

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

1. HOLLY CHARLES V. JOSEPH CHARLES

23FL0516

On July 22, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child and spousal support. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on August 29th however, it does not appear the Notice of Tentative Ruling was served.

Petitioner's Declaration re Support was filed and served on October 9th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and an Income and Expense Declaration on October 10th and again on October 13th. The court finds these 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 3rd the last day for filing Respondent's opposition papers. As such, the court cannot consider them. Even if they were timely filed, there is no Proof of Service for any of these documents therefore the court cannot consider them for that reason as well.

Petitioner filed and served another Income and Expense Declaration on October 13th.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court is adopting the Xspouse report attached to Petitioner's October 9th declaration as the order of the court. Utilizing the same figures as outlined therein, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$797 per month, and child support is \$1,023 per month. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$1,821 per month as and for child support and temporary spousal support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of August 1, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$5,463 through and including October 1, 2025. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$455.25 on the 15th of each month commencing on November 15, 2025 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If a payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE XSPOUSE REPORT ATTACHED TO PETITIONER'S OCTOBER 9TH DECLARATION AS THE ORDER OF THE COURT. UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED THEREIN, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$797 PER MONTH, AND CHILD SUPPORT IS \$1,023 PER MONTH. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,821 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF AUGUST 1, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,463 THROUGH AND INCLUDING OCTOBER 1, 2025. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$455.25 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON NOVEMBER 15, 2025 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF A PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

2. ERICA CHRISTINE FERNANDEZ V. ROJELIO MARTINEZ

24FL0566

Shannon Ramos, counsel for Respondent, filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and her supporting declaration on August 7, 2025. The motion was served on Petitioner's attorney as well as Respondent on August 1st.

Counsel states that there has been an irreparable breakdown of the attorney-client relationship. The motion is granted pursuant to *Aceves v. Sup. Ct.*, 51 Cal. App. 4th 584 (1996) which states that the court may rely on Counsel's representation that there is a conflict, or that the attorney-client relationship has suffered an unrepairable breakdown, without knowing the underlying facts behind those statements. Withdrawal will be effective as of the date of filing the Proof of Service of the formal, signed order upon the client.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS GRANTED. WITHDRAWAL WILL BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE DATE OF FILING 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

3. CHRISTOPHER KINGSLEY V. DIANE KINGSLEY

PFL20030287

On August 12, 2025, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). It was personally served on September 20, 2025. The OSC alleges 37 counts of attempt. The parties are ordered to appear for arraignment on the OSC.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

4. KRISTA KLINGENBERG V. DANIEL KERSEY

PFL20120509

On July 1, 2025, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). An amended OSC was filed on July 25th alleging 3 counts of contempt. There is no Proof of Service for either of the OSCs.

Respondent filed a Motion in Limine; Request for Judicial Notice; Request for Sanctions Per FC § 271 on October 7, 2025. There is an unsigned Proof of Service attached to this document. Because the Proof of Service is unsigned, the court cannot consider this filing.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

6. KATHRYN MCDONALD V. JOHN MCDONALD

PFL20210430

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 4, 2025. The parties attended hearings on this matter on May 29th and August 7th. Each time they were able to make some agreements and each time they requested a review hearing. Per the most recent agreement of the parties, a review hearing was set for the present date, and the parties were ordered to file Supplemental Declarations.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Child Custody and Parenting Time was filed and served on October 2nd. A Declaration of Petitioner was filed and served on October 3, 2025. Thereafter, on October 6th, Respondent filed and served an Objection to Petitioner's Declaration of Petitioner. Petitioner filed a Response to Respondent's Objection on October 7th.

Minor's Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions and Request for Orders was filed and served on October 6th.

Respondent requests sole legal custody of the children or, at minimum, sole legal custody regarding medical decisions. He requests sole physical custody of the children with Petitioner to have only supervised visits.

