LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

2. RACHEL GESSNER V. MATTHEW RYAN GESSNER 25FL1097

On February 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation and support orders. The parties appeared for the hearing on May 21st and were able to reach an agreement on all issues. As part of their agreement, the court set a review hearing for August 20, 2026. The parties appeared at the August 20th hearing and stipulated to continue the matter to the present date. The parties were ordered to file and serve supplemental declarations and Income and Expense Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

On October 9th, Petitioner filed another RFO seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was heard ex parte at which time the court suspended the current custody and visitation orders and allowed Respondent daytime visits every Saturday and Sunday for 4 hours each. A hearing on that RFO was set for October 23rd.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration on October 20th. It was served the same day.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the children with supervised visits to Respondent and specified procedures for alcohol testing.

Respondent opposes the requests and asks that the current ordered parenting schedule remain in full force and effect.

When making orders regarding custody or visitation the court is to consider (1) the state's policy to ensure the child has frequent and continuing contact with both parents after a separation and (2) the health, welfare, and safety of the child. Cal. Fam. Code § 3020. Where these two factors are in conflict, the health, welfare, and safety of the child trumps the policy regarding parental contact. *Id.* at (c).

Here given the evidence of Respondent's recurring alcohol abuse, the court is concerned with the welfare and safety of the children while in his custody. As such, the court is maintaining the visitation schedule established in its October 9th ex parte orders. Visits are to be monitored by the paternal grandmother or some other agreed upon third party. Likewise, Respondent shall not transport the children to or from the visits. Petitioner, the paternal grandmother, or an agreed upon third party may transport the children. Respondent is ordered to participate in an alcohol abuse program and provide Petitioner with evidence of completion thereof. Respondent is further ordered to participate in randomized ETG testing once per week with the testing facility to determine the randomized testing schedule. Petitioner shall be provided copies of all test results immediately. In the event Respondent tests positive for alcohol, he will lose his visits with the children for that week and he will not be given make-up visits for the missed visits. The

court is setting a review hearing for Thursday, January 28th at 8:30 AM in Department 5 . The parties are to file supplemental declarations no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

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 #2: THE COURT IS MAINTAINING THE VISITATION SCHEDULE ESTABLISHED IN ITS OCTOBER 9TH EX PARTE ORDERS. VISITS ARE TO BE MONITORED BY THE PATERNAL GRANDMOTHER OR SOME OTHER AGREED UPON THIRD PARTY. LIKEWISE, RESPONDENT SHALL NOT TRANSPORT THE CHILDREN TO OR FROM THE VISITS. PETITIONER, THE PATERNAL GRANDMOTHER, OR AN AGREED UPON THIRD PARTY MAY TRANSPORT THE CHILDREN. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PARTICIPATE IN AN ALCOHOL ABUSE PROGRAM AND PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION THEREOF. RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ORDERED TO PARTICIPATE IN RANDOMIZED ETG TESTING ONCE PER WEEK WITH THE TESTING FACILITY TO DETERMINE THE RANDOMIZED TESTING SCHEDULE. PETITIONER SHALL BE PROVIDED COPIES OF ALL TEST RESULTS IMMEDIATELY. IN THE EVENT RESPONDENT TESTS POSITIVE FOR ALCOHOL, HE WILL LOSE HIS VISITS WITH THE CHILDREN FOR THAT WEEK AND HE WILL NOT BE GIVEN MAKE-UP VISITS FOR THE MISSED VISITS. THE COURT IS SETTING A REVIEW HEARING FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 28TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. THE PARTIES ARE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.

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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

3. DUNIA LANDAVERDE V. ANGEL LANDAVERDE 23FL0394

On July 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. There are two Proofs of Service indicating that an RFO was served. One states that an RFO, Notice of Tentative Ruling and blank responsive declaration were all served on July 14th. The second proof indicates that only an RFO and blank responsive declaration were served on July 17th. It is unclear to the court which proof applies for the pending RFO; regardless, neither proof indicates that the CCRC referral was served.

Only Respondent attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on September 16, 2026 therefore a report without recommendations was prepared and sent to the parties.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and she did not appear at CCRC. Given the unclear Proofs of Service and the fact that there is no Proof of Service for the CCRC referral, the court drops the July 13th RFO from calendar.

