

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

1. ALLYSON CLINK V. GEORGE MICHAEL CLINK

PFL20200799

Petitioner moves to compel Respondent's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure or for an order allowing her to proceed without the disclosure, and attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,500. The Request for Order (RFO) was filed on March 21st. It was mail served and electronically served on April 10th.

The Petition was filed on December 14, 2020. The Response was filed on January 25, 2021. Petitioner served her preliminary disclosures on October 6, 2021. Despite Petitioner having served her disclosures, Respondent has refused to produce his and has refused to engage in counsel's efforts to informally resolve the matter. Petitioner requests an order compelling Respondent to produce his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure or an order allowing Petitioner to waive the requirement.

Petitioner requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,500. She has already spent over \$3,000 in costs and fees but has been unable to move the matter forward given Respondent's refusal to participate in the proceedings and refusal to respond to any communications. Petitioner does not specify the code section she is relying on for her sanctions request but she has completed and filed the FL-319 and FL-158.

Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel or a motion for an order granting the complying party's voluntary waiver of receipt of the noncomplying party's preliminary declaration of disclosure. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1) & (3). Where a party fails to comply with his or her disclosure requirements "...the court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney's fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Petitioner's Motion to Compel Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure is granted. Respondent is to serve his completed Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure and his completed Income and Expense Declaration and file his Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and Income and Expense Declaration (FL-141) with the court no later than July 13, 2023. In the event Respondent fails to serve his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure and his Income and Expense Declaration by July 13th then Petitioner will be deemed to have voluntarily waived receipt of the same and the matter may proceed without Respondent's disclosure.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

Petitioner's request for attorney's fees is granted. Respondent is to pay Petitioner \$2,500 as and for attorney's fees and sanctions pursuant to Section 2107(c). Payment may be made in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$250 due and payable on the 1st of each month commencing with July 1, 2023. If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: PETITIONER'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS TO SERVE HIS COMPLETED PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE AND HIS COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AND FILE HIS DECLARATION REGARDING SERVICE OF DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE AND INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION (FL-141) WITH THE COURT NO LATER THAN JULY 13, 2023. IN THE EVENT RESPONDENT FAILS TO SERVE HIS PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE AND HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION BY JULY 13TH THEN PETITIONER WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE VOLUNTARILY WAIVED RECEIPT OF THE SAME AND THE MATTER MAY PROCEED WITHOUT RESPONDENT'S DISCLOSURE. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,500 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2107(C). PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$250 DUE AND PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING WITH JULY 1, 2023. IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

2. ASHLEY RITTERS V. RYAN SMITH

PFL20180345

On March 28, 2023 Petitioner filed and served a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation orders as well as various additional orders. This is a post-judgment RFO which was mail served, as such, Petitioner properly filed her Declaration Regarding Address Verification – Post Judgment Request to Modify a Child Custody, Visitation, or Child Support Order. Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner Ashley Ritters on April 17th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 24th. Concurrently therewith the paternal grandmother filed and served a Declaration of Amy Marie Smith. Respondent filed and served a supplemental Declaration on April 28th. The Reply Declaration of Petitioner Ashley Ritters was filed and served on June 6th. Petitioner objects to the court considering the Declaration of Amy Smith as Ms. Smith is not a party to the action.

According to Petitioner, the coparenting relationship has broken down and she has concerns about the safety of the minor. She requests the following orders: (1) Parties submit and agree to a formal parenting agreement to address outstanding issues relating to custodial parent planning school schedules, vacation time, holidays, communication and health agreements; (2) Parties to communicate via the Talking Parents app; (3) Co-parenting counseling classes for both parties; (4) Parties to submit to alcohol and drug testing for a minimum of six months and attend drug or alcohol counseling if a positive test occurs. Petitioner has provided the court with a declaration from the minor's therapist wherein she expresses her concern for healthy boundaries between the minor and the paternal grandparents. She recommends parenting classes and Respondent to have his parenting time in a location other than his parents' home.

Respondent opposes all of the requests made by Petitioner, though he does note that he would be willing to use a communication platform such as Family Wizard instead of Talking Parents as he believes Talking Parents requires a paid for subscription. He asks for the following additional orders: (1) Order that the minor no longer be seen by Leslie Hill-Sokol, LMFT; (2) Appoint a new counselor for the minor; (3) Appoint Minor's Counsel; (5) Order Petitioner to be evaluated for Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy; (6) Order Petitioner not to schedule appointments during Respondent's parenting time without prior written agreement; (7) Allow paternal grandparents or any responsible adult authorized by either party to transport the child for transitions or other appointments; and (8) Order parties to request and schedule phone calls with the minor during the other party's parenting time. Respondent also notes that Exhibit B to the RFO contains personal information regarding a minor and he asks that the minor's name be redacted.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 24th. The parties were unable to come to any agreements at CCRC, but the CCRC counselor has proposed

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

recommendations on all issues. The CCRC counselor noted his concern that none of the parties seem to solely have the best interests of the child in mind and he is concerned with the therapist's admitted inability to remain objective in this matter. In addition to the recommended custody and parenting orders, CCRC recommends Minor's Counsel be appointed.

Following the CCRC appointment, Respondent filed a supplemental declaration noting that during CCRC it was revealed that Petitioner has been vaping, fallen unconscious, been hospitalized and since had her driver's license revoked. He is concerned that Petitioner has been driving the minor without a valid driver's license and as such asks the court to order that Petitioner may not be allowed to transport the minor at any time.

In response to the CCRC report, Petitioner notes that she does not believe a week on/week off schedule is in the best interest of the minor at this time given the lack of cooperation between the parties. She states that she would be willing to consider such an arrangement after at least three months of coparenting counseling. She also objects to the appointment of Minor's Counsel and asks that the parties first try coparenting counseling prior to resorting to the appointment of Minor's Counsel. She requests coparenting counseling in her Reply Declaration, though her moving papers request coparenting classes. Petitioner requests coparenting counseling to commence immediately and proposes the following counselors: (1) Wendy Campbell in Sacramento; (2) Floyd J. Sanders with PACE Family Services; or (3) Stephanie Stilley. Petitioner states she would have no objection to setting a review hearing for the court to consider progress made in coparenting counseling and decide whether or not moving to a week on/week off would be appropriate.

Petitioner objects to the minor changing counselors. However, if the court does grant this request, she proposes Veronica Mayfield who is accepting new patients and is covered by insurance. She objects to Respondent's proposed use of Donelle Anderson as Ms. Anderson does not accept Petitioner's insurance and is not currently accepting new patients.

Petitioner's objection to the declaration submitted by Ms. Smith is sustained. The court has not read or considered this document.

The court finds the recommendations as listed in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and adopts them as the orders of the court. The court echoes the concerns of the CCRC counselor. It appears that none of the parties are able to entirely see past their animosity for one another to consider solely the best interests of the minor. In that vein, the court appoints Kelly Bentley as Minor's Counsel. The parties are to share the costs of Minor's Counsel equally subject to reallocation. Additionally, the parties are ordered to attend coparenting counseling at a frequency and duration as recommended by the counselor. Respondent is to choose one of the following counselors and notify Petitioner of his choice no

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

later than June 29, 2023: (1) Wendy Campbell in Sacramento; (2) Floyd J. Sanders with PACE Family Services; or (3) Stephanie Stilley. The parties are to commence the intake process as soon as reasonably possible after a counselor is chosen. The parties are to evenly split the cost of counseling. Neither party is to transport the minor without a valid, legal, driver's license. Respondent's request to have Petitioner assessed for Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy is denied. The clerk is directed to file under seal Exhibit B to Petitioner's March 28, 2023 RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PETITIONER'S OBJECTION TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE DECLARATION SUBMITTED BY MS. SMITH IS SUSTAINED. THE COURT HAS NOT READ OR CONSIDERED THIS DOCUMENT. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS LISTED IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE COURT APPOINTS KELLY BENTLEY AS MINOR'S COUNSEL. THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE THE COSTS OF MINOR'S COUNSEL EQUALLY SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION. ADDITIONALLY, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ATTEND COPARENTING COUNSELING AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE COUNSELOR. RESPONDENT IS TO CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING COUNSELORS AND NOTIFY PETITIONER OF HIS CHOICE NO LATER THAN JUNE 29, 2023: (1) WENDY CAMPBELL IN SACRAMENTO; (2) FLOYD J. SANDERS WITH PACE FAMILY SERVICES; OR (3) STEPHANIE STILLEY. THE PARTIES ARE TO COMMENCE THE INTAKE PROCESS AS SOON AS REASONABLY POSSIBLE AFTER A COUNSELOR IS CHOSEN. THE PARTIES ARE TO EVENLY SPLIT THE COST OF COUNSELING. NEITHER PARTY IS TO TRANSPORT THE MINOR WITHOUT A VALID, LEGAL, DRIVER'S LICENSE. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO HAVE PETITIONER ASSESSED FOR MUNCHAUSEN SYNDROME BY PROXY IS DENIED. THE CLERK IS DIRECTED TO FILE UNDER SEAL EXHIBIT B TO PETITIONER'S MARCH 28, 2023 RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL STARR V. LEILANI ALICE STARR

21FL0124

Motion for Reconsideration

On March 29, 2023, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders directing Petitioner to pay half the cost of supervised visits, reinstate car insurance, and sign a pension cash out for Respondent's Sutter Health pension. Concurrently therewith she filed a Declaration to support her RFO. Respondent has filed several Proofs of Service, one showing that an MC-030 (Declaration) was served on March 28th but it is unclear if that is the same declaration that was filed on the 29th. There is also a Proof of Service filed on March 29th that shows an FL-300 and an MC-030 were served but states the date of service was January 18, 2023, so it seems unlikely that proof is evidencing service of the March 29th RFO and Declaration. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

The court drops this matter from calendar due to lack of proper service. However, even if the court were to reach the merits of the RFO, it would be denied.

Respondent brings her RFO in response to the court's March 16th tentative ruling which indicated that there was no Proof of Service in the file for the pending RFO. The tentative ruling went on to further state that even if the court had reached the merits of the RFO it would have been continued to join with the April 6th hearing date which was being held on another RFO by Respondent that made identical requests. Respondent claims to have served the RFO and filed the Proof of Service. She claims to have re-filed it on February 28th.

The court is considering this to be a Motion for Reconsideration. Respondent has not provided the court with any new or additional information which would change the court's previous analysis. Even if the court had the proof of service at the time of its March 16th tentative ruling, the court explicitly stated that the hearing would have been continued to join with the April 6th hearing which was being held on an RFO that made identical requests. The court ruled on those requests in its April 6th tentative ruling, which it later adopted. The ruling has since become final, and Respondent has not met her burden to establish new or different information that would warrant the court's reconsideration of its prior ruling.

Child Support

Petitioner filed an RFO on March 22, 2023 seeking child support orders. There is no Proof of Service on file evidencing Respondent was ever served with this RFO. Respondent served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, her Income and Expense Declaration and an additional Declaration on June 5, 2023 and filed them on June 8, 2023. These documents are late filed and therefore the court cannot consider them. Without considering the late filed documents the court is unable to determine if service is being waived. As such, the court drops this matter from calendar due to lack of proper service.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT DROPS THIS MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. HOWEVER, EVEN IF THE COURT WERE TO REACH THE MERITS OF THE RFO, IT WOULD BE DENIED. PETITIONER'S MARCH 22, 2023 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

4. DELIA CHUMLEY V. DONALD CHUMLEY

21FL0101

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO) filed April 4, 2023. Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration on April 3rd. Both documents were served on April 28th. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner brings this RFO requesting exclusive temporary use, possess and control of the parties' former residence on Tierra Karla Dr. in El Paso Texas. The house is currently set to be sold at auction on April 4, 2023. Petitioner asks the court to grant her authority to list the residence for sale without Respondent's signature and allow her to sign any and all documentation necessary for the sale. Proceeds of the sale to be deposited into counsel's blocked trust account.

According to Petitioner, Respondent left the home and stopped making mortgage payments on November 2, 2022. Petitioner's counsel has made numerous attempts to contact Respondent but has not been able to do so. Petitioner is in the process of filing for bankruptcy and her daughter is attempting to get a loan to save the home but, without Respondent's cooperation, Petitioner is requesting a court order to prevent foreclosure and allow her to sell the property. Petitioner requests \$10,000 in attorney's fees for having to file this motion. The amount can be paid from Respondent's portion of the proceeds of the sale.

It is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court's authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to "...make any orders [it] considers necessary.." Fam. Code § 2553. This includes ordering the sale and division of proceeds of the marital residence. Marriage of Holmgren, 60 Cal. App. 3d 869 (1976); *See also* In re Marriage of Horowitz, 159 Cal. App. 3d 368 (1984).

Here, the court finds it necessary to order the sale of the marital residence in order to preserve the community interest in that asset. Respondent has failed to participate in the proceedings in any way and he has not objected to the sale. As such, Petitioner's request to sell the marital residence and solely execute any and all documents necessary to do so is granted. Likewise, Petitioner's request for attorney's fees is granted.