Petitioner opposes Respondent's requests. Instead, she asks that she have sole legal custody of the children. She agrees to allow Petitioner access to records and the ability to participate but she requests final decision-making authority on all issues. She further requests the minor Michael to receive an ADHD evaluation by a qualified specialist. Finally, she asks that the children be allowed to participate in at least two extracurricular activities per year, including sports and both parties are to fully cooperate in ensuring the children are allowed to attend their chosen activities. Both parents to be allowed to attend all extracurricular activities and if one parent cannot drive the children to the requested activity then the other parent shall have the right to do so.

Respondent objects to Petitioner's declaration as it exceeds the 10-page limit as mandated by California Rule of Court rule 5.111(a). The objection is overruled as the subject declaration is a Supplemental Declaration which was ordered by the court.

Minors' Counsel requests the following: (1) The children shall continue with their current individual counseling; (2) Petitioner and CJ shall continue joint counseling; (3) The parties shall share joint legal custody of the children; (4) Parties to continue with a week-on/week-off schedule from Friday at 5 to Friday at 5 for Maverick and Michael; (5) CJ shall

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

visit Petitioner from Friday at 5 to Sunday at 5 during the weeks that she has custody of Maverick and Michael such that all three children will be visiting Petitioner's home together; (6) Petitioner shall have two weeks of vacation time with CJ during the summer. The vacation periods shall take place during her normally scheduled week with Maverick and Michael; and (7) CJ shall not have the ability to refuse any visits or to request to leave any visits early.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the requests made by Minors' Counsel to be in the best interests of the children. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Minors' Counsel shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: MINORS' COUNSEL'S REQUESTS ARE FOUND TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT AS FOLLOWS: (1) THE CHILDREN SHALL CONTINUE WITH THEIR CURRENT INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING; (2) PETITIONER AND CJ SHALL CONTINUE JOINT COUNSELING; (3) THE PARTIES SHALL SHARE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY OF THE CHILDREN; (4) PARTIES TO CONTINUE WITH A WEEK-ON/WEEK-OFF SCHEDULE FROM FRIDAY AT 5 TO FRIDAY AT 5 FOR MAVERICK AND MICHAEL; (5) CJ SHALL VISIT PETITIONER FROM FRIDAY AT 5 TO SUNDAY AT 5 DURING THE WEEKS THAT SHE HAS CUSTODY OF MAVERICK AND MICHAEL SUCH THAT ALL THREE CHILDREN WILL BE VISITING PETITIONER'S HOME TOGETHER; (6) PETITIONER SHALL HAVE TWO WEEKS OF VACATION TIME WITH CJ DURING THE SUMMER. THE VACATION PERIODS SHALL TAKE PLACE DURING HER NORMALLY SCHEDULED WEEK WITH MAVERICK AND MICHAEL; AND (7) CJ SHALL NOT HAVE THE ABILITY TO REFUSE ANY VISITS OR TO REQUEST TO LEAVE ANY VISITS EARLY.

MINORS' 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 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

7. KELSEY MCPARLAND V. PATRICK MCPARLAND

24FL0881

Mark P. Gross, counsel for Petitioner, filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and a supporting declaration on August 8, 2025. The motion was served on Petitioner's attorney as well as Respondent on August 13th.

Counsel states that there has been an irreparable breakdown of the attorney-client relationship. The motion is granted pursuant to *Aceves v. Sup. Ct.*, 51 Cal. App. 4th 584 (1996) which states that the court may rely on Counsel's representation that there is a conflict, or that the attorney-client relationship has suffered an unrepairable breakdown, without knowing the underlying facts behind those statements. The withdrawal will be effective as of the date of filing Proof of Service of the formal, signed order upon the client.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS GRANTED. WITHDRAWAL WILL BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE DATE OF FILING 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

8. MICHAL ADAM MISIASZEK V. KATARZYNA MISIASZEK

24FL0421

On December 11, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and orders regarding reimbursements and a real estate appraisal. The parties attended a hearing on the RFO on March 13, 2025 at which time they reached several agreements, and a review hearing was set for May 29, 2025. Supplemental declarations were ordered to be filed at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

The May 29th hearing was continued to August 14th due to several outstanding issues. The parties then stipulated to continue the August 14th hearing to the present date. There have been no filings since the stipulation to continue therefore this matter is dropped from calendar as it is presumed that the parties no longer need the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO FAILURE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS.