In addition to the July RFO, this matter is on calendar as the result of a request for an Order Shortening Time (OST) filed by Petitioner on October 26th. Petitioner is requesting a continuance of the settlement conference and trial dates.

After reviewing the filings, the court finds good cause to continue the trial and settlement conference dates. The parties are ordered to appear to select new dates.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE JULY RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE TRIAL AND SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT NEW DATES.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

4. SUNG LEE V. YUNJEE AHN **25FL1114**

On August 24, 2026, Counsel for Petitioner filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. The motion was served on both parties on August 25th.

Counsel states that there has been an irreparable breakdown of the attorney-client relationship due to a conflict of interest that cannot be waived. 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 #4: 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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

5. ANNE MCNELIS V. FERRIS NUESMEYER PFL20160411

On June 5, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding Respondent's failure to comply with discovery. The matter came before the court for hearing on August 27th at which time Respondent was ordered to serve full and complete verified responses to Request for Production of Documents (Set One) without objections, no later than September 7, 2026. Respondent was also ordered to pay monetary sanctions and the court set a review hearing on compliance with discovery and additional sanctions for the present date.

Neither party has filed a supplemental declaration updating the court on the status of the discovery therefore the court surmises that discovery has been forthcoming and additional sanctions are not necessary at this time. This matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS NEITHER PARTY HAS FILED A SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION WITH THE COURT.

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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

6. ISRAEL MENDOZA V. ENEIDA MENDOZA PFL20210121

On August 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it. This matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

7. ADAM MINOR V. MELINA SCHIFF **23FL0434**

On September 1, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Petitioner filed a declaration on September 17, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on September 28th, Petitioner filed an objection thereto the same day. There is no Proof of Service for Petitioner's objection, therefore the objection has not been read or considered.

On October 16th, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and two additional declarations, though there are no corresponding Proofs of Service for any of these documents therefore they have not been read or considered.

The parties attended CCRC on September 29, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on October 27, 2026. It was mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the child with a complete suspension of Petitioner's parenting time.

Given that the CCRC report was mailed to the parties just days prior to the hearing date, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to present any argument in response to the CCRC report.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO PRESENT ARGUMENT REGARDING THE CCRC REPORT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

8. ERIN ANNE WATSON V. ADAM LEE WATSON 24FL0010

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, an order to sell the marital residence, and an order to compel disclosures. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on February 19, 2026, at which time they were able to reach a full agreement. As part of their agreement, the parties stipulated to allow Petitioner to remain in the family home so long as she made all mortgage payments in a timely manner. In the event of a missed mortgage payment, or two late payments more than 10 days past due, then Respondent would have the authority to sell the home in accordance with the court's ruling from the February hearing. The parties agreed to set a review hearing on June 25th to address the status of the mortgage payments.

At the June 25th hearing, the court was informed that a bankruptcy had been filed which divested the court of jurisdiction pending completion of the bankruptcy proceedings. The matter was therefore continued to the present date and parties were ordered to file supplemental declarations 10 days prior to the hearing.

On September 11, 2026, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. The court deems this to be a supplemental declaration. She filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore the court has not read or considered them.

Given that Respondent who was the moving party has not filed a supplemental declaration, and given that Petitioner's declaration cannot be considered, this matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 <u>PHONE CALL</u> 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

9. LENDY WEST V. JASON WEST **PFL20160662**

On August 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order to set aside the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH) dated June 23, 2026. It was served on August 25th, however Respondent did not serve the required blank FL-320.

On September 23rd, Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and supporting documents thereto. She filed an Amended Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a declaration of Petitioner on September 28th. They were served on September 25th.

Respondent filed and served his Reply on October 22nd.

Respondent requests an order setting aside the FOAH from the February 19, 2026 hearing pursuant to Civil Procedure 473(b) and Family Code § 2121. He argues that he was not given proper, verbal, notice of the request for oral argument and therefore "there was no stipulation for electronic recording." He further argues that there was a countywide travel ban in effect on February 19th due to severe whether which precluded him from traveling to the courthouse for the hearing therefore this constitutes surprise and mistake under Civil Procedure § 473(b).

