

1. ANGELA CAROCCI V. NICOLAS CAROCCI

25FL1254

On September 29, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order to sell the marital residence and sanctions. All required documents were served the same day.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 9th.

Petitioner filed her reply declaration on October 14th. It was served on October 15th. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration

Petitioner requests an order to immediately list the property located at 1750 Bear Rock Road in Placerville for sale. She also requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271. She states Respondent has failed to pay the mortgage, as he was ordered to do on August 20th. As a result, the home is falling into foreclosure. She asks that the net proceeds from the sale be deposited into a trust account.

Respondent opposes the requests and asks that the court deny them and award him \$2,000 in attorney's fees for having to respond to the motion. He asks that the key to the mailbox be returned and that the lender statements from Bear Rock properties be directed to him. He states that once support is ordered he will be able to pay the mortgage on the home more easily without late payments. The issue of support is currently set to be heard on November 12th. He asks that this issue either be continued to join the November 12th hearing or that the issue of support be advanced to the present hearing date. If continued, then in the interim he requests authorization to sell community items to cover the cost of the mortgage. Finally, he asks the court to order Petitioner to provide Respondent with written notice and an accounting of any improvements or extraordinary expenditures related to the 1093 Goyan Ave. property.

The request to sell the property at 1750 Bear Rock Road in Placerville is continued to join the November 12th hearing on the issue of spousal support. In the interim, Respondent may sell the items listed in Paragraph 18, lines 20 through 27 on page 5 of Respondent's responsive declaration. Respondent is ordered to provide Petitioner with documentation of each sale and the amounts received for each item as well as 50% of all sale proceeds. Additionally, Petitioner is ordered to return the mailbox key to Respondent and the parties are ordered to cooperate in taking all necessary actions to change the contact on the mortgage to Respondent to ensure that future communications go to him.

10/22/2026
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

The court finds Respondent's request regarding improvements on the Goyan Ave. property to be outside the scope of the original RFO and therefore it is not properly before the court and the court declines to rule on it.

The court is reserving jurisdiction on each party's request for sanctions until the November 12th hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE REQUEST TO SELL THE PROPERTY AT 1750 BEAR ROCK ROAD IN PLACERVILLE IS CONTINUED TO JOIN THE NOVEMBER 12TH HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT. IN THE INTERIM, RESPONDENT MAY SELL THE ITEMS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 18, LINES 20 THROUGH 27 ON PAGE 5 OF RESPONDENT'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATION. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH DOCUMENTATION OF EACH SALE AND THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FOR EACH ITEM AS WELL AS 50% OF ALL SALE PROCEEDS. ADDITIONALLY, PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO RETURN THE MAILBOX KEY TO RESPONDENT AND THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE IN TAKING ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS TO CHANGE THE CONTACT ON THE MORTGAGE TO RESPONDENT TO ENSURE THAT FUTURE COMMUNICATIONS GO TO HIM.

THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST REGARDING IMPROVEMENTS ON THE GOYAN AVE. PROPERTY TO BE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO AND THEREFORE IT IS NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT AND THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON IT.

THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION ON EACH PARTY'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNTIL THE NOVEMBER 12TH 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.

2. APRIL GREEN V. MERLIN KELLY TURNER

26FL0299

On August 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees and an order compelling discovery responses. He filed a declaration of Pamela Jones in support thereof along with a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and an Income and Expense Declaration. All documents were served on September 2nd with the exception of the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order or an Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent, however, did file a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order seemingly opposing his own motion.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing and bring with them their proposed Xspouse reports. Petitioner is also ordered to bring with her a completed Income and Expense Declaration with the required supporting documents.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING AND BRING WITH THEM THEIR PROPOSED XSPOUSE REPORTS. PETITIONER IS ALSO ORDERED TO BRING WITH HER A COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

3. DANIELLE HOPKINS V. JOHN HOPKINS

PFL20170221

On August 3, 2026, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). It was served by mail on August 3rd and again on August 5th. Service of contempt papers must be done on personal service to the accused. *Albrecht v. Sup. Ct.*, 132 Cal. App. 3d 612, 618-619 (1982); See *also* Cal. Civ. Pro. §§ 1015 & 1016. Service on the accused's attorney is not sufficient. *Id.*

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: 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.

