

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

1. MICHAEL HAMMEL V. MICHELLE HAMMEL

25FL1040

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

2. JOSH ANDERSON V. YU CHEN CHANG

25FL0020

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

3. LEELO ARVISAIS V. JONAH GRIFFIN

24FL0346

On July 10, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Custody (CCRC) with an appointment on September 2, 2026 and a review hearing was set for the present date. All required documents were served on July 17th.

Neither party appeared at CCRC as required.

Respondent filed and served a supplemental declaration on October 1st.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Respondent is requesting primary physical custody of the minor with Petitioner to have supervised visits only. Alternatively, he asks that Petitioner have visits every other weekend. Additionally, he requests an order barring Runie Arvisais from having any contact with the minor. He also requests a re-referral to CCRC as he inadvertently missed the original appointment.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court does find a re-referral to CCRC is warranted. The parties are ordered to attend CCRC on Monday, December 28th at 9:00 am. A review hearing is set for Thursday, February 25th at 8:30 am in Department 5. Supplemental declarations, if any, are due no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing date. Pending the review hearing the minor shall not be left alone with Runie Arvisais.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ATTEND CCRC ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 28TH AT 9:00 AM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, ARE DUE NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING DATE. PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING THE MINOR SHALL NOT BE LEFT ALONE WITH RUNIE ARVISAIS.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

**THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE
8.05.07.**

4. CARLEY BAGATELOS V. THEODORE BAGATELOS

25FL1006

On July 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support, and to modify the DVRO. The RFO was originally filed ex parte at which time the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. The request to modify the DVRO was denied as it was not properly brought before the court.

The RFO and supporting declaration were served on July 10th along with an FL-305 and FL-303, however there is no indication that the Notice of Tentative Ruling was served, the blank FL-320, the referral to CCRC or the Notes/Orders After Ex Parte.

Neither party appeared for CCRC and Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service and failure to appear at CCRC.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AND FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC.

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

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

5. LISA MARIE CURLEE V. ERIC BRISTER

24FL1116

On July 27, 2026, Counsel for Respondent filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. The motion was served on Respondent on July 21st. It has not been served on Petitioner.

This matter is continued to November 12, 2026 at 8:30am in Department 5. Counsel is ordered to serve the moving papers on Petitioner and file a Proof of Service thereof.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 12, 2026 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. COUNSEL IS ORDERED TO SERVE THE MOVING PAPERS ON PETITIONER AND FILE A PROOF OF SERVICE THEREOF.

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

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

6. JENNIFER DANIELS V. JOSE CARRERO

PFL2010812

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

7. MERCEDES DAVIS V. SHATIZ MELONSON

24FL0236

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

8. MEGAN DOYLE V. GRANT DOUGLAS DAKIN

25FL0122

On March 11, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as attorney's fees. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on June 4th, at which time they were able to reach a full stipulation. As part of that stipulation they agreed to set a review hearing on the present date.

Petitioner filed and served a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, a Declaration of Counsel Re Attorney's Fees, an Income and Expense Declaration, and a supplemental declaration on October 5, 2026.

Respondent filed and served an updating declaration on October 5th and a reply declaration on October 8th.

Petitioner filed and served a reply declaration on October 8th. She filed and served an amended reply declaration on October 9th. Respondent then filed and served a Points and Authorities Re: Request to Strike/Objection to Pleading on October 9th.

The court authorized the filing of supplemental declarations 10 days prior to the hearing date. Respondent's reply declaration, which was served on October 8th. Petitioner's reply declaration filed October 8th, her amended reply declaration of October 9th, and Respondent's October 9th Request to Strike were all late filed and without leave of court. Accordingly, none of the aforementioned have been read or considered.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: RESPONDENT'S REPLY DECLARATION, WHICH WAS SERVED ON OCTOBER 8TH. PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION FILED OCTOBER 8TH, HER AMENDED REPLY DECLARATION OF OCTOBER 9TH, AND RESPONDENT'S OCTOBER 9TH REQUEST TO STRIKE WERE ALL LATE FILED AND WITHOUT LEAVE OF COURT. ACCORDINGLY, NONE OF THE AFOREMENTIONED HAVE BEEN READ OR CONSIDERED.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

**THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE
8.05.07.**

On February 26, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders as well as various other parenting plan orders. The parties appeared for the hearing on May 28th at which time the parties reached an agreement. As part of their agreement, the court set a review hearing for the present date.