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

9. TANYA ANDREA NEUSTADT V. CLINTON WAYNE RIGGINS

23FL0083

On September 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding the marital residence. The RFO was served along with all other required documents on September 17th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 30th.

Petitioner's Reply Declaration was filed and served on October 8th.

Petitioner requests an order for the immediate sale of the former family residence located at 1528 Highland Drive in Placerville. She requests Respondent have exclusive use, possession, and control of the residence until it's sold. During that time, she requests Respondent be ordered to make the monthly mortgage payments and the monthly solar loan payments. Finally, she requests reimbursement for the mortgage payment she made on August 30th.

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 Respondent's repeated failure to timely pay the mortgage, the court does find the home to be at risk of foreclosure. Thus, in order to preserve the community asset the court makes the following orders.

The parties are ordered to place the house up for sale with a real estate agent or broker forthwith. Petitioner shall propose the names of three realtors no later than October 23, 2025. Respondent shall choose one and inform Petitioner of his choice no later than October 30, 2025. If Respondent fails to timely inform Petitioner of his choice then Petitioner shall choose the realtor.

The parties are ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home in furtherance of its sale. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional to make the home available for showings and to communicate with the real estate professional as needed. The real estate professional is

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

authorized to determine the listing price for the home. The parties are ordered to accept any reasonable offer for the purchase of the home if one is received. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner. Net proceeds of the sale are to be placed in the Attorney Trust Account of Petitioner's counsel until written agreement of the parties or until court order to release the proceeds. The court reserves jurisdiction over all aspects of the sale and distribution of the net proceeds of the sale, including, but not limited to, the court's authority to direct the clerk to act as elisor for Respondent's signature if necessary.

Respondent shall be responsible for payment of the mortgage and solar loan until the home is sold. The court reserves jurisdiction over the issue of credits for mortgage and solar payments, this includes Petitioner's August 30th payment of the mortgage.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the findings and orders after hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOUSE UP FOR SALE WITH A REAL ESTATE AGENT OR BROKER FORTHWITH. PETITIONER SHALL PROPOSE THE NAMES OF THREE REALTORS NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 23, 2025. RESPONDENT SHALL CHOOSE ONE AND INFORM PETITIONER OF HIS CHOICE NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 30, 2025. IF RESPONDENT FAILS TO TIMELY INFORM PETITIONER OF HIS CHOICE THEN PETITIONER SHALL CHOOSE THE REALTOR.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL IS AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE THE LISTING PRICE FOR THE HOME. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE ARE TO BE PLACED IN THE ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT OF PETITIONER'S COUNSEL UNTIL WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR UNTIL COURT ORDER TO RELEASE THE PROCEEDS. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

SALE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE COURT'S AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO ACT AS ELISOR FOR RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE IF NECESSARY.

RESPONDENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PAYMENT OF THE MORTGAGE AND SOLAR LOAN UNTIL THE HOME IS SOLD. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE ISSUE OF CREDITS FOR MORTGAGE AND SOLAR PAYMENTS, THIS INCLUDES PETITIONER'S AUGUST 30TH PAYMENT OF THE MORTGAGE.

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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

10. TARA WORTH V. MICHAEL WORTH

25FL0593

On July 30, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. There is no Proof of Service for this document however, Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 24th thereby waiving any objection to defective service.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on August 28, 2025. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore, a report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on September 24, 2025.

Petitioner filed and served a Reply Declaration to CCRC Report on October 3rd.