4. NATALIA JIVANOV V. PETER JIVANOV

23FL0266

On June 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to sever the issue of the date of separation. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support thereof. Both documents were served on June 23, 2026 however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, neither was the blank FL-320 both of which are required documents.

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

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.

5. SAMUEL MATTILA V. KRISTIANNA HEIMAN

PFL20210271

On March 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and attorney's fees.

On March 27, 2026, Respondent filed an RFO also seeking custody and visitation orders. There is no Proof of Service for this RFO.

The parties attended the hearing on both RFOs on July 9th at which time they agreed to be re-referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). The court made the re-referral and set a review hearing for the present date.

Petitioner filed his RFO requesting an order permitting him to take the minor child on vacation. This issue was resolved by the stipulation. However, he further requests the current out-of-state travel order be modified to allow for such travel upon 30 days' written notice to the other party along with a full itinerary including travel dates, destination, lodging information and contact details with no agreement required. He requests \$1,500 for the time and expense of filing the RFO.

On August 14th, Petitioner filed another RFO requesting school placement orders for the minor. The RFO was granted ex parte and the court ordered the minor to be enrolled at Pioneer Elementary School pending the October 22nd hearing date.

The parties attended CCRC on September 2nd and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on September 2nd and mailed to the parties on September 3rd.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on October 12th. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court does find the agreements and recommendations contained in the September 2, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Given that Petitioner will have primary physical custody of the minor during the school year, the court is ordering that the minor be enrolled in Reigo Creed Elementary School in Roseville.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

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.

10/22/2026
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

TENTATIVE RULING #5: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

GIVEN THAT PETITIONER WILL HAVE PRIMARY PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINOR DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR, THE COURT IS ORDERING THAT THE MINOR BE ENROLLED IN REIGO CREED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN ROSEVILLE.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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.

6. NICOLE THOMAS-FRANCIS V. MATTHEW FRANCIS

PFL20180529

On August 18, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting various orders regarding Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). She concurrently filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support thereof. The RFO and memorandum were both served on August 24th, however Petitioner failed to serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling and the required blank FL-320.

Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 30th. It was served the same day.

Petitioner has not filed a reply declaration.

Petitioner is requesting the following orders: (1) Decline to adopt or rely upon any adverse recommendation resulting from the August 4, 2026 CCRC session until the court considers the concerns raised in the RFO; (2) Assign a different CCRC counselor for any future mediation sessions; (3) Permit separate or private CCRC sessions; (4) Consider the existence of the active CPS and criminal investigations before requiring or encouraging additional questioning of the minor regarding the underlying allegations; (5) Require that any recommendation concerning Petitioner's mental health be supported by a legally sufficient basis consistent with rule 5.210(h)(4); (6) Coordinate with CPS, law enforcement, medical professionals, mental-health professionals, or other appropriate professionals to reduce unnecessary repeated questioning of the child; (7) Any questioning of the minor child to be facilitated by a professional that understands the needs and requirements of an autistic child her age; and (8) Any other such relief as the court finds just and appropriate.

Respondent asks the court to deny Petitioner's request for a new mediator. He asks that CCRC evaluation process proceed with reasonable coordination, appropriate releases and records access, and consideration of any accommodations that qualified professionals determine the minor needs. He further requests the court consider his account of the August CCRC session and the following hearing.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: 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

10/22/2026
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

**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.**

7. LISA THOMASON V. LOUIS MOLAKIDES

PFL20210494

On August 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders and the appointment of Minor's Counsel as well as attorney's fees. She filed a declaration of Michael Whitaker, a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, an Income and Expense Declaration, and a declaration of Lisa Whitaker in support of the RFO. All required documents were served on August 10th.

Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 23, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it.

On October 13th, Petitioner filed a declaration of Lisa Whitaker along with a reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities and a Request for Judicial Notice.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

8. BETHANIE TURNBULL V. NIKOLAUS CRUZ

26FL0132

On August 4, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child 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 #8: 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.

9. JENNIFER WEISSENSEE V. DAVID KRUEGER

22FL0584

On August 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) for child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on August 14th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on October 9th.

In reviewing the file it appears the parties are set for a hearing on the issue of custody and visitation on November 19th. Given that the issues of child support and custody are inextricably intertwined, this matter is continued to join with the November 19th hearing date. The court reserves jurisdiction to award support back to the date of filing the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE NOVEMBER 19TH HEARING DATE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AWARD SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

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 13, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) to vacate the dismissal. She concurrently filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, a notice of proposed pleading, a declaration of Melissa Andersen Inman, and Petitioner's index of exhibits. The Proof of Service states that only the RFO, the "Attachment 7 (7 pages)" and the "Notice (5 pages)" were served. The Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, nor was the required blank FL-320.

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

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: 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.

11. CECILIA CIRINCIONE V. NESTOR TORRES JR.

26FL0813

On August 24, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for genetic testing. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO or for the Petition to Establish Parental Relationship. As such, the court finds that it does not yet have jurisdiction over this matter. Even if jurisdiction had been established the court would still drop the RFO due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE COURT FINDS THAT IT DOES NOT YET HAVE JURISDICTION OVER THIS MATTER. EVEN IF JURISDICTION HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED THE COURT WOULD STILL DROP THE RFO 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.

12. NATHANIEL DEPEE V. CHERYL COVINGTON

23FL0491

On July 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. The FL-300 and the CCRC referral were served on July 18th however Petitioner did not serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling or the required blank FL-320.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment on September 3, 2026, therefore CCRC was unable to make any recommendations.

Petitioner filed an amended RFO on October 1st, it was served on October 4th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all moving papers are to be filed and served at least sixteen 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 September 30th the last day to file and serve the amended RFO therefore this document is late filed and is dropped from calendar.

The July 10th RFO is also dropped from calendar due to Petitioners failure to appear at CCRC which was set at his request.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE JULY 10TH RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO PETITIONERS FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC WHICH WAS SET AT HIS REQUEST. THE OCTOBER 1ST AMENDED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO ITS UNTIMELY FILING AND 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.

13. AMANDA RACHELLE GRILLO V. RYAN WILLIAM HEGARTY

26FL0242

On August 25, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The FL-300 was personally served on September 6th, however none of the other required documents were served.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 19th. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot read or consider it. Even if there was a Proof of Service, this document was late filed therefore it has not been read or considered.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #13: 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.

10/22/2026
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

14. DCSS V. ANTWON LILES (OTHER PARTY: CASSANDRA THORP) PFS20170306

On August 7, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a change of venue. Other Party was served with the RFO “with attachments” on August 20th. There is no indication that the required Notice of Tentative Ruling or the required blank FL-320 was served. Additionally, the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) is a party to the action and they have not been served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: 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 24, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel Respondent's disclosures and property. All required documents were served by mail on August 24th.

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

Petitioner is requesting exclusive use and control of Petitioner's trust. He also requests an order directing Respondent to complete and file his "disclosures." It is unclear if he is requesting an order for Respondent to file his preliminary and final disclosures or just his preliminary.

Family Code sections 2104 and 2105 impose on each party the obligation of making preliminary and final disclosures of assets within the specified timeframes. Where a party fails to comply with their disclosure requirements, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel compliance by the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1).