Respondent filed and served a supplemental declaration on October 5th.

Petitioner filed and served an updating declaration on October 8th.

Respondent asks the court to expand his visits to a 2-2-3 schedule, adopt a holiday and vacation schedule, and clarify the provisions regarding exchanges, counseling and telephone/video contact with the minor.

Petitioner asks the court to maintain the current custody schedule at Step 3. She further requests that Respondent bear all the costs of co-parenting counseling with the exception of Petitioner's intake costs. She further requests two video calls per week at 6:00pm whenever Respondent is away five or more consecutive days, with a makeup call within 24 hours if one is missed through no fault of Respondent. She asks that Bradford Park be the designated exchange point with the exception of Petitioner's workdays at which time she asks that Respondent pick up the minor from the maternal grandmother's residence.

First and foremost, regarding visitation, the court does not find a 2-2-3 to be in the best interests of the minor prior to the parties practicing Step 3 for an extended period of time. As such, the request to move to a 2-2-3 schedule is denied. The parties are to continue practicing visitation under Step 3. A review hearing is set for Thursday, January 14th at 8:30 am in Department 5 to address the status of visits and whether progressing to a 2-2-3 schedule is appropriate.

For the October visitation schedule, Respondent shall have the minor on October 17-18th in accordance with the regular visitation schedule. In addition, Respondent is to have October 24-25th as a replacement for the October 3-4th weekend. Visits on these weekends are to be from 10:00am on Saturday and ending at 6:00pm on Sunday.

On the days that Petitioner is not working, the parties are to utilize Bradford Park in Shingle Springs for exchanges. When Petitioner is working, Respondent shall pick up the minor from the maternal grandmother's residence. The parties are ordered to conduct the exchanges in a calm manner without yelling or profanity. Information concerning meals, sleep, and other routine care is to be communicated through Our Family Wizard or directly

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

between the parties. The parties shall not utilize the minor to deliver any messages between them.

On days when Respondent does not have visitation with the minor, Respondent shall have telephone or video contact with the minor at 6:00pm daily unless agreed upon otherwise in writing. The parties are to reasonably assist with calls but may not monitor, direct, interrupt, or restrict the calls in any way. The court is not ordering make-up calls since the calls are to be held daily. If one is missed, there will be a 6:00pm call the following day.

Regarding vacations, in even-numbered years, Petitioner shall have December 24th at 11:00am through December 25th at 11:00am and Respondent will have December 25th at 11:00am through December 26th at 11:00am. Vice versa in odd numbered years. The court is adopting the remainder of the holiday schedule and the vacation schedule as listed on the FL-341(C) which is attached as Exhibit A to Respondent's declaration.

Regarding the cost of co-parenting counseling, the most recent Income and Expense Declaration the court has from Petitioner is approximately a year old. The court is unable to allocate costs for counseling without accurate and up-to-date information regarding each party's income. Accordingly, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing and they are ordered to bring with them completed Income and Expense Declarations.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE REQUEST TO MOVE TO A 2-2-3 SCHEDULE IS DENIED. THE PARTIES ARE TO CONTINUE PRACTICING VISITATION UNDER STEP 3. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 14TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ADDRESS THE STATUS OF VISITS AND WHETHER PROGRESSING TO A 2-2-3 SCHEDULE IS APPROPRIATE.

FOR THE OCTOBER VISITATION SCHEDULE, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE THE MINOR ON OCTOBER 17-18TH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULAR VISITATION SCHEDULE. IN ADDITION, RESPONDENT IS TO HAVE OCTOBER 24-25TH AS A REPLACEMENT FOR THE OCTOBER 3-4TH WEEKEND. VISITS ON THESE WEEKENDS ARE TO BE FROM 10:00AM ON SATURDAY AND ENDING AT 6:00PM ON SUNDAY.