Respondent is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and primary physical custody of the minor. She proposes Respondent have visits every Tuesday and Thursday from 2pm to 8pm, every other Saturday from 7am to 8pm and every other Sunday from 7am to 8pm.

After reviewing the filings of the parties, the court finds the recommendations contained in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS OF THE PARTIES, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

11. STEPHANNIE BROWN V. PAUL BROWN

PFL20210551

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a post-judgment modification of the judgment, on August 6, 2025. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

12. AMANDA FLYNN V. MARTY MARTINEZ

23FL0749

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 9, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders as well as child support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 9, 2025, and a review hearing on August 7, 2025.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was filed with the court on July 15, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on July 16th.

Petitioner appeared at the hearing on August 7, 2025. The court found good cause to continue the hearing to allow additional time to properly serve Respondent. The court set a further review hearing for October 16, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service on September 12, 2025, showing Respondent was personally served with all the necessary documents, excluding the Income and Expense Declaration and a blank Income and Expense Declaration on September 8, 2025.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration or an Income and Expense Declaration.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

13. HANNAH GIBONEY V. CHRISTOPHER GIBONEY

23FL0260

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 1, 2025, seeking an order to set aside the default entered on July 30, 2024. There is no Proof of Service for this document.

Nevertheless, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on September 29, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on September 26, 2025 and again on September 30th. Petitioner opposes the request to set aside the default and requests Family Code section 271 sanctions.

Respondent seeks to set aside his default, arguing that his failure to file a Response was due to his own mistaken belief that one was not required based on his conversations with Petitioner and their ongoing mediation. Respondent further asserts the Family Law Facilitator instructed him to refrain from filing a response.

“The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 473(b). To obtain relief under Section 473(b), the moving party must do so within a reasonable time and must provide a copy of the pleading proposed to be filed. *Id.* Here, Respondent has not met these requirements.

First, Respondent’s motion comes more than a year after the default was entered. Second, the court does not find Respondent’s declaration to be credible, specifically regarding the court facilitator. Even if his declaration were believable, a pro per is held to the same standard as a practicing attorney. *Goodson v. Bogerts, Inc.*, 252 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40 (1967). As such, the court denies Respondent’s request to set aside the default.

Turning to Petitioner’s request for Family Code section 271 sanctions. “Section 271 provides that a family court may impose an award of attorney fees and costs ‘in the nature of a sanction’ where the conduct of a party or attorney ‘frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation between the parties and attorneys.’ (§ 271, subd. (a).)” (*In re Marriage of Tharp* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1295, 1316.) “Expressed another way, section 271 vests family law courts with an additional means with which to enforce this state’s public policy of promoting settlement of family law litigation, while reducing its costs through mutual cooperation of clients and their counsel.” (*Id.* at 1318.) The court notes

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

neither party has filed or served an Income and Expense Declaration. Therefore, the court is unable to ascertain whether Respondent has the ability to pay such sanctions. The court reserves on the request for Family Code section 271 sanctions and strongly cautions both parties to be mindful of the state's policies regarding cooperation and reducing the costs of litigation.

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 #13: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT IS DENIED AS UNTIMELY, AS WELL AS FAILURE TO MEET A SHOWING UNDER CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 473(B). THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS. 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

14. STEVEN GIBSON V. STAR GIBSON

PFL20190532

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 6, 2025, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 2, 2025, and a review hearing on May 29th. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on April 23, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner appeared at the hearing on May 29, 2025, and requested additional time to have Respondent served. The court found good cause to continue the hearing and reset the hearing for August 7, 2025. Petitioner was directed to serve Respondent with the new hearing date.

On July 3, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request to Reschedule and to be referred to CCRC. The court granted the request and rereferred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on August 25, 2025, and a review hearing on October 19, 2025.

Petitioner also filed a Request for Posting, to effectuate service on Respondent as her whereabouts are unknown. The court granted the request and Proof of Service shows the posting was accomplished from July 24, 2025 to August 22, 2025.

