent change	0.0%
Operating losses	0	0			Default Case Settings	
Ca. operating loss adj.	0	0				
Roy, partnerships, S corp, trusts	0	0				
Rental income	0	0				
Misc ordinary tax. inc.	0	0				
Other nontaxable income	0	1,750				
New-spouse income	0	0				
SS paid other marriage	0	0				
CS paid other relationship	0	0				
Adj. to income (ATI)	0	0				
Ptr Support Pd. other P'ships	0	0				
Health insurance	160	0				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	422	0				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	422	0				
Ded. interest expense	0	0				
Charitable contribution	0	0				
Miscellaneous itemized	0	0				
State sales tax paid	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Cr. for Pd. Sick and Fam. L.	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0*	0*				
Other gdl. adjustments	0	0				
AMT info (IRS Form 6251)	0	0				
Child support add-ons	0	0				
TANF, SSI and CS received	0	0				

ATTORNEY (NAME AND ADDRESS): EDC Court California ATTORNEY FOR: Husband	TELEPHONE NO.:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
Husband Monthly Overtime Wages Report 2022 Monthly		CASE NUMBER:

"R" denotes that Husband is a recipient for the corresponding support
 "CS%" is the percentage of Overtime paid as additional Child Support
 "SS%" is the percentage of Overtime paid as additional Spousal Support

Husband's Gross Overtime	Basic CS%	Basic CS	Alameda SS%	Alameda SS	Total Basic CS	Total SS	Total Support CS+SS
0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	2,521	2,521
100	0.00	0	28.30	28	0	2,549	2,549
200	0.00	0	28.29	57	0	2,578	2,578
300	0.00	0	28.28	85	0	2,606	2,606
400	0.00	0	28.28	113	0	2,634	2,634
500	0.00	0	28.27	141	0	2,662	2,662
600	0.00	0	28.26	170	0	2,691	2,691
700	0.00	0	28.25	198	0	2,719	2,719
800	0.00	0	28.24	226	0	2,747	2,747
900	0.00	0	28.23	254	0	2,775	2,775
1,000	0.00	0	28.22	282	0	2,803	2,803
1,100	0.00	0	28.21	310	0	2,831	2,831
1,200	0.00	0	28.21	338	0	2,859	2,859
1,300	0.00	0	28.20	367	0	2,888	2,888
1,400	0.00	0	28.19	395	0	2,916	2,916
1,500	0.00	0	28.18	423	0	2,944	2,944
1,600	0.00	0	28.17	451	0	2,972	2,972
1,700	0.00	0	28.17	479	0	3,000	3,000
1,800	0.00	0	28.16	507	0	3,028	3,028
1,900	0.00	0	28.15	535	0	3,056	3,056
2,000	0.00	0	28.14	563	0	3,084	3,084



ATTORNEY (NAME AND ADDRESS): EDC Court California ATTORNEY FOR: Husband	TELEPHONE NO.:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
Husband Annual Bonus Wages Report 2022 Yearly		CASE NUMBER:

"R" denotes that Husband is a recipient for the corresponding support

"CS%" is the percentage of Bonus paid as additional Child Support

"SS%" is the percentage of Bonus paid as additional Spousal Support

Husband's Gross Bonus	Basic CS%	Basic CS	Alameda SS%	Alameda SS	Total Basic CS	Total SS	Total Support CS+SS
0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	30,252	30,252
100	0.00	0	28.31	28	0	30,280	30,280
200	0.00	0	28.31	57	0	30,308	30,308
300	0.00	0	28.31	85	0	30,337	30,337
400	0.00	0	28.31	113	0	30,365	30,365
500	0.00	0	28.31	142	0	30,393	30,393
600	0.00	0	28.31	170	0	30,422	30,422
700	0.00	0	28.31	198	0	30,450	30,450
800	0.00	0	28.31	226	0	30,478	30,478
900	0.00	0	28.31	255	0	30,507	30,507
1,000	0.00	0	28.30	283	0	30,535	30,535
1,100	0.00	0	28.30	311	0	30,563	30,563
1,200	0.00	0	28.30	340	0	30,591	30,591
1,300	0.00	0	28.30	368	0	30,620	30,620
1,400	0.00	0	28.30	396	0	30,648	30,648
1,500	0.00	0	28.30	425	0	30,676	30,676
1,600	0.00	0	28.30	453	0	30,705	30,705
1,700	0.00	0	28.30	481	0	30,733	30,733
1,800	0.00	0	28.30	509	0	30,761	30,761
1,900	0.00	0	28.30	538	0	30,789	30,789
2,000	0.00	0	28.30	566	0	30,818	30,818

