

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

12. AIMEE ELSE V. DANIEL ELSE

PFL20190360

On July 19, 2022, Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency temporary custody orders, requesting sole physical and legal custody of the minors. On July 22, 2022, the court denied the request, however, ordered the minors were not to be removed from California. Petitioner then filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 22, 2022, requesting the court modify the current child custody and parenting time orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counselling (CCRC) for an appointment on August 10, 2022 and a review hearing on September 22, 2022. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO or referral to CCRC.

However, Respondent completed and turned in the CCRC questionnaire and filed a Responsive Declaration on July 27, 2022. Therefore, the court finds Respondent had actual notice of the RFO and referral to CCRC. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served with the Responsive Declaration, therefore, the court is unable to consider it.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on August 10, 2022. Therefore, a single parent report with no agreements or recommendations was filed on August 11, 2022. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on August 31, 2022.

On September 6, 2022, Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders. Petitioner requested temporary sole physical and legal custody of the minors as Respondent had left the minors in her care and left the state of California for Arkansas. The court found good cause to proceed with the ex parte without notice to Respondent as he had left the minors with Petitioner, returned to Arkansas, and had provided no contact information to Petitioner. The court granted Petitioner's request for temporary sole physical and legal custody of the minors, pending the hearing on September 22, 2022. Petitioner filed a RFO on September 7, 2022, which was set for September 22, 2022.

There is no Proof of Service for the September 7, 2022 filed RFO showing Respondent was properly served.

Parties appeared for the September 22, 2022 hearing. Parties were ordered to attend CCRC on October 7, 2022 and the court set a further review hearing on December 8, 2022.

Petitioner filed an RFO on October 11, 2022, requesting child support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served by mail on October 11, 2022. Petitioner is requesting guideline child support. This matter is set to be heard on December 12, 2022.

Respondent has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent is ordered to file and serve an updated Income and Expense Declaration forthwith.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

Respondent filed a RFO requesting custody orders on October 24, 2022. There is no Proof of Service showing the RFO has been properly served on Petitioner. Therefore, the October 24, 2022 filed RFO is dropped from calendar due to lack of service. Further, the issues of custody and parenting time are currently before the court.

The parties attended CCRC on November 3, 2022. A report was filed on November 22, 2022. Copies were mailed to the parties on November 22, 2022. The court has read and considered the CCRC report and finds the recommendations to be in the minors' best interests. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders. The parties shall have joint legal custody. Petitioner shall have primary physical custody. Respondent shall have parenting time during the summer commencing one week after the last day of school until two weeks prior to the first day of school. The court adopts the holiday schedule as set forth in the CCRC report. The court adopts the provisions for transportation as well as the additional provisions as set forth in the CCRC report.

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 #12: RESPONDENT'S OCTOBER 24, 2022 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF SERVICE. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION FORTHWITH. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. THE PARTIES SHALL HAVE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PRIMARY PHYSICAL CUSTODY. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME DURING THE SUMMER COMMENCING ONE WEEK AFTER THE LAST DAY OF SCHOOL UNTIL TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE FIRST DAY OF SCHOOL. THE COURT ADOPTS THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE PROVISIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION AS WELL AS THE ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT. 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.

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 8, 2022

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

13. AMY BURSE V. DEWAYNE BURSE

PFL20170155

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 27, 2022, requesting the court modify custody, parenting time, and child support orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 17, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Respondent did not file an updated Income and Expense Declaration as required.

The court has reviewed the Proof of Service filed on October 5, 2022. Based on the Proof of Service, Petitioner was personally served the RFO FL-300 forms, however, there is no indication Petitioner was served the referral to CCRC or the other required documents. The court notes the El Dorado County Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) is also a party to the case, and there is no Proof of Service showing they were served with the RFO.