Once again, only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment on August 25th. A second single parent report was filed with the court on August 25, 2025, and mailed to the parties on August 27th. Respondent's copy has been returned to the court as undeliverable.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

15. CHAELA GRAVES V. MATTHEW GRAVES

22FL0522

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 30, 2025, seeking orders regarding claiming the minors on the parties' taxes. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

16. JAMES HERNANDEZ V. CHRISTINA SULLIVAN

24FL0301

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on August 11, 2025. On August 13, 2025, the court denied the ex parte request but reiterated its prior orders regarding non-professional supervision. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 13, 2025, seeking enforcement of visitation orders. Respondent was served on August 26, 2025.

Petitioner filed a second ex parte application for emergency orders on September 3, 2025. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on September 4, 2025. The court denied the ex parte application. Petitioner did not file a subsequent RFO.

Respondent filed a Declaration on October 3, 2025. It was served the same day. Respondent outlines what she perceived to be problems with Petitioner's parenting time.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on October 8, 2025. It was served the same day. The court finds this to be a Reply Declaration to Respondent's October 3rd Declaration, and therefore, has considered it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the current orders, which the court issued on July 24, 2025, to be in the best interest of the minors. Petitioner's additional requests are denied. Petitioner has failed to set forth any new or different information, change in circumstances, or how the requested changes would be in the minors' best interests. All current orders remain in full force and effect.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS, WHICH THE COURT ISSUED ON JULY 24, 2025, TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. PETITIONER'S ADDITIONAL REQUESTS ARE DENIED. ALL CURRENT 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 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

17. JUDY MARCUM V. ZACHARY NUGENT

21FL0051

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 8, 2025, requesting visitation and child support orders. Petitioner did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Respondent.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

18. ANGELICA MOFFITT V. JAMES MOFFITT

22FL0121

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on August 1, 2025. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on August 4, 2025. The court denied the request on August 5, 2025. Petitioner did not file a Request for Order (RFO).

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on August 20, 2025. The court denied the request on August 22, 2025. Respondent filed an RFO on August 22nd. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 22, 2025, and a review hearing on November 20, 2025. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served with the RFO and necessary documents.

Petitioner filed another ex parte request for emergency orders on September 8, 2025. On September 9, 2025, the court again denied the request to make emergency orders, however, the court referred the parties to an emergency set CCRC appointment on September 22, 2025, and advanced the review hearing from November 20th to October 16, 2025. Upon review of the court's file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment on September 22, 2025. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on October 2, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on October 3rd.

The court drops the matter from calendar as neither party has properly served the other. The current orders remain in full force and effect. The parties are strongly cautioned to refrain from filing further ex parte applications if unwarranted. Parties are reminded to review Family Code section 3064(a) and California Rule of Court 5.151 prior to filing any further ex parte applications.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR AS NEITHER PARTY HAS PROPERLY SERVED THE OTHER. THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE PARTIES ARE STRONGLY CAUTIONED TO REFRAIN FROM FILING FURTHER EX PARTE APPLICATIONS IF UNWARRANTED. PARTIES ARE REMINDED TO REVIEW FAMILY CODE SECTION 3064(A) AND CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 5.151 PRIOR TO FILING ANY FURTHER EX PARTE APPLICATIONS.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

19. JOANNE RUGGERI V. CHRISTOPHER RUGGERI

24FL1183

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO), on July 29, 2025, seeking spousal support as well as fees for a forensic accountant. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Respondent.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT. 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

October 16, 2025

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

20. BROCK VULGAMORE-HOSTETLER V. ANGEL FARIAS

22FL0670

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on August 7, 2025, alleging two counts of contempt. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with a “notice of hearing and exhibit a and b” on August 7, 2025.

The court cannot find Respondent was served with the necessary documents. As such, the matter is dropped from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT. 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 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.