Petitioner opposes the request arguing that Respondent did have adequate notice of the issues before the court and he was given notice of the request for oral argument via a voicemail left on February 18th with a follow up email.

"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). Family Code section 2121 also vests the court with the authority to set aside a judgment or order in matters of actual fraud or perjury. Fam. Code § 2122 (a) & (b).

After reviewing the filings, the court does not find grounds to set aside the FOAH based on either Section 473(b) or Section 2122. He accuses opposing counsel of manufacturing a "false notice record," presumably this is the basis for his argument to set aside pursuant to Section 2122. However, the call log that he attaches to his reply shows several incoming and outgoing calls from Mr. Junker's office on February 18th prior to the 4pm notice cutoff. That, in conjunction with the follow up email from his paralegal establishes more likely than not that proper notice of the request for oral argument was given. Additionally, Respondent argues that the weather conditions somehow constituted surprise and excusable neglect however,

Respondent made no effort to appear in court remotely or request a continuance of the hearing. Under the circumstances, the weather conditions alone were not sufficient to constitute either surprise or excusable neglect under Section 473(b). For the foregoing reasons, Respondent's request is denied.

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: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE FOAH FROM THE FEBRUARY 19, 2026 HEARING DATE IS DENIED.

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.

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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

11. SALLYANN BRITTAIN V. KYLE BRITTAIN 26FL0773

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 14, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders as well as child and spousal support orders. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 17, 2026, and a review hearing set for October 30, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Both parties appeared for CCRC and reached a full agreement. A report with the parties' agreement was prepared on September 22, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on September 23, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court adopts the agreement of the parties as its order as set forth in the September 22nd CCRC report, as they are in the best interest of the minors.

The remainder of the RFO is dropped from calendar due to the failure of Petitioner to file an Income and Expense Declaration as required as well as the failure to properly serve Respondent.

All prior orders 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES AS ITS ORDER AS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 22ND CCRC REPORT, AS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS.

THE REMAINDER OF THE RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE OF PETITIONER TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AS REQUIRED AS WELL AS THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

12. ROBERT CLARK V. LISSA LYNCH PFL20110438

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 14, 2026, seeking modification of the current custody and parenting plan orders as well as child support orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 16, 2026, and a review hearing on October 29, 2026. The child support request is set to be heard on November 9, 2026, at 10:00 AM in Department 10. A Proof of Service was filed on August 24, 2026, purporting to be on behalf of Petitioner, though Petitioner was the party served. All the required documents were served on August 20, 2026.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was prepared on October 2, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on October 5, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on October 5, 2025. It was served on September 13, 2026.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the October 2nd CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and the recommendations as its order.

The child support request shall be heard in Department 10 as set forth above. The court reserves jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the date of the filing of the RFO.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders 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 #12: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS SET FORTH IN THE OCTOBER 2ND CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

THE CHILD SUPPORT REQUEST SHALL BE HEARD IN DEPARTMENT 10 AS SET FORTH ABOVE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THE RFO.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS 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.

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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

13. JENNIFER COWLES V. BENJAMIN COWLES PFL20180808

On October 1, 2026, the court adopted its tentative ruling appointing Minors' Counsel. The court set a further review hearing to obtain input from Minors' Counsel on Petitioner's request to modify the current parenting plan orders and whether Petitioner's parenting time with the two youngest minors may be unsupervised. The court set a review hearing for October 29, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

14. JOSHUA KELLY V. DESIREE KELLY **25FL1099**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 13, 2026, 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 September 16, 2026 and a review hearing on October 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared for CCRC appointment. The parties were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as further recommendations was prepared on September 17, 2026 and copies were mailed to the parties on September 18th.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on August 21, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on October 19, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the September 17th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and the recommendations as set forth as its order.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders 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 #14: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 17TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH AS ITS ORDER.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

15. DEVON MATHIS V. AUBREY MATHIS 26FL0377

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 28, 2026, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counselling (CCRC). Proof of Service shows Petitioner was electronically served on August 5, 2026. The court notes this is a post-judgment request for modification, and as such, Family Code section 215 applies.

Parties appeared for the hearing and agreed to waive the defect in notice. They requested to be referred to CCRC. The request was granted and a further review hearing was set for the present date.