Only Respondent appeared for the CCRC appointment on October 17, 2022. As such, a single parent report was filed with no agreements or recommendations. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on October 26, 2022.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on October 26, 2022, requesting the issue of child support be set on the child support calendar pursuant to Family Code section 4251.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court finds the RFO and referral to CCRC were not properly served. Service requires not only the FL-300 be served, but also a blank FL-320 and the referral to CCRC. Additional documents are also required. Further, Respondent failed to file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration, an FL-150, and serve a blank FL-150 on Petitioner. Although Respondent did attach several DissoMasters to the FL-300, the FL-150 is required to make any adjudication on child support. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: 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 8, 2022

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

14. AMY DUNHAM V. NICHOLAS DUNHAM

PFL20150215

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 12, 2022, requesting to modify the parenting plan orders. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 20, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Upon review of the court file there is no Proof of Service Showing Respondent was served.

Neither party appeared for the CCRC appointment on October 20, 2022.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to lack of proper service. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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 8, 2022

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

15. BENECIA LEE V. DUSTIN JEGLINSKI

PFL20190085

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency custody orders on September 26, 2022. On September 27, 2022, the court partially granted and partially denied the request, modifying Respondent's parenting time to the 1st, 2nd, and 4th weekends of the month from 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM. Respondent's girlfriend was not to have contact with the minors. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 27, 2022 requesting the same orders as set forth in the ex parte request. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 18, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Respondent was served by mail on September 28, 2022.

Respondent filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on October 6, 2022, requesting the court restore the prior parenting plan. On October 7, 2022, the court denied the request and confirmed the previously set CCRC appointment and review hearing date. Respondent filed a RFO on October 7, 2022, requesting the same orders as set forth in the ex parte request. Upon review of the court file there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with the RFO. Therefore, Respondent's October 7, 2022 filed RFO is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service. Further, those issues are currently before the court based on Petitioner's September 27, 2022 filed RFO.

The parties attended CCRC on October 18, 2022, however, were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed on November 22, 2022. Copies of the report were mailed to the parties on November 23, 2022.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations contained within the CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders. The parties shall maintain joint legal and physical custody. The prior parenting plan adopted by the court on November 6, 2019 is restored. Petitioner shall have the minors from Monday after school until Friday drop off at school. Respondent shall have parenting time from Friday pick up after school until drop off at school on Monday. Petitioner shall have the minors the 3rd Saturday of the month at 10:00 AM until Sunday. Respondent shall have the minors the 3rd Thursday after school until Saturday at 10:00 AM. The court adopts the remaining recommendations as set forth in the CCRC report. The court dismisses the no contact order with Respondent's girlfriend.

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 #15: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED WITHIN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. THE PARTIES SHALL MAINTAIN JOINT LEGAL AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

PHYSICAL CUSTODY. THE PRIOR PARENTING PLAN ADOPTED BY THE COURT ON NOVEMBER 6, 2019 IS RESTORED. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE THE MINORS FROM MONDAY AFTER SCHOOL UNTIL FRIDAY DROP OFF AT SCHOOL. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME FROM FRIDAY PICK UP AFTER SCHOOL UNTIL DROP OFF AT SCHOOL ON MONDAY. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE THE MINORS THE 3RD SATURDAY OF THE MONTH AT 10:00 AM UNTIL SUNDAY. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE THE MINORS THE 3RD THURSDAY AFTER SCHOOL UNTIL SATURDAY AT 10:00 AM. THE COURT ADOPTS THE REMAINING RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT. THE COURT DISMISSES THE NO CONTACT ORDER WITH RESPONDENT'S GIRLFRIEND. 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.

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 8, 2022

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

16. DAMIAN BLOWERS V. NICOLLE ARCHER

22FL0922

Petitioner filed a Request for Order on September 29, 2022, requesting the court make orders as to custody, parenting time, and child support. Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on September 30, 2022. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 27, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Respondent was personally served on October 15, 2022.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor. Petitioner is requesting the court modify the 2018 orders for child support.

On October 27, 2022, parties filed a Stipulation as to custody and parenting time. The court signed and adopted the Stipulation as its order on the same day. Parties did not request to vacate the December 8, 2022 hearing as the issue of child support needed to be resolved.