Family Code Section 271 states in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties..." Fam. Code § 271(a). Petitioner's filing of the present motion was necessitated solely by Respondent's refusal to participate in the proceedings or respond in any way to Petitioner's counsel. While the court does not have an Income and Expense Declaration from Respondent, once the home is sold

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

Respondent will have sufficient proceeds to pay the requested \$10,000 in fees. In light of the foregoing, Petitioner's Request for Order is granted in full.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORDER IS GRANTED. PETITIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO PUT THE MARITAL RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 12804 TIERRA KARLA DR., EL PASO, TX UP FOR SALE FORTHWITH. PETITIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO SOLELY SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS AS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE SALE OF THE HOME. PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE ARE TO BE DEPOSITED INTO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL'S TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL A FINAL DETERMINATION ON PROPERTY DIVISION IS MADE. RESPONDENT IS TO PAY PETITIONER \$10,000 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID IMMEDIATELY UPON THE SALE OF THE HOME AND IS TO BE PAID FROM RESPONDENT'S PORTION OF THE SALE PROCEEDS. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

5. ELIZABETH SANTA V. TRAVIS LIRETTE

22FL0806

Petitioner's Counsel, David Foyil, moves to be relieved as counsel. The moving papers were filed on March 28, 2023. All parties were properly served on April 14, 2023. No opposition to the motion has been filed.

After reviewing Counsel's moving papers, the court finds good cause has been established to relieve Mr. Foyil of his position as attorney of record for Petitioner. The motion to be relieved is granted.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS GRANTED. WITHDRAWAL WILL BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE DATE OF FILING THE PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE FORMAL, SIGNED ORDER UPON THE CLIENT.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

6. JAMES WILLIS V. CHARLOTTE WILLIS

PFL20170040

This matter comes before the court on a Request for Order (RFO) filed by Petitioner on March 29th. Concurrently therewith Petitioner filed his Income and Expense Declaration. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were personally served on March 31, 2023, as is required for a post judgment RFO. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a hearing was set for the present date.

A Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner in Support of Request for Order Re: Child Custody, Visitation and Reimbursements was filed on June 6th. It was served the day prior on June 5th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 13, 2023. Proof of Service shows Personal Service on June 13, 2023. However, this document was late filed. Given its late filing, the court has not read or considered this document.

Petitioner brings his RFO requesting the court order a parenting schedule and clarify parenting time during on-line/remote school time. Petitioner would also like access to the minor's homeschool portal, the ability to homeschool the minor when he has time to do so, and an order for the minor to return to public school when his counselor believes he is ready. Finally, he requests an order for reimbursement of the minor's uninsured medical costs.

According to Petitioner, Respondent has requested they homeschool the minor. Petitioner agreed but only on a trial basis and informed Respondent the homeschooling would need to be done by Respondent, even on Petitioner's parenting days, because Petitioner works outside the home. Respondent agreed, however Petitioner argues Respondent is now trying to use this as a reason to increase her child support stating that her parenting time has increased. Petitioner would like the court to clarify that Respondent's time spent homeschooling the minor does not decrease Petitioner's parenting time.

Petitioner states that he has paid \$10,076.33 in uninsured medical costs for the minor and \$3,230 in uninsured counseling costs. Respondent owes \$6,653.17 for her portion of these costs but has refused to pay it despite several requests by Petitioner. Petitioner also states Respondent owes \$1,314.24 for her portion of childcare expenses and the summer program at Country Day Montessori. He requests 10% interest on the amounts due. He is agreeable to the amount being paid by reducing his monthly child support obligation, or his equalization payment, until paid in full.

The parties attended CCRC on April 26th and were able to come to some agreements. The agreements, as well as additional recommendations by the CCRC counselor, are codified in the CCRC report dated June 5, 2023.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

After CCRC, Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration indicating that he and Respondent had not reached any agreements at CCRC. He also noted additional amounts paid by him for uninsured medical, dental, and counseling expenses, which brings the total amount owed by Respondent to \$8,758.41.

The court has reviewed the aforementioned filings of the parties as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as contained in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and adopts them as the orders of the court. Respondent is to provide Petitioner access to the minor's homeschooling portal forthwith to facilitate the parties sharing in the homeschooling duties. The minor is to return to schooling outside the home as soon as the minor's therapist determines the minor is ready to do so. Any time spent with Respondent homeschooling the minor during Petitioner's parenting time does not decrease Petitioner's share of parenting time and Respondent is to return the minor to Petitioner on his regularly scheduled parenting days when he is able to pick up the minor from homeschool.

Respondent is to pay Petitioner \$8,758.41 for her portion of the uncovered medical expenses, counseling expenses, and childcare/summer school expenses. This amount may be paid by considering the equalization payment satisfied in full. Any remaining amount may be paid by reducing monthly support payments by \$200 until paid in full. Once paid in full, monthly support shall return to the full ordered amount.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. RESPONDENT IS TO PROVIDE PETITIONER ACCESS TO THE MINOR'S HOMESCHOOLING PORTAL FORTHWITH TO FACILITATE THE PARTIES SHARING IN THE HOMESCHOOLING DUTIES. THE MINOR IS TO RETURN TO SCHOOLING OUTSIDE THE HOME AS SOON AS THE MINOR'S THERAPIST DETERMINES THE MINOR IS READY TO DO SO. ANY TIME SPENT WITH RESPONDENT HOMESCHOOLING THE MINOR DURING PETITIONER'S PARENTING TIME DOES NOT DECREASE PETITIONER'S SHARE OF PARENTING TIME AND RESPONDENT IS TO RETURN THE MINOR TO PETITIONER ON HIS REGULARLY SCHEDULED PARENTING DAYS WHEN HE IS ABLE TO PICK UP THE MINOR FROM HOMESCHOOL. RESPONDENT IS TO PAY PETITIONER \$8,758.41 FOR HER PORTION OF THE UNCOVERED MEDICAL EXPENSES, COUNSELING EXPENSES, AND CHILDCARE/SUMMER SCHOOL EXPENSES. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID BY CONSIDERING THE EQUALIZATION PAYMENT SATISFIED IN FULL. ANY REMAINING AMOUNT MAY BE PAID BY REDUCING MONTHLY SUPPORT PAYMENTS BY \$200 UNTIL PAID IN FULL. ONCE PAID IN FULL, MONTHLY SUPPORT SHALL RETURN TO THE FULL ORDERED AMOUNT.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. JEREMY HEATH V. RACHEL LORRAINE HEATH

22FL0458

Request for Order

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 26, 2022, requesting the court make child custody, parenting time, child support, and spousal support orders. Respondent also requested Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on September 26, 2022 and a hearing on the RFO was set for November 17, 2022. Due to court oversight the hearing was not held until December 1, 2022 at which time the court ruled on all matters.

At the time of the December 1st hearing, it was noted that the parties were still living together but they intended to sell the family home and relocate to separate residences. The parties were re-referred to CCRC to establish a parenting plan in anticipation of their living apart. CCRC was scheduled for February 6, 2023 and a review hearing was set for March 23, 2023.

The parties appeared for hearing on the RFO on March 23, 2023 and requested a continuance. The continuance was granted, and a hearing was set for the present date. The parties are ordered to appear for hearing.

Temporary Restraining Order

The parties appeared for hearing on the Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order filed by Respondent. At the hearing, both parties requested a continuance which was granted, and the hearing date was reset for the present date. The parties are ordered to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

8. JESSICA CROXTON V. ADAM CROXTON

22FL0907

This matter is before the court on a Request for Order (RFO) filed by Petitioner on March 23, 2023. Her Income and Expense Declaration was filed concurrently therewith. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were mail served on April 3rd and personally served on April 21st. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner requests the following orders: (1) Joint legal and sole physical custody of the minors, with a set parenting schedule for Respondent; (2) Guideline child support; (3) Respondent to pay for half of the children's private school tuition and extracurricular expenses; (4) Guideline spousal support; (5) Exclusive possession and control of the RV lot and business located at 3355 Saratoga Lane in Cameron Park; and (6) An order directing the sale proceeds of the family residence to be placed into a blocked account with the exception of a lump sum payment to Petitioner's grandparents and one lump sum payment of \$25,000 to each party. The parties have since filed a stipulation regarding the sale proceeds from the family residence.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on May 3, 2023 but were unable to reach any agreements. A CCRC report was prepared which provides the court with recommended orders. The court has reviewed these recommendations and finds them to be in the best interest of the minors. Accordingly, the recommendations as contained in the June 5, 2023 CCRC report are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. The court is unable to rule on the issues of child support and spousal support as Respondent has not filed his Income and Expense Declaration. These issues are therefore continued to 8/10/2023. Respondent is ordered to file and serve his Income and Expense Declaration no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date. The court reserves jurisdiction to award child and spousal support back to the date of filing the RFO.

Regarding the RV lot and business, Petitioner has requested exclusive use and control. Respondent has not opposed this request. As such, Petitioner is granted exclusive use and control of the RV lot and business located at 3355 Saratoga Lane in Cameron Park pending trial on the issue of property division and subject to Epstein Charges.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS CONTAINED IN THE JUNE 5, 2023 CCRC REPORT ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE COURT IS UNABLE TO RULE ON THE ISSUES OF CHILD SUPPORT AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT AS RESPONDENT HAS NOT FILED HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. THESE ISSUES ARE THEREFORE CONTINUED TO 8/10/2023 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AWARD CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO. PETITIONER IS GRANTED EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

THE RV LOT AND BUSINESS LOCATED AT 3355 SARATOGA LANE IN CAMERON PARK PENDING TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF PROPERTY DIVISION AND SUBJECT TO EPSTEIN CHARGES.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. JOSE PELAYO V. ALEXIS RYKOWSKI

23FL0225

Petitioner filed an Order Shortening Time (OST) and Request for Order (RFO) on May 11, 2023. The court granted the OST and set the RFO for a hearing on June 15, 2023. The court directed Petitioner to serve Respondent on or before May 17, 2023. The court directed Respondent to file a Responsive Declaration on or before June 1, 2023. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on May 12, 2023.

Petitioner is requesting the court order Respondent to move out of Petitioner's separate property residence. Petitioner asserts the home was purchased prior to the marriage. Petitioner is also requesting reimbursements totaling \$10,087.70 for mortgage payments and for utility payments. For the months of February 2023 through June of 2023, Respondent has had exclusive use and control of the home from the date of separation through the date of the hearing. Petitioner has solely paid for the mortgage, and electric bills, as well as the sewer and water bills.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court grants Petitioner's request for exclusive use and control of the property located at 3181 Big Cut Road, Placerville California. Respondent shall vacate the home on or before June 30, 2023. The court reserves on the request for reimbursements until the time of trial.

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 #9: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3181 BIG CUT ROAD, PLACERVILLE CALIFORNIA. RESPONDENT SHALL VACATE THE HOME ON OR BEFORE JUNE 30, 2023. THE COURT RESERVES ON THE REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENTS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. 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 THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. LAURA WOLCOTT V. OLIVER WOLCOTT

PFL20140730

On March 16, 2023, the court adopted its tentative ruling, setting a call schedule for Petitioner and the minors and keeping the current visitation schedule in place. The court set a further review hearing to consider a potential step-up plan for Petitioner's parenting time. The parties were directed to file Supplemental Declarations/Statements of Issues and Contentions with proposed step-up plans at least 10 days prior to the review hearing date. Minors' Counsel was instructed to discuss the status of visits with the therapist for the minors and to advise the court regarding the therapist's opinions or recommendations regarding unsupervised parenting time for the minors.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions with recommendations on May 30, 2023. Parties were served the same day. Minors' Counsel met and conferred with all the necessary individuals in formulating her recommendations. Minors' Counsel recommends the court vacate its order for mandatory phone calls between Petitioner and the minors. Allow Petitioner's parenting time to be unsupervised a minimum of one time every other week for a duration to be determined by the minors and a location to be determined by the minors. With no overnights. The minors to have discretion for more frequent parenting time with notice to Respondent, so that a therapy session may be scheduled for after the parenting time with Petitioner.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 7, 2023. Parties were served on June 6, 2023. The court notes this is less than 9 days prior to the hearing as ordered by the court on March 16, 2023. Therefore, the court has not considered this document.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration to Minors' Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions on June 8, 2023. Parties were served on June 8, 2023. While not in compliance with the court's March 16, 2023 order to file a Supplemental Declaration, it does meet the filing criteria for a Reply Declaration, and therefore the court can consider the filing. Petitioner has proposed a step-up plan to progress to an equal time share over the next several months. Petitioner objects to Minors' Counsel's recommendations for parenting time to be initiated by the minors. Petitioner asserts when telephone contact was to be initiated by the minors, it often would not occur, which resulted in Petitioner requesting court ordered schedule telephone calls. Petitioner believes a court ordered schedule is imperative. Petitioner does believe the court order for scheduled telephone calls should be vacated. Petitioner is requesting she or the minors be able to initiate telephone contact. Petitioner refers to an attached exhibit in her declaration, however, the court's copy had no such attachment.