Both parties attended the appointment. A report with recommendations was prepared on September 30, 2026 and mailed to the parties on the same day.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on October 19, 2026. It was personally served the same day. The court finds this document to be untimely, and therefore, cannot consider it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the September 17th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and the recommendations as set forth as its order.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders 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 #15: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 17TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

16. MIKE MEDINA V. LEILANI SANCHEZ 25FL1037

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 25, 2026, seeking parenting plan orders as well as genetic testing. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with the FL-300 only on August 29, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on October 6, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent does not raise the issue of the lack of proper service, therefore, the court finds it to have been waived. Respondent opposes the motion, as raises the issue of proceedings taking place in Sacramento County for a stepparent adoption, which could potentially terminate the parental rights of Petitioner.

The court finds given the pending proceedings in Sacramento County, the court must continue this matter to determine the outcome of the proceedings in Sacramento County and to determine which county is the proper venue moving forward. Therefore, the court continues the matter to Thursday, January 14th at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS GIVEN THE PENDING PROCEEDINGS IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY, THE COURT CONTINUES THIS MATTER TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 14TH AT 1:30 PM IN 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

17. STACY OHMAN V. TIMOTHY OHMAN 22FL0498

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 14, 2026, 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 September 18, 2026 and a review hearing on October 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document.

Neither party appeared for CCRC.

Respondent filed a declaration on October 5, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore, the court cannot considered it.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as Respondent's failure to appear at CCRC.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC. 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

18. NICOLE PESA V. ALLEN RISKE 26FL0820

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on August 25, 2026. On the same day Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders. Neither the Petition not the RFO have been properly served. There is a Proof of Service showing substitute service of the Petition and Summons and RFO on October 7, 2026. However, there has been no Proof of Service showing further service by mail as required. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF COMPLETE 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

19. LEE ANDREW SARTAIN V. GINA ROSE SARTAIN 25FL0329

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 6, 2026, seeking an order compelling Respondent's disclosures and to set trial dates. Proof of Service shows Respondent was only served with the FL-300 and a Blank FL-320 on May 12, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

Petitioner filed a second RFO on June 9, 2026, seeking bifurcation of marital status. Respondent was served by mail on June 11, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration. The court deems the failure to do so as an admission that Petitioner's moving papers have merit. *See* El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C).

California Rules of Court, rule 5.390(a) states that on noticed motion of a party, using form FL-300, "Request for Order," "the stipulation of the parties, case management, or the court's own motion, the court may bifurcate one or more issues to be tried separately before other issues are tried."

Family Code section 2337 provides that "[i]n a proceeding for dissolution of marriage, the court, upon noticed motion, may sever and grant an early and separate trial on the issue of the dissolution of the status of the marriage apart from other issues." Fam. Code, § 2337, subd. (a). The trial court may separately try the issue of termination of marriage if doing so "is likely to simplify the determination of the other issues." Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.390(b)(7).

The minimum statutory requirements for bifurcating and terminating marital status are that six months must have passed since the date of service of the summons and petition (§ 2339, subd. (a)), and that the party seeking termination of marital status must have served a preliminary declaration of disclosure or obtained a written agreement to defer service to a later date (§ 2337, subd. (b)). Both requirements were met here.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on July 30, 2026 and requested the matter be continued 90 days.

Parties are ordered to appear for the bifurcation.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

THE COURT DROPS THE MAY 6, 2026 RFO 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 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

20. CRYSTAL STABLER V. BRYAN STABLER 23FL0783

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on August 25, 2026. On August 26, 2026, the court granted the ex parte request and restricted Respondent's parenting time to supervised twice a week. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 26, 2026, seeking the same orders as set forth in the ex parte application. The court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment for September 22, 2026, and a review hearing for October 29, 2026. Respondent was personally served on August 26, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on September 11, 2026. It was served on September 8, 2026. Respondent requests the court reinstate the prior orders.

The parties and minors participated in the September 22nd CCRC appointment. The parties were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was prepared on October 7, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on October 8th.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the October 7th CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE OCTOBER 7TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
October 29, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

21. KAYLA TRUJILLO V. GUNNER SEXTON 25FL0153

Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt on August 20, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally severed with some, but not all the required documents.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #21: 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.