On November 15, 2022, in case number PFS20180001, the parties submitted a stipulation to modify child support. The El Dorado County Department of Child Support Services joined in the stipulation. The court signed and adopted the stipulation as its order on November 15, 2022. The parties did not request to vacate the December 8, 2022 hearing.

The court finds the issues raised in the September 29, 2022 RFO have been resolved by the parties through the above reference stipulations. Therefore, the court finds the RFO to be moot and drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE MATTER HAS BEEN RESOLVED THROUGH THE PARTIES' STIPULATIONS. THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS MOOT.

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 8, 2022

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

17. DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES V. BRENT JENSEN (OTHER PARENT: OLIVIA SILVA) PFS20130093

Other Parent filed an ex parte request for emergency custody and parenting time orders on September 27, 2022. On September 28, 2022 the court denied the request. On September 28, 2022, Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the same orders requested in the ex parte request. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on October 21, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Upon review of the court file there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent or DCSS were served with the RFO.

Other Parent is requesting the court order sole physical and legal custody to her and for Respondent to have professionally supervised visitation.

Nevertheless, both Respondent and Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment on October 18, 2022. Based on respondent attending CCRC the court finds he has notice of Other Parent's requested orders. The parties were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and additional recommendations was filed on November 1, 2022. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on the same day. The court notes, Respondent's copy was returned to the court as undeliverable.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the CCRC report and finds the parties' agreements and the recommendations to be in the minors' best interests. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as its orders. The parties shall have joint legal custody. The court adopts the recommended parenting plan as well as the provisions for transportation, travel with the children, and the additional provisions. The court orders Respondent to participate in observed, random drug testing for 90 days, a minimum of four times per month. After 90 days, Other Parent may request Respondent drug test if she believes he has been using. Other parent will pay for all negative test results; Respondent will pay for all positive test results. Respondent will participate in an outpatient treatment program and follow the recommendations of the program. Parties shall participate in co-parenting counseling. Parties shall use the talkingparents.com application to communicate about the minors. Other parent will transport the minors to visits and Respondent will transport the minors back to Placerville when he has unsupervised parenting time.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. THE PARTIES SHALL HAVE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDED PARENTING PLAN AS WELL AS THE PROVISIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION, TRAVEL WITH THE CHILDREN, AND THE ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PARTICIPATE IN OBSERVED, RANDOM DRUG TESTING FOR 90 DAYS, A MINIMUM OF FOUR TIMES PER MONTH. AFTER 90 DAYS, OTHER PARENT MAY REQUEST RESPONDENT DRUG TEST IF SHE BELIEVES HE HAS BEEN USING. OTHER PARENT WILL PAY FOR ALL NEGATIVE TEST RESULTS; RESPONDENT WILL PAY FOR ALL POSITIVE TEST RESULTS. RESPONDENT WILL PARTICIPATE IN AN OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PROGRAM AND FOLLOW THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAM. PARTIES SHALL PARTICIPATE IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING. PARTIES SHALL USE THE TALKINGPARENTS.COM APPLICATION TO COMMUNICATE ABOUT THE MINORS. OTHER PARENT WILL TRANSPORT THE MINORS TO VISITS AND RESPONDENT WILL TRANSPORT THE MINORS BACK TO PLACERVILLE WHEN HE HAS UNSUPERVISED PARENTING TIME. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. OTHER PARENT 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 8, 2022

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

20. KAILEY O'DELL V. SWANEY COBB, JR.

PFL20190477

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on October 12, 2022, requesting a modification of custody and parenting plan orders. On October 14, 2022, the court denied the request as it had not been properly served. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte request on October 14, 2022. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on November 1, 2022 and a review hearing on December 8, 2022. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served.

Neither party appeared for CCRC on November 1, 2022.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #20: 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 8, 2022

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

21. KATRINA BAKER V. JEFFREY BAKER

22FL0440

On May 17, 2022, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make child custody, parenting time, child support and spousal support orders. Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration the same day. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on June 27, 2022 and a review hearing on August 11, 2022. Petitioner filed an amended RFO and Income and Expense Declaration on May 24, 2022. Respondent was personally served with the RFO and CCRC referral on June 4, 2022.