ON THE DAYS THAT PETITIONER IS NOT WORKING, THE PARTIES ARE TO UTILIZE BRADFORD PARK IN SHINGLE SPRINGS FOR EXCHANGES. WHEN PETITIONER IS WORKING, RESPONDENT SHALL PICK UP THE MINOR FROM THE MATERNAL GRANDMOTHER'S RESIDENCE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO CONDUCT THE EXCHANGES IN A CALM MANNER WITHOUT YELLING OR PROFANITY. INFORMATION CONCERNING MEALS, SLEEP, AND OTHER ROUTINE CARE IS TO BE COMMUNICATED THROUGH OUR FAMILY WIZARD OR DIRECTLY BETWEEN THE PARTIES. THE PARTIS SHALL NOT UTILIZE THE MINOR TO DELIVER ANY MESSAGES BETWEEN THEM.

ON DAYS WHEN RESPONDENT DOES NOT HAVE VISITATION WITH THE MINOR, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE TELEPHONE OR VIDEO CONTACT WITH THE MINOR AT 6:00PM DAILY UNLESS AGREED UPON OTHERWISE IN WRITING. THE PARTIES ARE TO REASONABLY ASSIST WITH CALLS BUT MAY NOT MONITOR, DIRECT, INTERRUPT, OR RESTRICT THE CALLS IN ANY WAY. THE COURT IS NOT ORDERING MAKE-UP CALLS SINCE THE CALLS ARE TO BE HELD DAILY. IF ONE IS MISSED, THERE WILL BE A 6:00PM CALL THE FOLLOWING DAY.

REGARDING VACATIONS, IN EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS, PETITIONER SHALL HAVE DECEMBER 24TH AT 11:00AM THROUGH DECEMBER 25TH AT 11:00AM AND RESPONDENT WILL HAVE DECEMBER 25TH AT 11:00AM THROUGH DECEMBER 26TH AT 11:00AM. VICE VERSA IN ODD NUMBERED YEARS. THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE REMAINDER OF THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE AND THE VACATION SCHEDULE AS LISTED ON THE FL-341(C) WHICH IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A TO RESPONDENT'S DECLARATION.

REGARDING THE COST OF CO-PARENTING COUNSELING, THE MOST RECENT INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION THE COURT HAS FROM PETITIONER IS APPROXIMATELY A YEAR OLD. THE COURT IS UNABLE TO ALLOCATE COSTS FOR COUNSELING WITHOUT ACCURATE AND UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION REGARDING EACH PARTY'S INCOME. ACCORDINGLY, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING AND THEY ARE ORDERED TO BRING WITH THEM COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

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

10. SARAH LESTER V. JASON LESTER

23FL1169

On August 12, 2026, Minor's Counsel filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for both parties to participate in counseling. The RFO and Notice of Tentative Ruling were served on both parties on August 24th and then again on Respondent on August 28th. The proofs indicate that a "blank notice of remote appearance" was served instead of a blank FL-320.

Neither Petitioner nor Respondent has filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the moving papers were properly and timely served on the parties and therefore the court finds good cause to treat each party's failure to file an FL-320 as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Minor's Counsel requests an order directing each party to enroll in counseling/therapy with a therapist experienced in high conflict custody cases.

"...[I]t is the public policy of this state to ensure that the health, safety, and welfare of children shall be the court's primary concern in determining the best interests of children when making orders regarding the physical or legal custody or visitation of children..." Cal. Fam. Code § 3020.

Here, after reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find that ordering individual therapy for the parties would be in the best interests of the children. Accordingly, each party is ordered to enroll in individual therapy forthwith. Parties are to select a therapist who is experienced in high conflict custody cases. The selection must be made within 30 days of the date of this order. A review hearing is set for December 3, 2026. Supplemental declarations, if any, are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The parties are admonished to abide by the respect guidelines and to ensure they are not discussing the proceedings with, or around, the children. Failure to do so may result in a change of custody orders.

Minor's Counsel is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: EACH PARTY IS ORDERED TO ENROLL IN INDIVIDUAL THERAPY FORTHWITH. PARTIES ARE TO SELECT A THERAPIST WHO IS EXPERIENCED IN HIGH CONFLICT CUSTODY CASES. THE SELECTION MUST BE MADE WITHIN 30 DAYS

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

OF THE DATE OF THIS ORDER. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR DECEMBER 3, 2026. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED TO ABIDE BY THE RESPECT GUIDELINES AND TO ENSURE THEY ARE NOT DISCUSSING THE PROCEEDINGS WITH, OR AROUND, THE CHILDREN. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN A CHANGE OF CUSTODY ORDERS.