The court has reviewed the filings of the parties as outlined above. While the court is sympathetic to the desire of the parties to provide for a more natural schedule, there remains some concern regarding the need to slowly increase visits. In furtherance of striking a balance

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

between flexibility and caution the court orders the following: (1) Petitioner is to have a minimum of two phone calls per week with the minors. The calls are to be initiated by the minors, not Petitioner. The minors may choose to have additional phone calls if they would like. (2) Petitioner is to have a minimum of 4 hours of unsupervised visitation time per week. This may be done in one visit or more broken up into more than one visit of at least one hour per visit. The minors are to choose the date, time, and place for the visit/visits. No overnight visits are allowed. The minors may choose to have additional visitation time if they would like. (3) The minors are to give Respondent sufficient advanced notice of the date and time for each visit to allow Respondent the opportunity to schedule a therapy session to take place post-visit. (4) The court sets a further review hearing for 9/14/2023 to determine whether or not an additional step up in visitation is warranted at that time.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT ORDERS THE FOLLOWING: (1) PETITIONER IS TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF TWO PHONE CALLS PER WEEK WITH THE MINORS. THE CALLS ARE TO BE INITIATED BY THE MINORS, NOT PETITIONER. THE MINORS MAY CHOOSE TO HAVE ADDITIONAL PHONE CALLS IF THEY WOULD LIKE. (2) PETITIONER IS TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF 4 HOURS WORTH OF UNSUPERVISED VISITATION TIME PER WEEK. THIS MAY BE DONE IN ONE VISIT OR MORE BROKEN UP INTO MORE THAN ONE VISIT OF AT LEAST ONE HOUR PER VISIT. THE MINORS ARE TO CHOOSE THE DATE, TIME, AND PLACE FOR THE VISIT/VISITS. NO OVERNIGHT VISITS ARE ALLOWED. THE MINORS MAY CHOOSE TO HAVE ADDITIONAL VISITATION TIME IF THEY WOULD LIKE. (3) THE MINORS ARE TO GIVE RESPONDENT SUFFICIENT ADVANCED NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME FOR EACH VISIT TO ALLOW RESPONDENT THE OPPORTUNITY TO SCHEDULE A THERAPY SESSION TO TAKE PLACE POST-VISIT. (4) THE COURT SETS A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING FOR 9/14/2023 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT AN ADDITIONAL STEP UP IN VISITATION IS WARRANTED AT THAT TIME.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

11. MATT KNESS V. JADE FRIES-KNESS

22FL0301

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 30, 2023, requesting the court enforce the provision of the Marital Settlement Agreement (MSA) pertaining to the sale of the real property located at 3500 Four Springs Drive, Rescue CA 95672 and adopting the proposed orders regarding the terms of the sale. Respondent is also requesting attorney's fees as the prevailing party per the terms of the parties' judgment at paragraph 8.2. Petitioner was personally served as required by Family Code section 215 on May 6, 2023.

Respondent sets forth in her motion that Petitioner has not refinanced the home within the timeframe as set forth in the terms of the parties' MSA. Respondent is therefore requesting enforcement of the term that the home be listed for sale and attorney's fees for having to bring this motion and for being the prevailing party.

Respondent filed an updating declaration on June 8, 2023. Petitioner was served electronically on June 8, 2023. While it was not filed 10 days prior to the hearing, the court finds good cause to consider the declaration, refinancing the home is a dynamic situation, which could have been resolved.

Respondent states in the Declaration, that her counsel has continued to attempt to meet and confer with Petitioner in an effort to resolve this matter. Petitioner has been unable to refinance the home and remove Respondent from the mortgage. Petitioner conveyed that there is an expectation to close refinancing by June 21, 2023, however, has failed to provide any documentation to Respondent or her counsel to verify this. Respondent is requesting the home be listed for sale. Respondent has proposed two potential listing agents.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court grants Respondent's request to list the home for sale. Petitioner shall select one of the proposed agents and notify Respondent on or before June 23, 2023. The home is to be listed for sale on or before June 30, 2023. Petitioner is to cooperate in signing all of the listing documents. The parties are to work with the listing agent in setting a listing price for the home. If the parties cannot agree, the listing agent shall set the list price. The clerk of the court is authorized to act as elisor should Petitioner fail to sign any of the necessary documents to list the home for sale.

As to Respondent's request for attorney's fees as the prevailing party pursuant to the parties' judgment, the request is granted. However, Respondent has not set forth in a Declaration any specific amount that the court should award. Article 8.2 of the parties' Judgment states: "...the party prevailing in such proceeding will be entitled to recover from the other party reasonable attorney fees and costs necessarily expensed in the undertaking as determine by the court." The court cannot determine what fees and costs have been incurred

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

by Respondent to pursue this action without a Declaration from counsel on the issue. Therefore, the court continues the request for attorney's fees to 8/17/2023 at 1:30 PM in department 5 to determine the amount to be awarded. Respondent is ordered to file a Supplemental Declaration addressing attorney's fees and costs at least 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

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 #11: THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO LIST THE HOME FOR SALE. PETITIONER SHALL SELECT ONE OF THE PROPOSED AGENTS AND NOTIFY RESPONDENT ON OR BEFORE JUNE 23, 2023. THE HOME IS TO BE LISTED FOR SALE ON OR BEFORE JUNE 30, 2023. PETITIONER IS TO COOPERATE IN SIGNING ALL OF THE LISTING DOCUMENTS. THE PARTIES ARE TO WORK WITH THE LISTING AGENT IN SETTING A PRICE TO LIST FOR THE SALE OF THE HOME. IF THE PARTIES CANNOT AGREE, THE LISTING AGENT SHALL SET THE LIST PRICE. THE CLERK OF THE COURT IS AUTHORIZED TO ACT AS ELLISOR SHOULD PETITIONER FAIL TO SIGN ANY OF THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO LIST THE HOME FOR SALE. THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS GRANTED. HOWEVER, THE COURT CONTINUES THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES TO DETERMINE THE AMOUNT TO 8/17/2023 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO DETERMINE TO AMOUNT TO BE AWARDED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION ADDRESSING ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE. 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 THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. ROSA MALLORY V. MICHAEL MALLORY

PFL20110553

On February 14, 2022 Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting a change to custody and parenting time. Petitioner was served with the RFO by mail on February 16, 2022.

Respondent requests the court modify custody and parenting time to allow him to be involved in the minors lives and decisions. Respondent requests to begin the visitation process again to be reunified with the minors. Respondent asserts he has been cleared through his mental health evaluation. Respondent included four exhibits with his declaration, including a letter from Keith Rivera, a Licensed Clinical Social Worker, who conducted a Mental Health Status Exam for Respondent.

On April 14, 2022, the court adopted its tentative ruling, findings good cause to continue the matter for the parties to attend CCRC. The court set a review hearing for July 7, 2022 for review of the CCRC report.

On May 11, 2022, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration requesting the court deny Respondent's requested orders. Respondent was served by mail on May 6, 2022. Petitioner asserts Respondent has failed to comply with the prior order to participate in a 730 evaluation, has not visited or had contact with the minors since approximately 2018, and failed to comply with the court order to use the Talkingparents.com application for all communication regarding the minors. Petitioner requests the court affirm its prior order for a 730 Evaluation, with additional provisions to be assessed. Petitioner further requests the court suspend the current order for professionally supervised visitation pending a return on the 730 Evaluation, as the minors have not had contact with Respondent in over three years. If and when contact is resumed, Petitioner requests it take place in a therapeutic setting under the guidance of a reunification counselor.

Parties participated in CCRC but were unable to reach any agreements. A CCRC report with recommendations was filed on June 24, 2022. A copy of the report was mailed to the parties on June 27, 2022.

On July 7, 2022, the court adopted its tentative ruling, adopting the recommendation for the minors to participate in individual therapy as its order. The court temporarily suspended the order for professionally supervised visitation. The court found Respondent had been absent from the minors lives for a substantial period. Further, the court found Respondent had failed to comply with the court's prior order to participate in a 730 evaluation. The mental health status exam completed did not fulfill the components of a 730 evaluation. The court further modified the order for Respondent to complete a 730 evaluation to include in the issues to be addressed whether it would be in the best interests of the minors to have

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

renewed contact with Respondent, given his lengthy absence. All other prior orders as to custody and communication between the parties not in conflict remained in full force and effect. The court set a further review hearing in October.

In October, the parties appeared and requested the matter be continued to allow the court an opportunity to review the 730 Evaluation. The court granted the request to continue the matter and set a further review hearing for January 19, 2023.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on January 13, 2023. Respondent was served electronically on January 13, 2023. Petitioner states Dr. Roeder published his report on September 14, 2022. The court notes it is not in receipt of the 730 Evaluation report. Petitioner asserts Respondent elected not to return to Dr. Roeder's office to address issues which had not initially been included as part of the scope of the evaluation, despite them being identified in the court's order. Petitioner states the minors are no longer receiving therapy, as their therapist found they have met their goals and therapy is no longer recommended. The minors do not desire reunification. Petitioner requests the court deny Respondent's request for contact with the minors due to Respondent's failure to comply with the July 7, 2022 court order. Petitioner requests in the alternative, if the court is not inclined to deny Respondent's request, that Respondent comply with the July 7, 2022 order as well as start the outpatient supportive counseling services identified in Dr. Roeder's report.

On January 19, 2023, the parties presented to the court a Stipulation and Order Re: Child Custody Evaluator wherein the parties agreed, among other things, to participate in a child custody evaluation pursuant to Family Code section 3111 with a psychological component pursuant to Evidence Code 730. The court signed the stipulation and set a review hearing for the present date.

On April 3, 2023, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking the termination of Respondent's parental rights and the suspension of supervised visitation until Respondent participates in the 730 Evaluation as ordered. The parties were referred to CCRC for an appointment on April 24, 2023 and a review hearing on June 15, 2023. According to the Proof of Service filed on April 13, 2023, Respondent was served by mail on "May 6, 2022". The court notes counsel for Petitioner signed the Proof of Service on April 6, 2023.

On January 17, 2023, the court received the 730 evaluation conducted by Dr. Roeder. The court continued the prior RFO matter to join with the hearing set for June 15, 2023.

Both parties appeared for and participated in the CCRC appointment on April 26, 2023. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on June 5, 2023. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 5, 2023.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

Petitioner filed a Declaration on June 7, 2023. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on June 7, 2023. The court finds this to be less than 10 days prior to the hearing. Therefore, the court has not considered the declaration.

The court finds it must take testimony on Petitioner's request for termination of parental rights. Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to select Mandatory Settlement Conference and trial dates. The court finds it must determine the issues presented in Petitioner's RFO prior to proceeding with Respondent's RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. ASHLEY SHENEFIELD V. SEAN AGUILAR

PFL20140027

On May 4, 2023, the parties appeared for a hearing where the court adopted its tentative ruling with a modified step-up plan. Petitioner was to have unsupervised full day visits with the minors every Saturday and Sunday on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd weekend of each month pending a review hearing on June 15, 2023. There were to be no 3rd parties present during the visits. The Petitioner and minors were to continue to have one-hour unsupervised visits prior to the reunification therapy sessions.

Petitioner submitted a Declaration on June 7, 2023. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on June 7, 2023. The court notes this is less than 10 days prior to the hearing. The recommendation from the reunification therapist is to proceed to Step 2 of the step-up plan beginning June 16, 2023. There have been no noted concerns in the minors' behaviors and the reunification therapy has been progressing well.

The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the January 27, 2023 CCRC report. The reunification therapist has approved progressing to Step 2. Step 2 shall commence beginning June 16, 2023.

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 #13: THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JANUARY 27, 2023 CCRC REPORT. THE REUNIFICATION THERAPIST HAS APPROVED PROGRESSING TO STEP 2. STEP 2 SHALL COMMENCE BEGINNING JUNE 16, 2023. 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 THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. BRADLEY LACZNY V. AMBER JUHL

PFL20140706

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for temporary emergency custody orders on May 11, 2023. Respondent was properly noticed of the request. On May 12, 2023, the court granted Petitioner's request granting Petitioner temporary sole physical custody of the minor. The court ordered Respondent to have professionally supervised visits in El Dorado County every other week for four hours each. The court authorized parties to agree to a non-professional supervisor in writing. The court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on May 16, 2023 and set a review hearing on June 15, 2023. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner served Respondent with the ex parte orders after hearing, or the referral to CCRC.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 12, 2023, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte request. There is no Proof of Service showing the RFO was served on Respondent.

Neither party appeared for CCRC on May 16, 2023.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on May 17, 2023. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner served Respondent with this Declaration, and therefore, the court cannot consider it.

As the RFO has not been properly served, the court drops the matter from calendar. The prior ex parte orders are hereby vacated. All prior orders are reinstated.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: AS THE RFO HAS NOT BEEN PROPERLY SERVED, THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR. THE PRIOR EX PARTE ORDERS ARE HEREBY VACATED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS ARE REINSTATED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

15. CANDICE HAILE V. ANDREW CHAVEZ

23FL0137

On February 14, 2023, Petitioner filed a request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order protecting both herself and the minor from Respondent. On the same day, the court granted the request for a Temporary Restraining Order and set a hearing for March 17, 2023.

On February 15, 2023, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make orders as to custody and parenting time. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on February 27, 2023 and a review hearing on April 20, 2023. Respondent was served by mail on March 13, 2023.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on February 27, 2023. As such a single parent CCRC report was filed on April 4, 2023. Copies were mailed to the parties on April 5, 2023.

On March 17, 2023, the parties appeared for a hearing on the request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order. The court continued the temporary order and referred the parties to CCRC for an appointment on April 17, 2023 and a review hearing on June 15, 2023. The court vacated the April 20, 2023 review hearing date.

Petitioner filed a Declaration with the court on April 17, 2023 regarding violations of the temporary restraining order. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on April 17, 2023.

Both parties attended CCRC on April 17, 2023. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on June 5, 2023. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 5, 2023.