Petitioner requested sole legal and physical custody of the minor with Respondent to have supervised parenting time after he completes in-patient substance abuse treatment. Petitioner requested guideline child support as well as \$1,500 per month as temporary spousal support. Petitioner also requested property control orders for the residence located at 2432 Black Rock Lane in Cool, California.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment on June 27, 2022. Respondent contacted the court a half-hour prior to the appointment to inform the counselor that his vehicle broke down. Petitioner was unwilling to allow Respondent to participate via phone, as she suspected he was under the influence. A single parent CCRC report was filed with the court though no recommendations could be made.

A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on July 5, 2022. At the August 11th hearing the court rereferred the parties to CCRC and set a review hearing for September 21st which was later continued by order of the court to the present hearing date. Pending the review hearing the court ordered Petitioner to have temporary sole legal and physical custody of the minor. Respondent was to have professionally supervised visitation twice a week for two hours each with Respondent to pay the cost of the supervision. The court ordered child support in the amount of \$998 per month with an arrears balance of \$2,994. The court reserved jurisdiction to modify child support retroactively to the date of filing of the RFO and ordered the parties to file and serve updated Income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the next hearing date. Likewise, the court ordered temporary spousal support in the amount of \$548 per month with an arrears balance of \$1,644. Again, the court reserved jurisdiction to retroactively modify back to the date of the RFO. Finally, the court awarded Petitioner exclusive control of the marital property in Cool, California.

The parties attended CCRC on September 21, 2022. A report was issued on October 28th and mailed to the parties on November 1st. The parties could not come to any agreements at CCRC but the CCRC counselor provided recommendations regarding legal custody, parenting time, phone contact, communication between the parties, alcohol or substance abuse, respect guidelines and counseling.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

Prior to receiving the CCRC report, Respondent filed an RFO of his own on September 21st asking to modify the custody and support decisions made in the court's prior ruling. The RFO was personally served on October 10th. It was set for hearing on December 8th.

On November 10, 2022, given the overlap in requests between the present hearing and the pending RFO, in the interest of judicial economy, the court continued the hearing to join with the December 8th hearing at 1:30 in Department 5. All prior orders remained in full force and effect. The court continued to reserve jurisdiction to modify child support and spousal support back to the date of filing of the May 17th RFO.

There have been no additional filings in this matter.

The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the CCRC report are in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders. The parties shall have joint legal custody. Petitioner shall continue to have sole physical custody. Respondent shall continue to have professionally supervised visitation for a minimum of two hours two times per week. Other parent will pay for all negative test results; Respondent will pay for all positive test results. Once Respondent has completed an Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) assessment and has initiated compliance with the recommendations, Respondent's visits may be non-professionally supervised, by a mutually agreed upon third party. Upon completion of all recommendations from the AOD assessment and a period of 30 days of clean tests, Respondent shall have unsupervised parenting time on Saturdays and Sundays from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM on alternating weekends. The court adopts: the phone contact provisions; the parties shall use the talkingparents.com application for all communication about the minor; the substance abuse provisions; the respect guidelines; and the counseling provisions.

Respondent requests the court modify the prior orders as to child support and spousal support as he is no longer employed. Respondent submitted a letter from his former employer stating he was terminated from employment as of April 6, 2022. The court had previously reserved jurisdiction to retroactively modify child and spousal support to the date of the filing of the RFO, May 17, 2022. The court temporarily suspends the child and spousal support orders, effective June 1, 2022. The court holds the prior orders, including the order for arrears in abeyance. The court notes Petitioner has not filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration since May 24, 2022. The court admonishes Respondent that it is the public policy of the state of California that parents provide for their children. The court's expectation is that Respondent seek and obtain employment forthwith. The court continues the hearing on the request for child and spousal support to February 16, 2022 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Both parties are ordered to file and serve updated income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the next hearing. The court continues to reserve jurisdiction to modify child and spousal support to the date of the filing of the RFO, May 17, 2022.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