MINOR'S COUNSEL IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

11. SUKHDEEP NATT V. GUNEET NATT

25FL0866

On November 13, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, spousal support, attorney's fees, and an order regarding payment of extracurricular activities. On March 13th, Respondent filed an RFO for child custody and visitation orders. Both RFOs came before the court for hearing on July 2nd at which time the parties reached agreements on all issues. As part of their agreements they agreed a review hearing would be held on the present date.

On October 1st, Petitioner filed and served a supplemental declaration and an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent has not filed a supplemental declaration or an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner asks the court to maintain visitation at step 1 of the step-up schedule. She further asks that, no later than the 5th of each month, Respondent be required to provide all paystubs and pay records for the previous month in order to ensure that support is being paid on the entirety of Respondent's income, not just his base pay.

Petitioner's requests are granted. The court does find it to be in the best interest of the minor to maintain visitation in accordance with step 1 of the step-up plan.

In addition to the foregoing, Respondent is ordered to provide Petitioner with copies of his paystubs and records for each month. He is to provide Petitioner with these documents via email no later than the 5th day of the following month.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: PETITIONER'S REQUESTS ARE GRANTED. THE COURT DOES FIND IT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR TO MAINTAIN VISITATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH STEP 1 OF THE STEP-UP PLAN.

IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH COPIES OF HIS PAYSTUBS AND RECORDS FOR EACH MONTH. HE IS TO PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH THESE DOCUMENTS VIA EMAIL NO LATER THAN THE 5TH DAY OF THE FOLLOWING MONTH.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

12. MICHAEL SOUDERS V. DONNA SOUDERS

25FL0270

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

13. CELESTE SPINA V. ANTHONY CATALANO

24FL0448

On September 11, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees and costs. It was served on September 14th along with the blank FL-320, however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

Respondent filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration and his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 1st.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration on October 2nd. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner is requesting \$25,000 in need-based attorney's fees. She requests \$10,000 up front to retain an attorney for the upcoming court dates.

Respondent opposes the request and asks the court to reserve on his ability to request sanctions-based attorney's fees. In the event an award is granted, Respondent asks that payments be set to no more than \$50 per month.

"[T]o request attorney's fees and costs, a party must complete, file and serve the following documents:...Request for Attorney's Fees and Costs Attachment (form FL-319) or a comparable declaration that addresses the factors covered in form FL-319...[and a] personal declaration in support of the request for attorney's fees and costs, either using Supporting Declaration for Attorney's Fees and Costs Attachment (form FL-158) or a comparable declaration that addresses the factors covered in form FL-158..." Cal. Rule of Ct. 5.427(b)(1). Petitioner has not filed either a form FL-319, an FL-158, or a declaration covering the necessary factors for the court to rule on a request for attorney's fees. Petitioner's request for attorney's fees is therefore denied due to her failure to file the requisite documentation.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED DUE TO HER FAILURE TO FILE THE REQUISITE DOCUMENTATION.

RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

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

14. CORAL STRICLER V. SCOTT STRICLER

25FL1201

On July 20, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to bifurcate and terminate the issue of marital status. There is a signed Judgment dated September 18th which, among other things, terminates the marital status. Accordingly, the court finds the RFO to be moot and it is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE RFO ARE MOOT.

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

15. ANTHONY TATUM V. PATRINA TATUM

23FL1230

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

On June 1, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and sanctions. She did not file her Income and Expense Declaration until September 22, 2026 along with a declaration of Julie Rosch and an amended declaration of attorney Taryn M. Scharf. All required documents were personally served on September 22nd.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 5th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made October 2nd the last day for filing; therefore, it is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Petitioner has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

This matter is continued to January 7, 2027 at 8:30am. Supplemental declarations, if any, are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date. Parties are ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations and proposed Xspouse reports no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO JANUARY 7, 2027 AT 8:30AM. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AND PROPOSED XSPOUSE REPORTS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

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

17. NIKI WILLIAMSON V. MICHAEL WILLIAMSON

24FL0835

On July 30, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a sale of the marital residence and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on August 4, 2026.