The court has read and considered the recommendations of the June 5, 2023 CCRC report and finds them to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with the order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the findings and orders after hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 5, 2023 CCRC REPORT AS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THE ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

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

June 15, 2023

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

16. DAVID MERCADO V. APRIL LOCKART

PFL20180104

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on April 25, 2023 alleging 20 counts of contempt by Respondent for failure to pay attorney's fees as ordered. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the OSC. Therefore, the matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

17. GERRIT VAN DEN OEVER V. CHRISTINA VAN DEN OEVER

PFL20180661

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 28, 2023, requesting a change of venue to Los Angeles County. Respondent was served by mail in Los Angeles County on April 21, 2023.

Petitioner asserts both parties are residents of Los Angeles County, and it is a more convenient forum. Petitioner further asserts he has health and mobility issues which make it difficult for him to appear in court in El Dorado County.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court notes the parties are currently pending trial which is set for August 15, 2023. A Mandatory Settlement Conference is scheduled to take place on July 24, 2023. This matter has been pending in El Dorado County since September 5, 2018. The court denies Petitioner's request to change venue. Code of Civil Procedure section 397.5 provides: "...where it appears that both petitioner and respondent have moved from the county rendering the order, the court *may*, when the ends of justice and the convenience of the parties would be promoted by the change, order that the proceedings be transferred to the county of residence of either party." (Emphasis added) Here, as the parties are currently pending trial, the case is not in the proper posture for transfer to a different venue. The denial is made without prejudice.

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 #17: THE REQUEST TO CHANGE VENUE IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE. 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 THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. JENNIFER HENRICH V. SHAWN MATTHEWS

PFL20190796

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 28, 2023, requesting a modification of the parenting plan. Respondent was served by mail on April 28, 2023. Parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had been referred within the prior six months. However, upon review of the prior CCRC report, only Petitioner appeared for the prior appointment, as Respondent had not been properly noticed of Petitioner's prior RFO.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 7, 2023. There is no Proof of Service for this document. Further, it was filed less than nine court days prior to the hearing. Therefore, the court has not considered this document.

The court finds good cause to refer the parties to CCRC as Respondent was not able to participate in the prior appointment due to not receiving proper notice. The minor shall be made available to the CCRC counselor to interview upon the counselor's request. The court continues this hearing to allow the parties to participate in CCRC.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE MATTER AND THE PARTIES ARE REFERRED TO CCRC FOR AN APPOINTMENT ON 8/10/2023 AT 1:00 PM WITH REBECCA NELSON AND A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING ON 9/28/23 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. THE MINOR SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE CCRC COUNSELOR TO INTERVIEW UPON THE COUNSELOR'S REQUEST. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

19. JOSEPH CARLISLE V. GINA CARLISLE

PFL20170803

Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on November 7, 2022, alleging 12 counts of contempt. Petitioner was personally served on November 14, 2022.

Parties were ordered to appear for arraignment on January 26, 2023. At the hearing the court appointed the Public Defender and continued the matter to March 30, 2023 to allow Respondent an opportunity to meet with counsel.

On March 30, 2023, Petitioner did not appear for the hearing. The Public Defender requested the matter be continued. Respondent also requested the matter be continued. The court granted the requests to continue the matter.

Parties are ordered to appear for the continued arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE CONTINUED ARRAIGNMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. KATRINA BAKER V. JEFFERY BAKER

22FL0440

On February 16, 2023, parties were ordered to appear for the hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO). Parties were able to meet and confer with the Family Law Facilitator and reach an agreement to continue the matter for approximately four months, as parties were working toward a reconciliation. The court granted the parties request to continue the matter and set a further review hearing for June 15, 2023. The court reserved jurisdiction to retroactively modify child and spousal support to the date of the filing of the RFO. Parties were ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations as least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on June 5, 2023. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been served with this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Neither party has filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

As neither party has filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration, but particularly as the moving party has failed to file the requisite documents for the court to calculate child and spousal support, the court drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS THE MOVING PARTY HAS FAILED TO FILE AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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

June 15, 2023

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

21. MATTHEW DAWKINS V. KRISTINE DAWKINS

PFL20160738

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 30, 2023, requesting a modification of parenting time and the holiday schedule. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on April 27, 2023 and a review hearing on June 15, 2023. Respondent was served by mail on April 3, 2023. Although the Department of Child Support Services is a party to the case, they were not served. The court notes there is a hearing set for modification of child support currently set for a hearing on July 10, 2023 in Department 8.

Petitioner is requesting a week on week off schedule to reduce the number of exchanges between the parties. Petitioner is also requesting the holiday schedule be modified to make Mother's and Father's Day a full weekend holiday and Memorial and Labor Day extended drop offs on Tuesday rather than Monday. Petitioner is requesting a two-week vacation for each party during the year.

Petitioner filed a Declaration with Talking Parents conversations and pictures on April 12, 2023. There is no Proof of Service for this Declaration, therefore the court has not considered it.

Respondent filed a Declaration on April 19, 2023. Petitioner was served my mail on April 19, 2023. Respondent asserts Petitioner has been harassing towards Respondent's 17-year-old daughter. Respondent also asserts Petitioner has not complied with court orders regarding traveling out of state with the minor. Respondent has not filed any additional Responsive Declaration.

Both parties appeared for CCRC on April 27, 2023 but were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was field with the court on June 5, 2023. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 5, 2023.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court finds good cause to proceed with this matter, despite the lack of notice to DCSS, as there is currently a hearing set for the modification of child support, and these orders do not modify the current custody arrangement. The court adopts the recommendations of the June 5, 2023 CCRC report with the following modifications: the court is not adopting the provision for Right of First option for child care as set forth on page 8 beginning at line 12. Additionally, the CCRC report does not address Petitioner's requests for modification for holidays. The court grants Petitioner's request as set forth. The Mother's and Father's Day holiday shall be the entire weekend. Additionally, for the Memorial and Labor Day holidays, the drop off shall be on the Tuesday following the Monday holiday. The remainder of the CCRC report is adopted as set forth.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

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 #21: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THIS MATTER, DESPITE THE LACK OF NOTICE TO DCSS, AS THERE IS CURRENTLY A HEARING SET FOR THE MODIFICATION OF CHILD SUPPORT, AND THESE ORDERS DO NOT MODIFY THE CURRENT CUSTODY ARRANGEMENT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUNE 5, 2023 CCRC REPORT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE PROVISION FOR RIGHT OF FIRST OPTION FOR CHILD CARE AS SET FORTH ON PAGE 8 BEGINNING AT LINE 12. ADDITIONALLY, THE CCRC REPORT DOES NOT ADDRESS PETITIONER'S REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION FOR HOLIDAYS. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST AS SET FORTH. THE MOTHER'S AND FATHER'S DAY HOLIDAY SHALL BE THE ENTIRE WEEKEND. ADDITIONALLY, FOR THE MEMORIAL AND LABOR DAY HOLIDAYS, THE DROP OFF SHALL BE ON THE TUESDAY FOLLOWING THE MONDAY HOLIDAY. THE REMAINDER OF THE CCRC REPORT IS ADOPTED AS SET FORTH. 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 THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

22. ROBERT THORNTON V. MELISSA MEANOR

PFL20140803

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 7, 2022, once again requesting the custody and parenting time go back to 50/50. Petitioner has failed to include any declaration or supporting evidence, save his conclusory statement that he has done everything the court has required of him. Petitioner again filed this request the day after the court adopted the current orders. Respondent and Minor's Counsel were served by mail on October 31, 2023. This matter has previously been on calendar and continued multiple times, most recently from May 18, 2023 to the current hearing date to allow to the court to receive and consider Minor Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on February 14, 2023 with a letter from Granite Wellness Center and Accurate Affordable Assessments. Proof of Service show Respondent and the prior Minor's Counsel were served with the Declaration on February 14, 2023.

Minor's Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on May 17, 2023. Parties were served electronically on May 16, 2023. Minor's Counsel had an opportunity to meet with the parties as well as the minor.

Minor's Counsel filed a Supplemental Statement of Issues and Contentions on June 5, 2023 after further information was received from Petitioner, including documentation showing he had participated in an outpatient treatment program. Minor's Counsel also received a lengthy letter from Respondent objecting to the recommendations in initial Statement of Issues and Contentions and Respondent's concerns. Minor's Counsel has conducted her assessment of the case and sets forth her requested orders.

Respondent filed a Declaration on June 2, 2023. Proof of Service shows Minor's Counsel and Petitioner were served by mail on June 2, 2023. Respondent is objecting to Minor's Counsel's request for orders and requesting that Minor's Counsel be removed from the case. Respondent objects to any modification of the prior court orders.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court adopts the recommended orders as set forth in Minor's Counsel's Supplemental Statement of Issues and Contentions filed on June 5, 2023. The court sets a review hearing in six months on December 14, 2023 at 1:30 in Department 5, to review Petitioner's participation in random substance abuse testing and determine a step up to overnight parenting time. Respondent's request to have Minor's Counsel removed from the case is denied.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Minor's Counsel shall prepare and file the findings and orders after hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDED ORDERS AS SET FORTH IN MINOR'S COUNSEL'S SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND CONTENTIONS FILED ON JUNE 5, 2023. THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING IN SIX MONTHS ON DECEMBER 14, 2023 AT 1:30 IN DEPARTMENT 5, TO REVIEW PETITIONER'S PARTICIPATION IN RANDOM SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING AND DETERMINE A STEP UP TO OVERNIGHT PARENTING TIME. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO HAVE MINOR'S COUNSEL REMOVED FROM THE CASE IS DENIED. MINOR'S COUNSEL SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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
June 15, 2023
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

23. SAMANTHA LOUISE JOHNSON V. MATTHEW GREG JOHNSON

22FL0195

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and an order compelling Respondent's preliminary disclosure of documents. The RFO and her Income and Expense Declaration were filed on February 21, 2023 and mail served on February 24th. Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, his Income and Expense Declaration and his Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and Income and Expense Declaration. The Income and Expense Declaration was served on April 18th while the responsive declaration was served on April 21st.

Parties appeared on May 4, 2023, requesting a continuance and the court to stay its tentative ruling as they were working on a written stipulation. The court granted the request, stayed its tentative ruling, and continued the matter to June 15, 2023 at 1:30 pm. The court has not received a written stipulation. Therefore, the court reissues its prior tentative ruling as set forth below.

Petitioner is requesting guideline spousal support and attorney's fees in the amount of \$5,000 pursuant to Family Code section 2030, as well as an additional \$1,500 in fees pursuant to Family Code section 2107(c). She also requests an order compelling Respondent's preliminary disclosures, however given the Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and Income and Expense Declaration it appears this issue is moot as the declarations have already been served. That leaves the issues of spousal support and attorney's fees to be decided by the court.

Spousal Support

According to Petitioner, Respondent's monthly income is more than triple that of Petitioner's. She further argues that Respondent left the state, took all of the furniture from their home, and used community funds to purchase a home in Texas. Petitioner was no longer able to afford rent, so she and her daughter were forced to move.

Respondent opposes the request for spousal support. He states that the two were only married for 6 months prior to separation and although the parties were together prior to marriage during that time Respondent states they both contributed equally to the monthly expenses, and they did not have any children nor did he support Petitioner.

Generally speaking, a married person has a duty to support his or her spouse. Cal. Fam. Code § 4300. The intent is to ensure that each party, upon separation, is able to maintain the marital standard of living. See Cal. Fam. Code § 4330(a). The court maintains broad discretion in determining whether a support award is warranted and if so, the amount and duration thereof. In re Marriage of McLain, 7 Cal. App. 5th 262, 269 (2017). In doing so, however, Family Code section 4320 enumerate a myriad of factors the court is to consider. Where the court finds,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

taking into consideration all of the factors enumerated in Family Code section 4320, that each party is sufficiently able to maintain the marital standard of living the court is within its discretion to deny a request for spousal support or determine its amount. In re Marriage of Schu, 6 Cal. App. 5th 470, 474 (2016).

While it is apparent the marriage was for an exceptionally short duration, there was still a standard of living established during that time. The parties each contributed to the bills, including the home they rented together. Additionally, when Respondent left, he took all of the furniture in the house which left Petitioner in need of new furniture and household items to maintain the standard of living she had become accustomed to. Petitioner states that she is working full time though she did not receive her annual bonus last year as she had in the past which has also contributed to her difficulty in maintaining the standard of living from the marriage.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined in the attached DissoMaster, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$0 per month. See attached DissoMaster report. The court finds that Respondent and Petitioner routinely earn commissions and bonuses, therefore the court adopts the attached monthly overtime table to be used to account for monthly overtime and commissions. The party owing based on the table is to pay a true up payment on the 1st of the month following the month in which the commission or overtime was received. Parties are to provide copies of paystubs to substantiate the true-up amount due. This order is effective as of March 1, 2023. This results in arrears owed for amounts earned during March and April. The parties are to calculate arrears owed and agree to a monthly installment payment amount until arrears are paid in full.

2030 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 present the party's case adequately. In addition to the parties' financial resources, the court may consider the parties' trial tactics. In Re Marriage Of Falcone & Fyke, 203 Cal. App. 4th 964; 975 (2012). The court must consider the impact of the fee award on the payor taking into account any orders for support. In Re Marriage Of Keech, supra, at 860.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

First, the court must consider whether a disparity exists in ability to pay for, and access to funds to retain counsel. This requirement has been met. Respondent's gross monthly income exceeds that of Petitioner's by over \$4,000. While it is true that Respondent's monthly expenses also exceed those of Petitioner's, the majority of those expenses are attributable to mortgage payments on his rental properties and not his primary residence or his day-to-day living expenses.