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 #21: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. THE PARTIES SHALL HAVE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. PETITIONER SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED VISITATION FOR A MINIMUM OF TWO HOURS TWO TIMES PER WEEK. OTHER PARENT WILL PAY FOR ALL NEGATIVE TEST RESULTS; RESPONDENT WILL PAY FOR ALL POSITIVE TEST RESULTS. ONCE RESPONDENT HAS COMPLETED AN ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG (AOD) ASSESSMENT AND HAS INITIATED COMPLIANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONDENT'S VISITS MAY BE NON-PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED, BY A MUTUALLY AGREED UPON THIRD PARTY. UPON COMPLETION OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AOD ASSESSMENT AND A PERIOD OF 30 DAYS OF CLEAN TESTS, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE UNSUPERVISED PARENTING TIME ON SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS FROM 10:00 AM TO 4:00 PM ON ALTERNATING WEEKENDS. THE COURT ADOPTS: THE PHONE CONTACT PROVISIONS; THE PARTIES SHALL USE THE TALKINGPARENTS.COM APPLICATION FOR ALL COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE MINOR; THE SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROVISIONS; THE RESPECT GUIDELINES; AND THE COUNSELING PROVISIONS.

THE COURT TEMPORARILY SUSPENDS THE CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDERS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2022. THE COURT HOLDS THE PRIOR ORDERS, INCLUDING THE ORDER FOR ARREARS IN ABEYANCE. THE COURT ADMONISHES RESPONDENT THAT IT IS THE PUBLIC POLICY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT PARENTS PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN. THE COURT'S EXPECTATION IS THAT RESPONDENT SEEK AND OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT FORTHWITH. THE COURT CONTINUES THE HEARING ON THE REQUEST FOR CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO FEBRUARY 16, 2022 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. BOTH PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING. THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE JURISDICTION TO MODIFY CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THE RFO, MAY 17, 2022.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

GROUND 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 8, 2022

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

22. MARICRUZ SANCHEZ V. OMAR NEGRETE

21FL0110

On November 16, 2021, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make custody and visitation orders. A CCRC session was set for December 17, 2021 with a hearing set for January 27, 2022. On December 5, 2021, Respondent was personally served with the RFO and Referral to CCRC.

Both parties participated in the CCRC session and came to some agreements but not on all issues. A CCRC report was issued on January 14, 2022 with copies mailed to the parties on January 20, 2022.

The CCRC report notes that the parties previously had agreed for the oldest of the parties four minor children to spend the school year with Respondent in Mexico, after which he would move to Petitioner's home in El Dorado County. Respondent contends that the oldest child recently told Petitioner that he wants to remain in Mexico with Respondent.

Per the report, the parties agreed for the oldest minor to return to Petitioner in August 2022, consistent with the parties' prior agreement, and that the rest of the children continue to live primarily with Petitioner. Among its several recommendations, the report recommends that the parties share joint legal custody and that Respondent get five weeks of parenting time over the summer school break with the children.

On January 27, 2022, the parties appeared for the hearing, although no oral argument was requested, the court heard the matter due to the language barrier. After hearing from the parties, the court adopted the tentative ruling and re-referred the parties to CCRC for an appointment on October 17, 2022 and a further review hearing on December 8, 2022.

Both parties attended CCRC on October 17, 2022 but were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed on November 23, 2022. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on the same day. The recommendation is for the parties to continue to share joint legal custody with the Petitioner having primary physical custody in El Dorado County. Respondent shall have parenting time in El Dorado County when he is able to arrange it, with 30-days' notice to Petitioner. Respondent shall have two weeks of parenting time with the minors in Mexico during the summer of 2023. The date and times are to be arranged with Petitioner at least 30 days in advance. During the summer of 2024 Respondent shall have four weeks of parenting time in Mexico. The date and times are to be arranged with Petitioner at least 30 days in advance. Respondent shall have five weeks of parenting time with the minors in Mexico all subsequent summers. The date and times are to be arranged with Petitioner at least 30 days in advance.