On August 6th, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore this matter is dropped from calendar.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, it appears the RFO was timely and properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending requests and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner is requesting an order to sell the marital residence located at 1961 El Ninos Way in Placerville. She further requests \$2,500 in Family Code § 271 sanctions.

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 "[a]t any time during the proceeding...order the liquidation of community or quasi-community assets so as to avoid unreasonable market or investment risks..." Cal. Fam. Code § 2108.

Here, given that Respondent has failed to make mortgage payments, and given his willful disregard for the court's orders of support and payment of the costs and utilities associated with the home, the court does find an order to sell the residence proper at this time. The court infers that Respondent concedes to this matter due to his failure to file a responsive declaration. Accordingly, the parties are ordered to place the home located at 1961 El Ninos Way in Placerville for sale within 60 days of the date of this order.

Regarding sanctions, 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 and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a).

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

As previously mentioned, Respondent has failed to comply with the court's orders to date. His willful disregard for the court's orders has inarguably frustrated the policy of the law to promote settlement and reduce the cost of litigation. Accordingly, Petitioner's request for sanctions is granted. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$2,500 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$500 commencing on November 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1st of each month thereafter until paid in full (approximately 5 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOME LOCATED AT 1961 EL NINOS WAY IN PLACERVILLE FOR SALE WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS ORDER. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,500 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$500 COMMENCING ON NOVEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH THEREAFTER UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 5 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

18. CHERYL FISCHIETTO V. FREDRICK FISCHIETTO

22FL0286

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

19. DCSS V. KRISTY ARROYO (OTHER PARENT: ANTHONY HESTER) PFS20180026

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

On July 13, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It was mail served on August 19th, however the blank FL-320 and the Notice of Tentative Ruling were not served.

Petitioner filed and served a supplemental declaration on August 26th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on September 3, 2026 and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on September 4, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minors. She asks that Respondent have supervised visits with the children every other weekend. She proposes visits to be non-professionally supervised by the paternal aunt Katlyn or the paternal grandmother. She requests video communication to be supervised as well and an order for Respondent to submit to a hair follicle drug test. Finally, she asks that the parties be ordered to utilize the Talking Parents app for communications.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements and recommendations in the September 4, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

In addition to the above, Respondent is ordered to update his address with the court forthwith. "When an action is pending, an attorney or self-represented party has the burden of notifying the court of any change of address, and failure so to do does not enable them to claim improper notice." *Kramer v. Traditional Escrow, Inc.*, 56 Cal. App. 5th 13, 31 (2020).

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO UPDATE HIS ADDRESS WITH THE COURT FORTHWITH.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

21. KIM CHAVEZ V. RICHARD CHAVEZ

PFL20130224

On June 2, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking property control and ownership orders. The RFO was served on June 28th, however none of the other required documents were served. Additionally, this is a post-judgment request and as such, service was to comply with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THIS 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.

On August 6, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) for spousal support. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore this matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THIS 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

23. DANIEL FREIER V. NANCEY NIEMAN

25FL1234

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

24. CANDANCE GARCIA V. FRANK GARCIA

24FL0172

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

On July 9, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and child support orders.

There is no Proof of Service for the Summons, the Petition for Custody and Support, or for the RFO. This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #25: THIS 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

26. KELLI JEANCOQ V. RAYMOND LONERGAN

PFL20190708

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

27. PETER KASHUBA V. ALLISON KASHUBA

PFL20200214

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

28. KAIWA KUPIHEA V. JENNIFER FARIA

26FL0741

On August 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was originally filed ex parte and was granted in part. The court issued temporary orders and referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment. All required documents were served the same day as filing.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 24th. It was served on August 20th.

Respondent appeared at the emergency set CCRC appointment however, due to technical difficulties with UDC, Petitioner was unable to appear and the CCRC counselor was unable to make any recommendations.

Petitioner filed a declaration on September 24th, however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore it has not been read or considered.