The court next turns to the issue of whether the fees and costs of maintaining or defending the proceeding are reasonably necessary. Here, the marriage between the parties was of extremely short duration. Only 9 months. While this does not necessarily lend itself to be a difficult or intricate divorce, Respondent has already incurred over \$5,000 in fees, while Petitioner has already paid \$3,033.50. It is not unreasonable to believe that the amount of attorney's fees incurred by Petitioner will reach the \$5,000 mark. Thus, the court finds the request for \$5,000 to be reasonable and necessary.

For the foregoing reasons, the court grants Petitioner's request for \$5,000 in attorney's fees. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$500 due and payable on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount becomes immediately due and payable with legal interest.

2107 Attorney's Fees

Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). "...[T]he court shall...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and shall include reasonable attorney's fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Respondent opposes the request for Section 2107 sanctions on the basis that a motion to compel was not necessary. He claims he would have produced the documents regardless of the motion to compel and he in fact, has produced them. Regardless, Section 2107 mandates the imposition of sanctions where a party has failed to comply with Section 2104 which does impose time limits on the production of documents. Petitioner attempted to meet and confer on the missing documents, yet they still were not timely produced.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 15, 2023

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

When imposing sanctions under Section 2107 the court is required to award reasonable attorney's fees and costs unless the court finds that circumstances make the imposition of sanctions unjust. As discussed above, Respondent has already been ordered to pay \$5,000 as and for Petitioner's attorney's fees. Thus, ordering the payment of fees associated with the preparation of the present motion would result in a windfall to Petitioner. The court finds it is more appropriate under the circumstances to impose sanctions in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct. As such, Petitioner's request for sanctions is granted. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$500 in sanctions due and payable no later than May 18, 2023.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED DISSOMASTER, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$0 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED DISSOMASTER REPORT. THE COURT FINDS THAT RESPONDENT AND PETITIONER ROUTINELY EARN COMMISSIONS AND BONUSES, THEREFORE THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED MONTHLY OVERTIME TABLE TO BE USED TO ACCOUNT FOR MONTHLY OVERTIME AND COMMISSIONS. THE PARTY OWING BASED ON THE TABLE IS TO PAY A TRUE UP PAYMENT ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH FOLLOWING THE MONTH IN WHICH THE COMMISSION OR OVERTIME WAS RECEIVED. PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE COPIES OF PAYSTUBS TO SUBSTANTIATE THE TRUE-UP AMOUNT DUE. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF MARCH 1, 2023. THIS RESULTS IN ARREARS OWED FOR AMOUNTS EARNED DURING MARCH AND APRIL. THE PARTIES ARE TO CALCULATE ARREARS OWED AND AGREE TO A MONTHLY INSTALLMENT PAYMENT AMOUNT UNTIL ARREARS ARE PAID IN FULL. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR \$5,000 IN ATTORNEY'S FEES. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$500 DUE AND PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT BECOMES IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$500 IN SANCTIONS DUE AND PAYABLE NO LATER THAN MAY 18, 2023. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER 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): <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-weight: bold; margin-top: 20px;">California</div>	TELEPHONE NO:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
ATTORNEY FOR: Husband		CASE NUMBER:
DISSOMASTER REPORT 2023, Monthly		

Input Data	Husband	Wife	Guideline (2023)	Cash Flow Analysis	Husband	Wife
			Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
Number of children	0	0				
% time with Second Parent	0%	0%	Husband	2,589 Payment (cost)/benefit	0	0
Filing status	MFS->	<-MFS	Wife	2,777 Net spendable income	2,589	2,777
# Federal exemptions	1*	1*	Total	5,366 % combined spendable	48.2%	51.8%
Wages + salary	3,000	3,079	Support	Total taxes	573	568
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Alameda	0 Comb. net spendable	5,367	
Self-employment income	0	0	Total	0 Proposed		
Other taxable income	484	366	Proposed, tactic 9	Payment (cost)/benefit	0	0
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Alameda	0 Net spendable income	2,589	2,777
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	Total	0 NSI change from gdl	0	0
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Savings	0 % combined spendable	48.2%	51.8%
Ordinary dividends	0	0	No releases	% of saving over gdl	0%	0%
Tax. interest received	0	0		Total taxes	573	568
Social Security received	0	0		Comb. net spendable	5,367	
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.	484	366				
Other nontaxable income	0	0				
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	322	100				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	625	0				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	625	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): <div style="text-align: center;">California</div>	TELEPHONE NO.:	Superior Court Of The State of California, County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
ATTORNEY FOR: Husband		
Two-way Monthly Overtime Wages Report 2023 Monthly		CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages	Husband's Gross Overtime Wages							
	500	600	700	800	900	1,000	1,100	1,200
500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	44	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	73	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	100	60	21	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	127	87	48	9	0	0	0	0
1,800	154	114	75	36	0	0	0	0
1,900	181	142	102	63	24	0	0	0
2,000	208	168	129	89	50	11	0	0
2,100	234	195	155	116	76	37	0	0
2,200	261	221	182	142	103	63	24	0
2,300	287	248	208	169	129	90	50	11
2,400	313	274	234	195	156	116	77	37
2,500	340	300	261	221	182	143	103	64
2,600	366	327	287	248	208	169	129	90
2,700	393	353	314	274	235	195	156	116
2,800	419	380	340	301	261	222	182	143
2,900	445	406	366	327	288	248	209	169
3,000	472	432	393	353	314	275	235	196
3,100	498	459	419	380	340	301	262	222
3,200	525	485	446	406	367	327	288	249
3,300	551	512	472	433	393	354	314	275
3,400	577	538	499	459	420	380	341	301
3,500	604	564	525	486	446	407	367	327
3,600	630	591	551	512	472	433	393	353
3,700	657	617	578	538	498	459	419	379
3,800	683	643	603	564	524	484	445	405
3,900	709	669	629	590	550	510	471	431
4,000	735	695	655	616	576	536	497	457
4,100	761	721	681	642	602	562	523	483
4,200	787	747	707	668	628	588	549	509



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	1,300	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,000
500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	51	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	77	38	4	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	103	64	30	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	130	91	56	22	0	0	0	0
3,000	156	117	83	49	15	0	0	0
3,100	183	143	109	75	41	7	0	0
3,200	209	170	136	101	67	34	0	0
3,300	236	196	162	127	93	60	26	0
3,400	262	222	188	153	120	86	53	19
3,500	287	248	214	180	146	113	79	45
3,600	313	274	240	206	172	139	105	72
3,700	339	300	266	232	199	165	132	98
3,800	365	326	292	259	225	192	158	124
3,900	391	352	318	285	251	218	184	151
4,000	417	378	345	311	278	244	211	177
4,100	443	404	371	338	304	271	237	203
4,200	470	431	397	364	330	297	263	230
4,300	496	457	424	390	357	323	290	256
4,400	522	483	450	416	383	349	316	282
4,500	549	510	476	443	409	376	342	309
4,600	575	536	503	469	436	402	369	335
4,700	601	562	529	495	462	428	395	361
4,800	627	589	555	522	488	455	421	388



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800
500	52	78	105	131	158	184	210	237
600	12	39	65	92	118	144	171	197
700	0	0	26	52	79	105	131	158
800	0	0	0	13	39	66	92	118
900	0	0	0	0	0	26	53	79
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	42
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	38	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	64	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	91	57	24	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	117	83	50	16	0	0	0	0
4,000	143	110	76	43	9	0	0	0
4,100	170	136	102	69	35	2	0	0
4,200	196	162	129	95	62	28	0	0
4,300	222	189	155	121	88	54	21	0
4,400	249	215	181	148	114	81	47	13
4,500	275	241	208	174	141	107	73	40
4,600	301	268	234	200	167	133	100	66
4,700	328	294	260	227	193	160	126	92
4,800	354	320	287	253	220	186	152	119



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600
500	263	289	316	342	369	395	421	447
600	224	250	276	303	329	356	382	408
700	184	211	237	264	290	316	345	371
800	145	171	198	224	253	279	305	331
900	105	135	161	188	214	240	266	292
1,000	69	95	122	148	174	200	226	252
1,100	29	56	82	108	134	160	186	212
1,200	0	16	42	68	94	120	146	172
1,300	0	0	3	29	55	81	107	133
1,400	0	0	0	0	15	41	67	93
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	57
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	59	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	85	52	19	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
500	473	499	525	554	580	606	632	658
600	437	463	489	515	541	567	593	619
700	397	423	449	475	501	527	553	579
800	357	383	409	435	461	487	513	539
900	318	344	370	396	422	448	474	500
1,000	278	304	330	356	382	408	434	460
1,100	238	264	290	316	342	368	394	420
1,200	198	224	250	276	302	328	354	380
1,300	159	185	211	237	263	289	315	341
1,400	119	145	171	197	223	249	275	301
1,500	83	109	135	161	187	213	239	265
1,600	48	74	100	126	152	178	205	231
1,700	14	40	66	92	118	145	171	197
1,800	0	6	32	59	85	111	138	164
1,900	0	0	0	25	51	78	104	130
2,000	0	0	0	0	18	44	70	97
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	63
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	29
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900	5,000	5,100	5,200
500	684	710	736	762	788	814	840	866
600	645	671	697	723	749	775	801	827
700	605	631	657	683	709	735	761	787
800	565	591	617	643	669	695	721	747
900	526	552	578	604	630	656	682	708
1,000	486	512	538	564	590	616	642	668
1,100	446	472	498	524	550	576	602	628
1,200	406	432	458	484	510	536	562	588
1,300	367	393	419	445	471	497	523	549
1,400	327	353	379	405	431	458	484	510
1,500	291	317	343	370	396	422	448	475
1,600	257	283	310	336	362	389	415	441
1,700	224	250	276	303	329	355	382	408
1,800	190	216	243	269	295	322	348	374
1,900	157	183	209	236	262	288	314	341
2,000	123	149	176	202	228	255	281	307
2,100	89	116	142	168	195	221	247	274
2,200	56	82	108	135	161	187	214	240
2,300	22	48	75	101	127	154	180	206
2,400	0	15	41	67	94	120	146	173
2,500	0	0	8	34	60	86	113	139
2,600	0	0	0	0	27	53	79	105
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	19	46	72
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	38
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	5,300	5,400	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900	6,000
500	892	918	944	970	995	1,020	1,046	1,071
600	852	878	904	930	956	981	1,006	1,031
700	813	839	865	891	916	941	966	991
800	773	799	825	851	876	902	927	952
900	734	759	785	811	837	862	887	912
1,000	694	720	746	772	797	823	848	873
1,100	654	680	706	732	758	783	809	834
1,200	614	641	667	693	719	744	770	795
1,300	575	602	628	654	680	705	731	756
1,400	537	563	589	615	641	666	692	717
1,500	501	527	554	580	606	631	656	682
1,600	468	494	520	547	572	598	623	648
1,700	434	460	487	513	539	564	590	615
1,800	401	427	453	480	505	531	556	582
1,900	367	393	420	446	472	497	522	548
2,000	333	360	386	412	438	463	489	514
2,100	300	326	353	379	404	430	455	481
2,200	266	293	319	345	371	396	422	447
2,300	233	259	285	312	337	363	388	414
2,400	199	225	252	278	304	329	354	380
2,500	165	192	218	244	270	295	321	346
2,600	132	158	184	211	236	262	287	313
2,700	98	124	151	177	203	228	254	279
2,800	65	91	117	144	169	195	220	246
2,900	31	57	84	110	135	161	187	212
3,000	0	24	50	76	102	128	154	179
3,100	0	0	17	43	69	95	120	146
3,200	0	0	0	10	36	62	87	113
3,300	0	0	0	0	3	29	54	80
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	47
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800
500	1,096	1,121	1,146	1,171	1,196	1,221	1,247	1,272
600	1,056	1,081	1,106	1,132	1,157	1,182	1,207	1,232
700	1,017	1,042	1,067	1,092	1,117	1,143	1,168	1,194
800	977	1,002	1,027	1,053	1,078	1,104	1,129	1,155
900	938	963	989	1,014	1,039	1,065	1,090	1,116
1,000	899	924	950	975	1,001	1,026	1,051	1,077
1,100	860	885	910	936	961	987	1,012	1,038
1,200	821	846	871	897	922	948	973	999
1,300	782	807	833	858	883	909	934	960
1,400	743	768	794	819	845	870	895	921
1,500	707	733	758	784	809	835	860	885
1,600	674	699	725	750	776	801	826	852
1,700	640	666	691	717	742	768	793	818
1,800	607	632	658	683	709	734	760	785
1,900	573	599	624	650	675	701	726	751
2,000	540	565	591	616	642	667	692	718
2,100	506	532	557	582	608	633	659	684
2,200	473	498	523	549	574	600	625	651
2,300	439	464	490	515	541	566	592	617
2,400	405	431	456	482	507	533	558	583
2,500	372	397	423	448	473	499	524	550
2,600	338	364	389	414	440	465	491	517
2,700	305	330	355	381	407	432	458	484
2,800	271	297	322	348	374	399	425	451
2,900	238	264	289	315	341	366	392	417
3,000	205	231	256	282	307	333	359	384
3,100	172	197	223	249	274	300	326	351
3,200	139	164	190	216	241	267	293	318
3,300	105	131	157	182	208	234	259	285
3,400	72	98	124	149	175	201	226	252
3,500	39	65	90	116	142	167	193	219
3,600	6	32	57	83	109	134	160	186
3,700	0	0	24	50	75	101	127	152
3,800	0	0	0	17	42	68	93	119
3,900	0	0	0	0	9	35	60	86
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	53
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,900	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400	7,500	7,600
500	1,297	1,322	1,348	1,373	1,398	1,424	1,449	1,474
600	1,258	1,283	1,309	1,334	1,360	1,385	1,410	1,435
700	1,219	1,244	1,270	1,295	1,321	1,346	1,371	1,396
800	1,180	1,206	1,231	1,256	1,282	1,307	1,332	1,357
900	1,141	1,167	1,192	1,217	1,243	1,268	1,293	1,318
1,000	1,102	1,128	1,153	1,179	1,204	1,229	1,255	1,280
1,100	1,063	1,088	1,114	1,139	1,165	1,190	1,215	1,240
1,200	1,024	1,050	1,075	1,100	1,126	1,151	1,176	1,201
1,300	985	1,011	1,036	1,061	1,087	1,112	1,137	1,162
1,400	946	972	997	1,023	1,048	1,073	1,099	1,124
1,500	911	936	962	987	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088
1,600	877	903	928	954	979	1,005	1,030	1,055
1,700	844	869	895	920	946	971	996	1,021
1,800	810	836	861	887	912	938	963	988
1,900	777	802	828	853	879	904	929	954
2,000	743	769	794	820	845	870	896	921
2,100	710	735	761	786	811	837	862	887
2,200	676	701	727	752	778	803	828	853
2,300	642	668	693	719	744	770	795	820
2,400	609	634	660	685	711	737	762	787
2,500	575	601	627	652	678	704	729	754
2,600	542	568	594	619	645	671	696	721
2,700	509	535	561	586	612	637	663	688
2,800	476	502	527	553	579	604	630	655
2,900	443	469	494	520	546	571	597	622
3,000	410	436	461	487	513	538	564	589
3,100	377	403	428	454	480	505	530	556
3,200	344	369	395	421	446	472	497	523
3,300	311	336	362	388	413	439	464	489
3,400	277	303	329	354	380	406	431	456
3,500	244	270	296	321	347	373	398	423
3,600	211	237	262	288	314	339	365	390
3,700	178	204	229	255	281	306	332	357
3,800	145	171	196	222	247	273	298	324
3,900	112	137	163	189	214	240	265	290
4,000	78	104	130	155	181	207	232	257
4,100	45	71	97	122	148	174	199	224
4,200	12	38	63	89	115	140	166	191
4,300	0	5	30	56	82	107	132	158
4,400	0	0	0	23	48	74	99	125
4,500	0	0	0	0	15	41	66	91
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	8	33	58
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	7,700	7,800	7,900	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
500	1,499	1,524	1,549	1,574	1,599	1,624	1,649	1,674
600	1,460	1,485	1,510	1,535	1,560	1,585	1,610	1,635
700	1,421	1,446	1,471	1,496	1,521	1,546	1,571	1,597
800	1,382	1,407	1,432	1,458	1,483	1,508	1,533	1,558
900	1,343	1,369	1,394	1,419	1,444	1,469	1,494	1,519
1,000	1,305	1,330	1,355	1,380	1,405	1,430	1,455	1,480
1,100	1,265	1,290	1,315	1,340	1,365	1,390	1,416	1,441
1,200	1,226	1,251	1,276	1,302	1,327	1,352	1,377	1,402
1,300	1,187	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288	1,313	1,338	1,363
1,400	1,149	1,174	1,199	1,224	1,249	1,274	1,299	1,324
1,500	1,113	1,138	1,163	1,188	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288
1,600	1,080	1,105	1,130	1,155	1,180	1,205	1,230	1,255
1,700	1,046	1,071	1,096	1,121	1,146	1,171	1,196	1,222
1,800	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088	1,113	1,138	1,163	1,188
1,900	979	1,004	1,029	1,054	1,079	1,104	1,129	1,155
2,000	946	971	996	1,021	1,046	1,071	1,096	1,121
2,100	912	937	962	987	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088
2,200	879	904	929	954	980	1,005	1,030	1,055
2,300	846	871	896	921	947	972	997	1,022
2,400	812	838	863	888	913	939	964	989
2,500	779	805	830	855	880	906	931	956
2,600	746	772	797	822	847	873	898	923
2,700	713	739	764	789	814	839	865	890
2,800	680	705	731	756	781	806	832	857
2,900	647	672	698	723	748	773	799	824
3,000	614	639	665	690	715	740	766	791
3,100	581	606	631	657	682	707	732	758
3,200	548	573	598	624	649	674	699	725
3,300	515	540	565	590	616	641	666	691
3,400	481	507	532	557	582	608	633	658
3,500	448	474	499	524	549	575	600	625
3,600	415	440	466	491	516	541	567	592
3,700	382	407	433	458	483	508	533	559
3,800	349	374	399	425	450	475	500	526
3,900	316	341	366	391	417	442	467	492
4,000	283	308	333	358	384	409	434	459
4,100	249	275	300	325	350	376	401	426
4,200	216	241	267	292	317	342	368	393
4,300	183	208	234	259	284	309	335	360
4,400	150	175	200	226	251	276	301	327
4,500	117	142	167	193	218	243	268	294
4,600	84	109	134	159	185	210	235	260
4,700	50	76	101	126	151	177	202	227
4,800	17	43	68	93	118	143	169	194