The court has read and considered the CCRC report and finds the recommendations to be in the minors' best interests. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner is ordered to prepare and file the Findings and Order After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED WITHIN THE CCRC ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDER AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

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 8, 2022

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

23. MARY RISEMAN V. JONATHAN RISEMAN

PFL20170232

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 26, 2022, requesting a modification of the child custody orders. Parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served with the RFO.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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 8, 2022

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

24. WALTER BORING V. ALLISON BORING

PFL20160114

On September 7th the parties filed a Stipulation and Order Regarding Child Support and 11/17/22 Hearing. The stipulation was signed and became the order of the court the same day. The stipulation noted that Respondent requested guideline child support in the RFO but the issue was inadvertently overlooked by both parties and the court; as such, no child support orders were made. The parties stipulated to add the issue of child support to the November 17th hearing date and allow the court to rule on the issue retroactively back to the date of filing (May 25, 2022). The parties agreed to file updated Income and Expense Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

As stipulated, Petitioner filed his Income and Expense Declaration as well as a document entitled Update to the Court Re Child Support and Uninsured Medical Reimbursement. The documents were filed on October 18th, and served the day prior on October 17th. The court has not received any filings from Respondent or Minor's Counsel.

According to Petitioner, Respondent has stopped paying child support because she has lost her job. He claims she is employable but has chosen not to seek work. Petitioner requests a seek work order as well as an order directing Petitioner to pay an arrears amount of \$5,282.26. He is also requesting \$1,381.14 for Respondent's half of uninsured medical expenses for the minor. Finally, he asks the court to make its support order based on Respondent's ability to earn.

Respondent filed an update Income and Expense Declaration on November 7, 2022. It was served electronically on the same day. Respondent also filed a Supplemental Declaration the same day. The Supplemental Declaration was served electronically the same day.

Parties appeared for the hearing on December 1, 2022, and the court ruled on the parenting time issues, but did not have time to reach the issue of child support. Respondent requested the court calculate three different timeframes for support. First, for the period of time she was unemployed from May 16, 2022 until July 17, 2022. Next from July 2022 to August of 2022, when she was employed and had a 0% timeshare with the minor. Finally, from September forward taking into consideration a 2% timeshare with the minor. Parties agreed to meet and confer on the issue of reimbursement for medical expenses.

For the months of June and July 2022, the court sets child support at \$0 due to Respondent's unemployment.

Starting August 1, 2022 though September 1, 2022, the court orders guideline child support of \$1,556 per month payable from Respondent to Petitioner. See attached DissoMaster.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

Starting September 1, 2022 and through November 1, 2022, the court orders guideline child support of \$1,524 per month payable from Respondent to Petitioner. See attached DissoMaster. Payment is due on the 1st of each month.

Starting December 1, 2022, the court orders guideline child support of \$1,484 per month payable from Respondent to Petitioner. See attached DissoMaster. Payment is due starting December 1, 2022 and payable on the first of each month thereafter until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order may result in an overpayment as a wage garnishment order has been in place at the prior order amount of \$1,886 per month. The court finds since June 1, 2022 through October 31, 2022, Respondent has paid \$7,668.35 in child support payments. Based on the current order, June 1, 2022 through October 31, 2022, Respondent's total owing is \$4,606. Therefore, through October 31, 2022, there has been an overpayment of \$3,062.35. The court notes because a wage garnishment has been in place, there is an overpayment for November and December as well totaling approximately \$804. The total over payment though December 31, 2022 is \$3,866.35. As a result of the overpayment, Respondent's payments for January 1, 2023 and February 1, 2023 are reduced to \$0. Payment for March 1, 2023 shall be \$899. Starting April 1, 2023, Respondent shall return to the \$1,484 payment.