Given Petitioner's inability to appear at CCRC the court finds it would be best to re-refer the parties. As such, the parties are referred to CCRC with an appointment on Monday, December 28th at 1:00 pm. A review hearing is set for Thursday, February 25th at 1:30 pm in Department 5. Supplemental declarations, if any, shall be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date. All ex parte orders remain in full force and effect pending the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #28: THE PARTIES ARE REFERRED TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 28TH AT 1:00 PM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, SHALL BE FILED AND SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE. ALL EX PARTE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT PENDING THE REVIEW 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

29. SYDNEY LEOS V. LAWRENCE PORCHIA

PFL20210592

See tentative ruling from October 8, 2026.

30. BEVERLY MOORE V. KENNETH MOORE

25FL0651

On August 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking appointment of the court clerk as elisor. All required documents were personally served on Respondent on August 19th in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, it appears the RFO was timely and properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending request and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner requests an order allowing the clerk to sign the quitclaim deed of the marital residence as elisor on behalf of Respondent.

After reviewing the file, it does appear the October 28, 2025 Judgment did award Petitioner the entirety of the interest in the home located at 6532 Onyx Trail in Pollock Pines. As such, Petitioner’s request is granted. The clerk of court is authorized to sign the quitclaim deed as elisor on behalf of Respondent.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court’s adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #30: PETITIONER’S REQUEST IS GRANTED. THE CLERK OF COURT IS AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THE QUITCLAIM DEED AS ELISOR ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT’S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON

10/15/26
Tentative Rulings
Department 5

**THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE
8.05.07.**

31. BRAD POPEJOY V. ANNETTE POPEJOY

26FL0240

On July 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as property orders. All required orders were personally served on August 20th.

The parties filed a Stipulation and Order Re: Physical Custody of Gaige Popejoy on August 21st resolving some of the issues.

Only Respondent appeared at the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment. Petitioner was late signing on to UDC and was therefore unable to participate in the appointment.

Given that Petitioner was unable to participate in CCRC the court finds it appropriate to re-refer the parties to CCRC with an appointment on Wednesday, December 30th at 9:00 am. A review hearing is set for Thursday, February 25th at 1:30 pm in Department 5. Supplemental declarations, if any, are to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #31: THE COURT FINDS IT APPROPRIATE TO RE-REFER THE PARTIES TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30TH AT 9:00 AM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.

On July 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either of these documents. Nevertheless, Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 1st.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on September 3, 2026 and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on September 16th and mailed to the parties on September 17th.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the minors as well as guideline child support and guideline spousal support. She also requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$8,500.

Respondent also requests joint legal and joint physical custody of the children with a 50/50 timeshare. He is not opposed to spousal support or child support but asks that the court include an Ostler/Smith overtime table. Finally, he opposes Petitioner's request for attorney's fees.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the September 16, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children with the following modifications. The court is not adopting the physical custody provisions of the CCRC report. Instead, the parties are ordered to follow a week-on/week-off schedule. Exchanges are to occur on Thursdays at school drop-off or 8am if no school. Paragraph 2(e) of the legal custody section shall be deleted. Each party may make decisions regarding the religious activities of the minor during his or her parenting time, without infringing on the parenting time of the other party.

It is unclear to the court whether Respondent has been paying all expenses associated with Petitioner and the children remaining in the home. If so, this may be used to offset spousal support since the parties are still living together. The parties are ordered to appear to address the issues of support and attorney's fees.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

**TENTATIVE RULING #32: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE SEPTEMBER 16, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE**

IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE PHYSICAL CUSTODY PROVISIONS OF THE CCRC REPORT. INSTEAD, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW A WEEK-ON/WEEK-OFF SCHEDULE. EXCHANGES ARE TO OCCUR ON THURSDAYS AT SCHOOL DROP-OFF OR 8AM IF NO SCHOOL. PARAGRAPH 2(E) OF THE LEGAL CUSTODY SECTION SHALL BE DELETED. EACH PARTY MAY MAKE DECISIONS REGARDING THE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES OF THE MINOR DURING HIS OR HER PARENTING TIME, WITHOUT INFRINGING ON THE PARENTING TIME OF THE OTHER PARTY. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF SUPPORT AND ATTORNEY'S FEES.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

33. BRITTNEY STUCKEY V. MICHAEL STUCKEY

23FL0078

On August 5, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child and spousal support. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served by mail on August 13th, however this is a post-judgment request and as such personal service was required in accordance with Family Code § 215.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #33: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE 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 PHONE CALL 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 PHONE CALL 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.