PETITIONER:

RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900	9,000	9,100	9,200
500	1,699	1,724	1,749	1,774	1,800	1,825	1,850	1,875
600	1,660	1,686	1,711	1,736	1,761	1,786	1,811	1,836
700	1,622	1,647	1,672	1,697	1,722	1,747	1,772	1,797
800	1,583	1,608	1,633	1,658	1,683	1,708	1,733	1,758
900	1,544	1,569	1,594	1,619	1,644	1,669	1,694	1,719
1,000	1,505	1,530	1,555	1,580	1,605	1,630	1,655	1,680
1,100	1,466	1,491	1,516	1,541	1,566	1,591	1,616	1,641
1,200	1,427	1,452	1,477	1,502	1,527	1,552	1,577	1,602
1,300	1,388	1,413	1,438	1,463	1,488	1,513	1,538	1,563
1,400	1,349	1,374	1,399	1,424	1,449	1,474	1,499	1,524
1,500	1,313	1,339	1,364	1,389	1,414	1,439	1,464	1,489
1,600	1,280	1,305	1,330	1,355	1,380	1,405	1,430	1,455
1,700	1,247	1,272	1,297	1,322	1,347	1,372	1,397	1,422
1,800	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288	1,314	1,339	1,364	1,389
1,900	1,180	1,205	1,230	1,255	1,281	1,306	1,331	1,356
2,000	1,147	1,172	1,197	1,222	1,248	1,273	1,298	1,323
2,100	1,114	1,139	1,164	1,189	1,215	1,240	1,265	1,290
2,200	1,081	1,106	1,131	1,156	1,182	1,207	1,232	1,257
2,300	1,047	1,073	1,098	1,123	1,148	1,174	1,199	1,224
2,400	1,014	1,040	1,065	1,090	1,115	1,141	1,166	1,191
2,500	981	1,007	1,032	1,057	1,082	1,108	1,133	1,158
2,600	948	974	999	1,024	1,049	1,075	1,100	1,125
2,700	915	940	966	991	1,016	1,041	1,067	1,092
2,800	882	907	933	958	983	1,008	1,034	1,059
2,900	849	874	900	925	950	975	1,001	1,026
3,000	816	841	867	892	917	942	968	993
3,100	783	808	833	859	884	909	934	960
3,200	750	775	800	825	851	876	901	926
3,300	717	742	767	792	818	843	868	893
3,400	683	709	734	759	784	810	835	860
3,500	650	676	701	726	751	777	802	827
3,600	617	642	668	693	718	743	769	794
3,700	584	609	634	660	685	710	735	761
3,800	551	576	601	627	652	677	702	728
3,900	518	543	568	593	619	644	669	694
4,000	485	510	535	560	586	611	636	661
4,100	451	477	502	527	552	578	603	628
4,200	418	443	469	494	519	544	570	595
4,300	385	410	436	461	486	511	537	562
4,400	352	377	402	428	453	478	503	529
4,500	319	344	369	394	420	445	470	495
4,600	286	311	336	361	387	412	437	462
4,700	252	278	303	328	353	379	404	429
4,800	219	245	270	295	320	346	371	396

PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	9,300	9,400	9,500	9,600	9,700	9,800	9,900	10,000
500	1,900	1,925	1,950	1,975	2,000	2,025	2,050	2,076
600	1,861	1,886	1,911	1,936	1,961	1,986	2,012	2,037
700	1,822	1,847	1,872	1,897	1,922	1,947	1,973	1,998
800	1,783	1,808	1,833	1,858	1,883	1,908	1,934	1,959
900	1,744	1,769	1,794	1,819	1,844	1,869	1,895	1,920
1,000	1,705	1,730	1,755	1,780	1,805	1,830	1,856	1,881
1,100	1,666	1,691	1,716	1,741	1,766	1,791	1,817	1,842
1,200	1,627	1,652	1,677	1,702	1,727	1,752	1,778	1,803
1,300	1,588	1,613	1,638	1,663	1,688	1,713	1,739	1,764
1,400	1,549	1,574	1,599	1,624	1,649	1,675	1,700	1,726
1,500	1,514	1,539	1,564	1,589	1,614	1,640	1,665	1,691
1,600	1,481	1,506	1,531	1,556	1,582	1,607	1,633	1,658
1,700	1,448	1,473	1,498	1,523	1,549	1,574	1,600	1,625
1,800	1,415	1,440	1,465	1,490	1,516	1,541	1,567	1,592
1,900	1,382	1,407	1,432	1,457	1,483	1,508	1,534	1,559
2,000	1,349	1,374	1,399	1,424	1,450	1,475	1,501	1,526
2,100	1,316	1,341	1,366	1,391	1,417	1,442	1,468	1,493
2,200	1,282	1,308	1,333	1,358	1,383	1,409	1,435	1,460
2,300	1,249	1,275	1,300	1,325	1,350	1,376	1,401	1,427
2,400	1,216	1,242	1,267	1,292	1,317	1,343	1,368	1,394
2,500	1,183	1,209	1,234	1,259	1,284	1,310	1,335	1,361
2,600	1,150	1,176	1,201	1,226	1,251	1,277	1,302	1,328
2,700	1,117	1,142	1,168	1,193	1,218	1,244	1,269	1,295
2,800	1,084	1,109	1,135	1,160	1,185	1,210	1,236	1,262
2,900	1,051	1,076	1,102	1,127	1,152	1,177	1,203	1,229
3,000	1,018	1,043	1,069	1,094	1,119	1,144	1,170	1,196
3,100	985	1,010	1,035	1,061	1,086	1,111	1,137	1,163
3,200	952	977	1,002	1,027	1,053	1,078	1,104	1,129
3,300	919	944	969	994	1,020	1,045	1,071	1,096
3,400	885	911	936	961	986	1,012	1,037	1,063
3,500	852	878	903	928	953	979	1,004	1,030
3,600	819	844	870	895	920	945	971	997
3,700	786	811	836	862	887	912	938	964
3,800	753	778	803	829	854	879	905	930
3,900	720	745	770	795	821	846	872	897
4,000	686	712	737	762	787	813	839	864
4,100	653	679	704	729	754	780	805	831
4,200	620	645	671	696	721	747	772	798
4,300	587	612	638	663	688	713	739	765
4,400	554	579	604	630	655	680	706	732
4,500	521	546	571	596	622	647	673	698
4,600	488	513	538	563	589	614	640	665
4,700	454	480	505	530	555	581	606	632
4,800	421	447	472	497	522	548	573	599



PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages	Husband's Gross Overtime Wages							
	500	600	700	800	900	1,000	1,100	1,200
4,300	<i>813</i>	<i>773</i>	<i>733</i>	<i>694</i>	<i>654</i>	<i>614</i>	<i>575</i>	<i>535</i>
4,400	<i>839</i>	<i>799</i>	<i>759</i>	<i>720</i>	<i>680</i>	<i>640</i>	<i>601</i>	<i>561</i>
4,500	<i>865</i>	<i>825</i>	<i>785</i>	<i>746</i>	<i>706</i>	<i>666</i>	<i>627</i>	<i>587</i>
4,600	<i>891</i>	<i>851</i>	<i>811</i>	<i>772</i>	<i>732</i>	<i>692</i>	<i>653</i>	<i>614</i>
4,700	<i>917</i>	<i>877</i>	<i>837</i>	<i>798</i>	<i>758</i>	<i>718</i>	<i>679</i>	<i>640</i>
4,800	<i>943</i>	<i>903</i>	<i>863</i>	<i>824</i>	<i>784</i>	<i>744</i>	<i>705</i>	<i>666</i>
4,900	<i>969</i>	<i>929</i>	<i>889</i>	<i>850</i>	<i>810</i>	<i>771</i>	<i>732</i>	<i>693</i>
5,000	<i>995</i>	<i>955</i>	<i>915</i>	<i>876</i>	<i>836</i>	<i>797</i>	<i>758</i>	<i>719</i>

PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	1,300	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,000
4,300	<i>496</i>	<i>457</i>	<i>424</i>	<i>390</i>	<i>357</i>	<i>323</i>	<i>290</i>	<i>256</i>
4,400	<i>522</i>	<i>483</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>349</i>	<i>316</i>	<i>282</i>
4,500	<i>549</i>	<i>510</i>	<i>476</i>	<i>443</i>	<i>409</i>	<i>376</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>309</i>
4,600	<i>575</i>	<i>536</i>	<i>503</i>	<i>469</i>	<i>436</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>369</i>	<i>335</i>
4,700	<i>601</i>	<i>562</i>	<i>529</i>	<i>495</i>	<i>462</i>	<i>428</i>	<i>395</i>	<i>361</i>
4,800	<i>627</i>	<i>589</i>	<i>555</i>	<i>522</i>	<i>488</i>	<i>455</i>	<i>421</i>	<i>388</i>
4,900	<i>654</i>	<i>615</i>	<i>581</i>	<i>548</i>	<i>515</i>	<i>481</i>	<i>447</i>	<i>414</i>
5,000	<i>680</i>	<i>641</i>	<i>608</i>	<i>574</i>	<i>541</i>	<i>507</i>	<i>474</i>	<i>440</i>

PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800
4,300	<i>222</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>0</i>
4,400	<i>249</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>13</i>
4,500	<i>275</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>141</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>40</i>
4,600	<i>301</i>	<i>268</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>167</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>66</i>
4,700	<i>328</i>	<i>294</i>	<i>260</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>126</i>	<i>92</i>
4,800	<i>354</i>	<i>320</i>	<i>287</i>	<i>253</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>186</i>	<i>152</i>	<i>119</i>
4,900	<i>380</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>313</i>	<i>279</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>145</i>
5,000	<i>407</i>	<i>373</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>306</i>	<i>272</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>205</i>	<i>171</i>

PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	<i>6</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	<i>32</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	<i>59</i>	<i>25</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	<i>85</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>19</i>	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	<i>111</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>12</i>	0	0	0	0
5,000	<i>138</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>5</i>	0	0	0



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900	5,000	5,100	5,200
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	5,300	5,400	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900	6,000
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,900	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400	7,500	7,600
4,300	0	5	30	56	82	107	132	158
4,400	0	0	0	23	48	74	99	125
4,500	0	0	0	0	15	41	66	91
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	8	33	58
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	7,700	7,800	7,900	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
4,300	183	208	234	259	284	309	335	360
4,400	150	175	200	226	251	276	301	327
4,500	117	142	167	193	218	243	268	294
4,600	84	109	134	159	185	210	235	260
4,700	50	76	101	126	151	177	202	227
4,800	17	43	68	93	118	143	169	194
4,900	0	9	35	60	85	110	136	161
5,000	0	0	1	27	52	77	102	128

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900	9,000	9,100	9,200
4,300	385	410	436	461	486	511	537	562
4,400	352	377	402	428	453	478	503	529
4,500	319	344	369	394	420	445	470	495
4,600	286	311	336	361	387	412	437	462
4,700	252	278	303	328	353	379	404	429
4,800	219	245	270	295	320	346	371	396
4,900	186	211	237	262	287	312	338	363
5,000	153	178	203	229	254	279	304	330

PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Change in Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	9,300	9,400	9,500	9,600	9,700	9,800	9,900	10,000
4,300	587	612	638	663	688	713	739	765
4,400	554	579	604	630	655	680	706	732
4,500	521	546	571	596	622	647	673	698
4,600	488	513	538	563	589	614	640	665
4,700	454	480	505	530	555	581	606	632
4,800	421	447	472	497	522	548	573	599
4,900	388	413	439	464	489	514	540	566
5,000	355	380	405	431	456	481	507	533

PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages	Husband's Gross Overtime Wages							
	500	600	700	800	900	1,000	1,100	1,200
500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	44	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	73	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	100	60	21	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	127	87	48	9	0	0	0	0
1,800	154	114	75	36	0	0	0	0
1,900	181	142	102	63	24	0	0	0
2,000	208	168	129	89	50	11	0	0
2,100	234	195	155	116	76	37	0	0
2,200	261	221	182	142	103	63	24	0
2,300	287	248	208	169	129	90	50	11
2,400	313	274	234	195	156	116	77	37
2,500	340	300	261	221	182	143	103	64
2,600	366	327	287	248	208	169	129	90
2,700	393	353	314	274	235	195	156	116
2,800	419	380	340	301	261	222	182	143
2,900	445	406	366	327	288	248	209	169
3,000	472	432	393	353	314	275	235	196
3,100	498	459	419	380	340	301	262	222
3,200	525	485	446	406	367	327	288	249
3,300	551	512	472	433	393	354	314	275
3,400	577	538	499	459	420	380	341	301
3,500	604	564	525	486	446	407	367	327
3,600	630	591	551	512	472	433	393	353
3,700	657	617	578	538	498	459	419	379
3,800	683	643	603	564	524	484	445	405
3,900	709	669	629	590	550	510	471	431
4,000	735	695	655	616	576	536	497	457
4,100	761	721	681	642	602	562	523	483
4,200	787	747	707	668	628	588	549	509
4,300	813	773	733	694	654	614	575	535
4,400	839	799	759	720	680	640	601	561
4,500	865	825	785	746	706	666	627	587
4,600	891	851	811	772	732	692	653	614
4,700	917	877	837	798	758	718	679	640
4,800	943	903	863	824	784	744	705	666



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	1,300	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,000
500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	51	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	77	38	4	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	103	64	30	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	130	91	56	22	0	0	0	0
3,000	156	117	83	49	15	0	0	0
3,100	183	143	109	75	41	7	0	0
3,200	209	170	136	101	67	34	0	0
3,300	236	196	162	127	93	60	26	0
3,400	262	222	188	153	120	86	53	19
3,500	287	248	214	180	146	113	79	45
3,600	313	274	240	206	172	139	105	72
3,700	339	300	266	232	199	165	132	98
3,800	365	326	292	259	225	192	158	124
3,900	391	352	318	285	251	218	184	151
4,000	417	378	345	311	278	244	211	177
4,100	443	404	371	338	304	271	237	203
4,200	470	431	397	364	330	297	263	230
4,300	496	457	424	390	357	323	290	256
4,400	522	483	450	416	383	349	316	282
4,500	549	510	476	443	409	376	342	309
4,600	575	536	503	469	436	402	369	335
4,700	601	562	529	495	462	428	395	361
4,800	627	589	555	522	488	455	421	388



PETITIONER:

RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800
500	52	78	105	131	158	184	210	237
600	12	39	65	92	118	144	171	197
700	0	0	26	52	79	105	131	158
800	0	0	0	13	39	66	92	118
900	0	0	0	0	0	26	53	79
1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	42
1,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	38	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	64	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	91	57	24	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	117	83	50	16	0	0	0	0
4,000	143	110	76	43	9	0	0	0
4,100	170	136	102	69	35	2	0	0
4,200	196	162	129	95	62	28	0	0
4,300	222	189	155	121	88	54	21	0
4,400	249	215	181	148	114	81	47	13
4,500	275	241	208	174	141	107	73	40
4,600	301	268	234	200	167	133	100	66
4,700	328	294	260	227	193	160	126	92
4,800	354	320	287	253	220	186	152	119

PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600
500	263	289	316	342	369	395	421	447
600	224	250	276	303	329	356	382	408
700	184	211	237	264	290	316	345	371
800	145	171	198	224	253	279	305	331
900	105	135	161	188	214	240	266	292
1,000	69	95	122	148	174	200	226	252
1,100	29	56	82	108	134	160	186	212
1,200	0	16	42	68	94	120	146	172
1,300	0	0	3	29	55	81	107	133
1,400	0	0	0	0	15	41	67	93
1,500	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	57
1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
1,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	59	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	85	52	19	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
500	473	499	525	554	580	606	632	658
600	437	463	489	515	541	567	593	619
700	397	423	449	475	501	527	553	579
800	357	383	409	435	461	487	513	539
900	318	344	370	396	422	448	474	500
1,000	278	304	330	356	382	408	434	460
1,100	238	264	290	316	342	368	394	420
1,200	198	224	250	276	302	328	354	380
1,300	159	185	211	237	263	289	315	341
1,400	119	145	171	197	223	249	275	301
1,500	83	109	135	161	187	213	239	265
1,600	48	74	100	126	152	178	205	231
1,700	14	40	66	92	118	145	171	197
1,800	0	6	32	59	85	111	138	164
1,900	0	0	0	25	51	78	104	130
2,000	0	0	0	0	18	44	70	97
2,100	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	63
2,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	29
2,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900	5,000	5,100	5,200
500	684	710	736	762	788	814	840	866
600	645	671	697	723	749	775	801	827
700	605	631	657	683	709	735	761	787
800	565	591	617	643	669	695	721	747
900	526	552	578	604	630	656	682	708
1,000	486	512	538	564	590	616	642	668
1,100	446	472	498	524	550	576	602	628
1,200	406	432	458	484	510	536	562	588
1,300	367	393	419	445	471	497	523	549
1,400	327	353	379	405	431	458	484	510
1,500	291	317	343	370	396	422	448	475
1,600	257	283	310	336	362	389	415	441
1,700	224	250	276	303	329	355	382	408
1,800	190	216	243	269	295	322	348	374
1,900	157	183	209	236	262	288	314	341
2,000	123	149	176	202	228	255	281	307
2,100	89	116	142	168	195	221	247	274
2,200	56	82	108	135	161	187	214	240
2,300	22	48	75	101	127	154	180	206
2,400	0	15	41	67	94	120	146	173
2,500	0	0	8	34	60	86	113	139
2,600	0	0	0	0	27	53	79	105
2,700	0	0	0	0	0	19	46	72
2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	38
2,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	5,300	5,400	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900	6,000
500	892	918	944	970	995	1,020	1,046	1,071
600	852	878	904	930	956	981	1,006	1,031
700	813	839	865	891	916	941	966	991
800	773	799	825	851	876	902	927	952
900	734	759	785	811	837	862	887	912
1,000	694	720	746	772	797	823	848	873
1,100	654	680	706	732	758	783	809	834
1,200	614	641	667	693	719	744	770	795
1,300	575	602	628	654	680	705	731	756
1,400	537	563	589	615	641	666	692	717
1,500	501	527	554	580	606	631	656	682
1,600	468	494	520	547	572	598	623	648
1,700	434	460	487	513	539	564	590	615
1,800	401	427	453	480	505	531	556	582
1,900	367	393	420	446	472	497	522	548
2,000	333	360	386	412	438	463	489	514
2,100	300	326	353	379	404	430	455	481
2,200	266	293	319	345	371	396	422	447
2,300	233	259	285	312	337	363	388	414
2,400	199	225	252	278	304	329	354	380
2,500	165	192	218	244	270	295	321	346
2,600	132	158	184	211	236	262	287	313
2,700	98	124	151	177	203	228	254	279
2,800	65	91	117	144	169	195	220	246
2,900	31	57	84	110	135	161	187	212
3,000	0	24	50	76	102	128	154	179
3,100	0	0	17	43	69	95	120	146
3,200	0	0	0	10	36	62	87	113
3,300	0	0	0	0	3	29	54	80
3,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	47
3,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
3,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800
500	1,096	1,121	1,146	1,171	1,196	1,221	1,247	1,272
600	1,056	1,081	1,106	1,132	1,157	1,182	1,207	1,232
700	1,017	1,042	1,067	1,092	1,117	1,143	1,168	1,194
800	977	1,002	1,027	1,053	1,078	1,104	1,129	1,155
900	938	963	989	1,014	1,039	1,065	1,090	1,116
1,000	899	924	950	975	1,001	1,026	1,051	1,077
1,100	860	885	910	936	961	987	1,012	1,038
1,200	821	846	871	897	922	948	973	999
1,300	782	807	833	858	883	909	934	960
1,400	743	768	794	819	845	870	895	921
1,500	707	733	758	784	809	835	860	885
1,600	674	699	725	750	776	801	826	852
1,700	640	666	691	717	742	768	793	818
1,800	607	632	658	683	709	734	760	785
1,900	573	599	624	650	675	701	726	751
2,000	540	565	591	616	642	667	692	718
2,100	506	532	557	582	608	633	659	684
2,200	473	498	523	549	574	600	625	651
2,300	439	464	490	515	541	566	592	617
2,400	405	431	456	482	507	533	558	583
2,500	372	397	423	448	473	499	524	550
2,600	338	364	389	414	440	465	491	517
2,700	305	330	355	381	407	432	458	484
2,800	271	297	322	348	374	399	425	451
2,900	238	264	289	315	341	366	392	417
3,000	205	231	256	282	307	333	359	384
3,100	172	197	223	249	274	300	326	351
3,200	139	164	190	216	241	267	293	318
3,300	105	131	157	182	208	234	259	285
3,400	72	98	124	149	175	201	226	252
3,500	39	65	90	116	142	167	193	219
3,600	6	32	57	83	109	134	160	186
3,700	0	0	24	50	75	101	127	152
3,800	0	0	0	17	42	68	93	119
3,900	0	0	0	0	9	35	60	86
4,000	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	53
4,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
4,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,900	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400	7,500	7,600
500	1,297	1,322	1,348	1,373	1,398	1,424	1,449	1,474
600	1,258	1,283	1,309	1,334	1,360	1,385	1,410	1,435
700	1,219	1,244	1,270	1,295	1,321	1,346	1,371	1,396
800	1,180	1,206	1,231	1,256	1,282	1,307	1,332	1,357
900	1,141	1,167	1,192	1,217	1,243	1,268	1,293	1,318
1,000	1,102	1,128	1,153	1,179	1,204	1,229	1,255	1,280
1,100	1,063	1,088	1,114	1,139	1,165	1,190	1,215	1,240
1,200	1,024	1,050	1,075	1,100	1,126	1,151	1,176	1,201
1,300	985	1,011	1,036	1,061	1,087	1,112	1,137	1,162
1,400	946	972	997	1,023	1,048	1,073	1,099	1,124
1,500	911	936	962	987	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088
1,600	877	903	928	954	979	1,005	1,030	1,055
1,700	844	869	895	920	946	971	996	1,021
1,800	810	836	861	887	912	938	963	988
1,900	777	802	828	853	879	904	929	954
2,000	743	769	794	820	845	870	896	921
2,100	710	735	761	786	811	837	862	887
2,200	676	701	727	752	778	803	828	853
2,300	642	668	693	719	744	770	795	820
2,400	609	634	660	685	711	737	762	787
2,500	575	601	627	652	678	704	729	754
2,600	542	568	594	619	645	671	696	721
2,700	509	535	561	586	612	637	663	688
2,800	476	502	527	553	579	604	630	655
2,900	443	469	494	520	546	571	597	622
3,000	410	436	461	487	513	538	564	589
3,100	377	403	428	454	480	505	530	556
3,200	344	369	395	421	446	472	497	523
3,300	311	336	362	388	413	439	464	489
3,400	277	303	329	354	380	406	431	456
3,500	244	270	296	321	347	373	398	423
3,600	211	237	262	288	314	339	365	390
3,700	178	204	229	255	281	306	332	357
3,800	145	171	196	222	247	273	298	324
3,900	112	137	163	189	214	240	265	290
4,000	78	104	130	155	181	207	232	257
4,100	45	71	97	122	148	174	199	224
4,200	12	38	63	89	115	140	166	191
4,300	0	5	30	56	82	107	132	158
4,400	0	0	0	23	48	74	99	125
4,500	0	0	0	0	15	41	66	91
4,600	0	0	0	0	0	8	33	58
4,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
4,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	7,700	7,800	7,900	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
500	1,499	1,524	1,549	1,574	1,599	1,624	1,649	1,674
600	1,460	1,485	1,510	1,535	1,560	1,585	1,610	1,635
700	1,421	1,446	1,471	1,496	1,521	1,546	1,571	1,597
800	1,382	1,407	1,432	1,458	1,483	1,508	1,533	1,558
900	1,343	1,369	1,394	1,419	1,444	1,469	1,494	1,519
1,000	1,305	1,330	1,355	1,380	1,405	1,430	1,455	1,480
1,100	1,265	1,290	1,315	1,340	1,365	1,390	1,416	1,441
1,200	1,226	1,251	1,276	1,302	1,327	1,352	1,377	1,402
1,300	1,187	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288	1,313	1,338	1,363
1,400	1,149	1,174	1,199	1,224	1,249	1,274	1,299	1,324
1,500	1,113	1,138	1,163	1,188	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288
1,600	1,080	1,105	1,130	1,155	1,180	1,205	1,230	1,255
1,700	1,046	1,071	1,096	1,121	1,146	1,171	1,196	1,222
1,800	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088	1,113	1,138	1,163	1,188
1,900	979	1,004	1,029	1,054	1,079	1,104	1,129	1,155
2,000	946	971	996	1,021	1,046	1,071	1,096	1,121
2,100	912	937	962	987	1,013	1,038	1,063	1,088
2,200	879	904	929	954	980	1,005	1,030	1,055
2,300	846	871	896	921	947	972	997	1,022
2,400	812	838	863	888	913	939	964	989
2,500	779	805	830	855	880	906	931	956
2,600	746	772	797	822	847	873	898	923
2,700	713	739	764	789	814	839	865	890
2,800	680	705	731	756	781	806	832	857
2,900	647	672	698	723	748	773	799	824
3,000	614	639	665	690	715	740	766	791
3,100	581	606	631	657	682	707	732	758
3,200	548	573	598	624	649	674	699	725
3,300	515	540	565	590	616	641	666	691
3,400	481	507	532	557	582	608	633	658
3,500	448	474	499	524	549	575	600	625
3,600	415	440	466	491	516	541	567	592
3,700	382	407	433	458	483	508	533	559
3,800	349	374	399	425	450	475	500	526
3,900	316	341	366	391	417	442	467	492
4,000	283	308	333	358	384	409	434	459
4,100	249	275	300	325	350	376	401	426
4,200	216	241	267	292	317	342	368	393
4,300	183	208	234	259	284	309	335	360
4,400	150	175	200	226	251	276	301	327
4,500	117	142	167	193	218	243	268	294
4,600	84	109	134	159	185	210	235	260
4,700	50	76	101	126	151	177	202	227
4,800	17	43	68	93	118	143	169	194