Here, there is an FL-141 on file with the court indicating that Petitioner has served his preliminary declaration of disclosure. There is no indication that he has served a final declaration of disclosure. Therefore, he only has standing to pursue an order to compel the preliminary declaration of Respondent. To that extent, Petitioner's request is granted. Respondent is ordered to serve his complete preliminary declaration of disclosure, with all required documents, and file the completed FL-141 no later than November 5, 2026.

Regarding the request for exclusive use and control of the trust, given that the trust apparently owns title to the home, the court is not inclined to make such an order at this time. The court reserves jurisdiction over the characterization of the trust and its assets until the time of trial.

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 #15: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE HIS COMPLETE PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE, WITH ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTS, AND FILE THE COMPLETED FL-141 NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 5, 2026. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TRUST AND ITS ASSETS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

10/22/2026
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

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.

On August 13, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration on August 14th. Both documents were personally served on August 20th along with a blank FL-320, however Petitioner did not serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration. Both were served on September 14th.

Petitioner filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on October 5th, it was served on October 7th. He has not filed a reply declaration.

Respondent filed an additional Income and Expense Declaration on October 19th. The court finds this to be untimely therefore it has not been read or considered. Even if it had been filed timely, there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot read or consider it on that grounds as well.

Petitioner is requesting guideline child support for the minor children based on the fact that he was recently laid off from his job.

Respondent concedes that Petitioner was laid off but she requests that any modification of child support be based on Petitioner's verified income, including severance compensation.

According to Petitioner, at the time of filing his RFO he was in the process of applying for unemployment. It is unclear to the court if Petitioner is now collecting unemployment benefits and, if so, the amount thereof. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

**17. COUNTY OF EL DORADO DCSS V. NATHAN WILLIAM SPROULE (OTHER PARENT:
JAYCEE BERGESON) 24FL0279**

On August 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It was originally filed ex parte so there is a Proof of Service indicating service of the FL-300 on August 20th however there is no indication that the RFO was served after it was filed and assigned a hearing date.

Neither DCSS nor Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Because the court cannot confirm that Petitioner or Other Parent was provided notice of the pending hearing, the matter is dropped from calendar.

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

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

Parties and their counsel appeared for the hearing on Respondent's Request for Order (RFO) on July 9, 2026. The parties were able to reach a full agreement. Part of the agreement included the court setting a compliance review hearing on the present date. Parties were directed to file and serve updated Income and Expense Declarations as well as supplemental declarations at least 10 days prior to the review hearing which was set to be heard on October 8th.

On September 28th, Respondent filed and served his supplemental declaration and his updated Income and Expense Declaration.

On September 30th, Petitioner filed and served her supplemental declaration and her Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent filed and served a reply declaration on October 6th, however this was late filed for the October 8th hearing date.

The parties stipulated to continue the hearing to the present date due to the unavailability of counsel.

Petitioner filed and served a proposed Xspouse report on October 14th, this is late filed for the October 22nd hearing date.

Given the late filings, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to address the matters on the merits.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

19. JENNIFER DANIELS V. JOSE CARRERO

PFL20170812

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 1, 2026, requesting clarification of the current orders regarding communication with the minor and appointment of Minor's Counsel. The request was served concurrently with a request for an Order Shortening Time (OST). Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on June 1, 2026. The court denied the request for an OST and set the matter in the regular course. Petitioner was served on June 2, 2026.

Respondent filed a second RFO on June 11, 2026, requesting to change the trial dates. Petitioner was served on June 16, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on July 1, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner is not opposed to continuing the trial dates.

Parties appeared for the arraignment on July 16, 2026. Respondent requested a continuance to secure counsel. The court granted the request and set the matter on October 8, 2026, for further arraignment.

The court also vacated the settlement conference and trial dates and set a trial setting conference for October 8, 2026, to select new trial dates.

The October 8th hearing was held on October 15th, due to the court's unavailability on the 8th. At the hearing, the matter was once again continued to the present date.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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