The court finds Petitioner's request for a seek work order to be moot, as Respondent has secured employment. The court denies Petitioner's request for arrears, as there has been a wage garnishment order in place, which has resulted in an overpayment as set forth above.

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 #24: THE COURT ORDERS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT AS SET FORTH ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A SEEK WORK ORDER TO BE MOOT, AS RESPONDENT HAS SECURED EMPLOYMENT. THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ARREARS AS SET FORTH ABOVE. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

December 8, 2022

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

**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:	TELEPHONE NO:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em; color: blue;">August 2022</div>
DISSOMASTER REPORT 2022, Monthly		CASE NUMBER: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em; color: blue;">PFL 20160114</div>

Input Data	Father	Mother	Guideline (2022)	Cash Flow Analysis	Father	Mother
Number of children	1	0	Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
% time with Second Parent	0%	0%	Father	9,684	Payment (cost)/benefit	1,556 (1,556)
Filing status	<-MFJ	MFS->	Mother	9,642	Net spendable income	11,240 8,086
# Federal exemptions	3*	1*	Total	19,326	% combined spendable	58.2% 41.8%
Wages + salary	12,811	18,989	Support		Total taxes	2,540 6,351
401(k) employee contrib	1,665	0	CS Payor	Mother	# WHA	5 0
Self-employment income	0	0	Presumed	(1,556)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,924
Other taxable income	0	4	Basic CS	(1,556)	Comb. net spendable	19,326
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Add-ons	0	Proposed	
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Payment (cost)/benefit	1,556 (1,556)
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Child 1	(1,556)	Net spendable income	11,240 8,086
Ordinary dividends	0	0	Spousal support	blocked	NSI change from gdl	0 0
Tax. interest received	0	0	Total	(1,556)	% combined spendable	58.2% 41.8%
Social Security received	0	0	Proposed, tactic 9		% of saving over gdl	0% 0%
Unemployment compensation	0	0	CS Payor	Mother	Total taxes	2,540 6,351
Operating losses	0	0	Presumed	(1,556)	# WHA	5 0
Ca. operating loss adj.	0	0	Basic CS	(1,556)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,924
Roy, partnerships, S corp, trusts	0	0	Add-ons	0	Comb. net spendable	19,326
Rental income	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Percent change	0.0%
Misc ordinary tax. inc.	0	4	Child 1	(1,556)	Default Case Settings	
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Spousal support	blocked		
New-spouse income	0	0	Total	(1,556)		
Adj. to income (ATI)	0	0	Savings	0		
SS paid other marriage	0	0	No releases			
Ptr Support Pd. other P'ships	0	0				
CS paid other relationship	0	0				
Health ins(Pd by party)	587	0				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	0	1,583				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	0	1,583				
Ded. interest expense	0	0				
Charitable contribution	0	0				
Miscellaneous itemized	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Cr. for Pd. Sick and Fam. L.	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0*	3,000*				
Other gdl. deductions	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	TELEPHONE NO:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME: <i>September, October, November 2022</i>
ATTORNEY FOR: DISSOMASTER REPORT 2022, Monthly		CASE NUMBER: <i>PFL 20160114</i>