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900	9,000	9,100	9,200
500	1,699	1,724	1,749	1,774	1,800	1,825	1,850	1,875
600	1,660	1,686	1,711	1,736	1,761	1,786	1,811	1,836
700	1,622	1,647	1,672	1,697	1,722	1,747	1,772	1,797
800	1,583	1,608	1,633	1,658	1,683	1,708	1,733	1,758
900	1,544	1,569	1,594	1,619	1,644	1,669	1,694	1,719
1,000	1,505	1,530	1,555	1,580	1,605	1,630	1,655	1,680
1,100	1,466	1,491	1,516	1,541	1,566	1,591	1,616	1,641
1,200	1,427	1,452	1,477	1,502	1,527	1,552	1,577	1,602
1,300	1,388	1,413	1,438	1,463	1,488	1,513	1,538	1,563
1,400	1,349	1,374	1,399	1,424	1,449	1,474	1,499	1,524
1,500	1,313	1,339	1,364	1,389	1,414	1,439	1,464	1,489
1,600	1,280	1,305	1,330	1,355	1,380	1,405	1,430	1,455
1,700	1,247	1,272	1,297	1,322	1,347	1,372	1,397	1,422
1,800	1,213	1,238	1,263	1,288	1,314	1,339	1,364	1,389
1,900	1,180	1,205	1,230	1,255	1,281	1,306	1,331	1,356
2,000	1,147	1,172	1,197	1,222	1,248	1,273	1,298	1,323
2,100	1,114	1,139	1,164	1,189	1,215	1,240	1,265	1,290
2,200	1,081	1,106	1,131	1,156	1,182	1,207	1,232	1,257
2,300	1,047	1,073	1,098	1,123	1,148	1,174	1,199	1,224
2,400	1,014	1,040	1,065	1,090	1,115	1,141	1,166	1,191
2,500	981	1,007	1,032	1,057	1,082	1,108	1,133	1,158
2,600	948	974	999	1,024	1,049	1,075	1,100	1,125
2,700	915	940	966	991	1,016	1,041	1,067	1,092
2,800	882	907	933	958	983	1,008	1,034	1,059
2,900	849	874	900	925	950	975	1,001	1,026
3,000	816	841	867	892	917	942	968	993
3,100	783	808	833	859	884	909	934	960
3,200	750	775	800	825	851	876	901	926
3,300	717	742	767	792	818	843	868	893
3,400	683	709	734	759	784	810	835	860
3,500	650	676	701	726	751	777	802	827
3,600	617	642	668	693	718	743	769	794
3,700	584	609	634	660	685	710	735	761
3,800	551	576	601	627	652	677	702	728
3,900	518	543	568	593	619	644	669	694
4,000	485	510	535	560	586	611	636	661
4,100	451	477	502	527	552	578	603	628
4,200	418	443	469	494	519	544	570	595
4,300	385	410	436	461	486	511	537	562
4,400	352	377	402	428	453	478	503	529
4,500	319	344	369	394	420	445	470	495
4,600	286	311	336	361	387	412	437	462
4,700	252	278	303	328	353	379	404	429
4,800	219	245	270	295	320	346	371	396



PETITIONER:
RESPONDENT:

CASE NUMBER:

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	9,300	9,400	9,500	9,600	9,700	9,800	9,900	10,000
500	1,900	1,925	1,950	1,975	2,000	2,025	2,050	2,076
600	1,861	1,886	1,911	1,936	1,961	1,986	2,012	2,037
700	1,822	1,847	1,872	1,897	1,922	1,947	1,973	1,998
800	1,783	1,808	1,833	1,858	1,883	1,908	1,934	1,959
900	1,744	1,769	1,794	1,819	1,844	1,869	1,895	1,920
1,000	1,705	1,730	1,755	1,780	1,805	1,830	1,856	1,881
1,100	1,666	1,691	1,716	1,741	1,766	1,791	1,817	1,842
1,200	1,627	1,652	1,677	1,702	1,727	1,752	1,778	1,803
1,300	1,588	1,613	1,638	1,663	1,688	1,713	1,739	1,764
1,400	1,549	1,574	1,599	1,624	1,649	1,675	1,700	1,726
1,500	1,514	1,539	1,564	1,589	1,614	1,640	1,665	1,691
1,600	1,481	1,506	1,531	1,556	1,582	1,607	1,633	1,658
1,700	1,448	1,473	1,498	1,523	1,549	1,574	1,600	1,625
1,800	1,415	1,440	1,465	1,490	1,516	1,541	1,567	1,592
1,900	1,382	1,407	1,432	1,457	1,483	1,508	1,534	1,559
2,000	1,349	1,374	1,399	1,424	1,450	1,475	1,501	1,526
2,100	1,316	1,341	1,366	1,391	1,417	1,442	1,468	1,493
2,200	1,282	1,308	1,333	1,358	1,383	1,409	1,435	1,460
2,300	1,249	1,275	1,300	1,325	1,350	1,376	1,401	1,427
2,400	1,216	1,242	1,267	1,292	1,317	1,343	1,368	1,394
2,500	1,183	1,209	1,234	1,259	1,284	1,310	1,335	1,361
2,600	1,150	1,176	1,201	1,226	1,251	1,277	1,302	1,328
2,700	1,117	1,142	1,168	1,193	1,218	1,244	1,269	1,295
2,800	1,084	1,109	1,135	1,160	1,185	1,210	1,236	1,262
2,900	1,051	1,076	1,102	1,127	1,152	1,177	1,203	1,229
3,000	1,018	1,043	1,069	1,094	1,119	1,144	1,170	1,196
3,100	985	1,010	1,035	1,061	1,086	1,111	1,137	1,163
3,200	952	977	1,002	1,027	1,053	1,078	1,104	1,129
3,300	919	944	969	994	1,020	1,045	1,071	1,096
3,400	885	911	936	961	986	1,012	1,037	1,063
3,500	852	878	903	928	953	979	1,004	1,030
3,600	819	844	870	895	920	945	971	997
3,700	786	811	836	862	887	912	938	964
3,800	753	778	803	829	854	879	905	930
3,900	720	745	770	795	821	846	872	897
4,000	686	712	737	762	787	813	839	864
4,100	653	679	704	729	754	780	805	831
4,200	620	645	671	696	721	747	772	798
4,300	587	612	638	663	688	713	739	765
4,400	554	579	604	630	655	680	706	732
4,500	521	546	571	596	622	647	673	698
4,600	488	513	538	563	589	614	640	665
4,700	454	480	505	530	555	581	606	632
4,800	421	447	472	497	522	548	573	599

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages	Husband's Gross Overtime Wages							
	500	600	700	800	900	1,000	1,100	1,200
4,900	<i>969</i>	<i>929</i>	<i>889</i>	<i>850</i>	<i>810</i>	<i>771</i>	<i>732</i>	<i>693</i>
5,000	<i>995</i>	<i>955</i>	<i>915</i>	<i>876</i>	<i>836</i>	<i>797</i>	<i>758</i>	<i>719</i>



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	1,300	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,000
4,900	<i>654</i>	<i>615</i>	<i>581</i>	<i>548</i>	<i>515</i>	<i>481</i>	<i>447</i>	<i>414</i>
5,000	<i>680</i>	<i>641</i>	<i>608</i>	<i>574</i>	<i>541</i>	<i>507</i>	<i>474</i>	<i>440</i>



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800
4,900	<i>380</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>313</i>	<i>279</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>145</i>
5,000	<i>407</i>	<i>373</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>306</i>	<i>272</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>205</i>	<i>171</i>



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600
4,900	<i>111</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>12</i>	0	0	0	0
5,000	<i>138</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>5</i>	0	0	0



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER: RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER:
--------------------------------	--------------

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900	5,000	5,100	5,200
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	5,300	5,400	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900	6,000
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	6,900	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400	7,500	7,600
4,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. Red italic is a cost to Wife

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	7,700	7,800	7,900	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
4,900	0	9	35	60	85	110	136	161
5,000	0	0	1	27	52	77	102	128



PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900	9,000	9,100	9,200
4,900	186	211	237	262	287	312	338	363
5,000	153	178	203	229	254	279	304	330

PETITIONER:	CASE NUMBER:
RESPONDENT:	

Total Alameda Spousal Support, cont'd

Blue is a cost to Husband. *Red italic is a cost to Wife*

Wife's Gross Overtime Wages								
	9,300	9,400	9,500	9,600	9,700	9,800	9,900	10,000
4,900	388	413	439	464	489	514	540	566
5,000	355	380	405	431	456	481	507	533