Input Data	Father	Mother	Guideline (2022)	Cash Flow Analysis	Father	Mother
Number of children	1	0	Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
% time with Second Parent	0%	2%	Father	9,684	Payment (cost)/benefit	1,524 (1,524)
Filing status	<-MFJ	MFS->	Mother	9,642	Net spendable income	11,207 8,119
# Federal exemptions	3*	1*	Total	19,326	% combined spendable	58% 42%
Wages + salary	12,811	18,989	Support		Total taxes	2,540 6,351
401(k) employee contrib	1,665	0	CS Payor	Mother	# WHA	5 0
Self-employment income	0	0	Presumed	(1,524)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,924
Other taxable income	0	4	Basic CS	(1,524)	Comb. net spendable	19,326
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Add-ons	0	Proposed	
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Payment (cost)/benefit	1,524 (1,524)
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Child 1	(1,524)	Net spendable income	11,207 8,119
Ordinary dividends	0	0	Spousal support	blocked	NSI change from gdl	0 0
Tax. interest received	0	0	Total	(1,524)	% combined spendable	58% 42%
Social Security received	0	0	Proposed, tactic 9		% of saving over gdl	0% 0%
Unemployment compensation	0	0	CS Payor	Mother	Total taxes	2,540 6,351
Operating losses	0	0	Presumed	(1,524)	# WHA	5 0
Ca. operating loss adj.	0	0	Basic CS	(1,524)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,924
Roy, partnerships, S corp, trusts	0	0	Add-ons	0	Comb. net spendable	19,326
Rental income	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Percent change	0.0%
Misc ordinary tax. inc.	0	4	Child 1	(1,524)	Default Case Settings	
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Spousal support	blocked		
New-spouse income	0	0	Total	(1,524)		
Adj. to income (ATI)	0	0	Savings	0		
SS paid other marriage	0	0	No releases			
Ptr Support Pd. other P'ships	0	0				
CS paid other relationship	0	0				
Health ins(Pd by party)	587	0				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	0	1,583				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	0	1,583				
Ded. interest expense	0	0				
Charitable contribution	0	0				
Miscellaneous itemized	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Cr. for Pd. Sick and Fam. L.	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0*	3,000*				
Other gdl. deductions	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	TELEPHONE NO:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em; color: blue;">December 2022</div>
DISSOMASTER REPORT 2022, Monthly		CASE NUMBER: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em; color: blue;">PFL20160114</div>

Input Data	Father	Mother	Guideline (2022)	Cash Flow Analysis	Father	Mother
Number of children	1	0	Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
% time with Second Parent	0%	2%	Father	9,684	Payment (cost)/benefit	1,484 (1,484)
Filing status	<-MFJ	MFS->	Mother	9,359	Net spendable income	11,167 7,875
# Federal exemptions	3*	1*	Total	19,043	% combined spendable	58.6% 41.4%
Wages + salary	12,811	18,447	Support		Total taxes	2,540 6,093
401(k) employee contrib	1,665	0	CS Payor	Mother	# WHA	5 0
Self-employment income	0	0	Presumed	(1,484)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,575
Other taxable income	0	4	Basic CS	(1,484)	Comb. net spendable	19,042
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Add-ons	0	Proposed	
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Payment (cost)/benefit	1,484 (1,484)
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Child 1	(1,484)	Net spendable income	11,167 7,875
Ordinary dividends	0	0	Spousal support	blocked	NSI change from gdl	0 0
Tax. interest received	0	0	Total	(1,484)	% combined spendable	58.6% 41.4%
Social Security received	0	0	Proposed, tactic 9		% of saving over gdl	0% 0%
Unemployment compensation	0	0	CS Payor	Mother	Total taxes	2,540 6,093
Operating losses	0	0	Presumed	(1,484)	# WHA	5 0
Ca. operating loss adj.	0	0	Basic CS	(1,484)	Net wage paycheck/mo	10,000 12,575
Roy, partnerships, S corp, trusts	0	0	Add-ons	0	Comb. net spendable	19,042
Rental income	0	0	Presumed Per Kid		Percent change	0.0%
Misc ordinary tax. inc.	0	4	Child 1	(1,484)	Default Case Settings	
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Spousal support	blocked		
New-spouse income	0	0	Total	(1,484)		
Adj. to income (ATI)	0	0	Savings	0		
SS paid other marriage	0	0	No releases			
Ptr Support Pd. other P'ships	0	0				
CS paid other relationship	0	0				
Health ins(Pd by party)	587	0				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	0	1,583				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	0	1,583				
Ded. interest expense	0	0				
Charitable contribution	0	0				
Miscellaneous itemized	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Cr. for Pd. Sick and Fam. L.	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0*	3,000*				
Other gdl. deductions	0	0				
AMT info (IRS Form 6251)	0	0				
Child support add-ons	0	0.				
TANF, SSI and CS received	0	0				