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

1. SHYLO RAE BELL V. CHRISTOPHER DWAIN LOVELESS 22FL0232

On August 26, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking several orders as set forth therein. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. She filed an amended RFO on September 1st. The Proof of Service indicates that on September 2nd the RFO was served, it does not state that the amended RFO was served. Additionally, there is no indication that the blank FL-320 was served, which is required.

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

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO* LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

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

3. JOSHUA KHOSHSEFAT V. HEIDI KHOSHEFAT **24FL0682**

Joinder

On July 30, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as stated therein. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on July 2nd at which time the court set the matter for trial, continued the issue of the joinder, and adopted the remainder of the tentative ruling.

The parties attended the hearing on the joinder issue on September 3, 2026 at which time the court once again continued the issue.

Respondent filed and served a supplemental declaration on October 22, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served his supplemental declaration on October 22nd as well.

Respondent asks that the court grant joinder of Jane Yeun Sook Khoshsefat. Alternatively, she requests a continuance until after November 13th when she is able to obtain the Chase bank records.

Petitioner opposes the request and argues that his mother is not an indispensable party.

Regarding the joinder, "[t]he court may order that a person be joined as a party to the proceeding if the court finds that it would be appropriate to determine the particular issue in the proceeding and that the person to be joined as a party is either indispensable for the court to make an order about that issue or is necessary to the enforcement of any judgment rendered on that issue." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.24(e)(2).

This matter is continued to Thursday, December 10th at 8:30 am in Department 5 to allow additional time for Respondent to obtain the bank records. The parties are ordered to file and serve supplemental declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

Attorney's Fees

On October 9, 2026, Respondent filed an RFO seeking attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 2030. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration and a declaration of Gregory S. Clark concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on October 12th.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order although the court does have an Income and Expense Declaration filed by him on September 16th.

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

Respondent is requesting $20,000 in attorney's fees and costs. She states she has already incurred over $18,000 worth of fees and costs. Petitioner, in his Income and Expense Declaration, does not specify the amount of fees and costs he has incurred to date.

In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. "In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party's case adequately." *Id.* at (b). Financial resources are only one factor to be considered though. *Id.* In addition to the parties' financial resources, the court may consider the parties' trial tactics. In Re Marriage Of Falcone & Fyke, 203 Cal. App. 4th 964; 975 (2012).

Here, the court does find a disparity in income as well as Petitioner's ability to pay. His monthly income is far in excess of Respondent's. As such, Respondent's request for attorney's fees is granted. Petitioner is ordered to pay, directly to Respondent's attorney, $20,000 as and for attorney's fees and costs. This payment may be made in one lump sum or in monthly increments of $1,000 commencing on November 15th and continuing on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 20 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE JOINDER ISSUE IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL TIME FOR RESPONDENT TO OBTAIN THE BANK RECORDS. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS GRANTED. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY, DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY, $20,000 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS. THIS PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN

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

MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF $1,000 COMMENCING ON NOVEMBER 15TH AND CONTINUING ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 20 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

4. TYLER LINDSEY V. ANNA LINDSEY **26FL0459**

On May 19, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as child support, spousal support, property control, and attorney's fees. The parties appeared before the court for the RFO hearing on September 3rd, at which time the court made custody and visitation orders and the parties agreed to continue the issues of spousal support, child support and attorney's fees until the present date. The parties agreed to file updated Income and Expense Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing and, pending the hearing, the parties agreed Petitioner would make monthly support payments to Respondent in the amount of $2,000. The court reserved jurisdiction over support back to the date of filing the RFO.

Petitioner filed his Income and Expense Declaration on October 23, 2026 along with an FL-141 indicating service was completed on September 21st.

Respondent filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on October 26th.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined in the attached Xspouse report, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is $416 per month and child support is $1,131 per month. See attached Xspouse report. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Petitioner to pay Respondent $1,547 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 June 1, 2026.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of $9,282 through and including November 1, 2026. The parties are ordered to meet and confer to address any credits on arrears that Petitioner has earned through any prior support payments. The parties are further ordered to meet and confer to reach a payment plan for any outstanding arrears. The court reserves jurisdiction on arrears.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, in the face of such a request, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2). Here, while there is a disparity in income, the court does not find that Petitioner has the ability to pay, especially in light of his support payments. Accordingly, the request for attorney's fees is denied.

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

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 #4: THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS $416 PER MONTH AND CHILD SUPPORT IS $1,131 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT $1,547 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 JUNE 1, 2026.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF $9,282 THROUGH AND INCLUDING NOVEMBER 1, 2026. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER TO ADDRESS ANY CREDITS ON ARREARS THAT PETITIONER HAS EARNED THROUGH ANY PRIOR SUPPORT PAYMENTS. THE PARTIES ARE FURTHER ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER TO REACH A PAYMENT PLAN FOR ANY OUTSTANDING ARREARS. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON ARREARS.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED AS THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THAT PETITIONER HAS THE ABILITY TO PAY THE FEES AND COSTS OF BOTH PARTIES.

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.

Fixed Shares	Father		Mother	
#of children	0		2	
% time with NCP	30.00	%	0.00	%
Filing status	MFJ->		<-MFJ	
# exemptions	1	*	3	*
Wages+salary	3800		1135	
Self-employed income	0		0	
Other taxable income	0		0	
TANF+CS received	0		0	
Other nontaxble income	0		0	
New spouse income	0		0	
401(k) employee contrib	0		0	
Adjustments to income	0		0	
SS paid prev marriage	0		0	
CS paid prev marriage	0		0	
Health insurance	0		0	
Other medical expense	0		0	
Property tax expense	0		0	
Ded interest expense	0		849	
Charitable contributions	0		0	
Misc tax deductions	0		0	
Qual bus income ded	0		0	
Required union dues	0		0	
Mandatory retirement	0		0	
Hardship deduction	0	*	0	*
Other GDL deductions	0		0	
Child care expenses	0		0	

Monthly figures

2026

GUIDELINE

Nets(adjusted)

Father	3656
Mother	1092
Total	4748

Support

Addons	0
Guideln CS	1131
Alameda SS	416
Total	1547

-

Proposed

Tactic 9

CS	1131
SS	416
Total	1547
Saving	0
Releases	0

Cash Flow

	Guideline	Proposed
Comb. net spendable	4748	4748
Percent change	0%	0%
Father		
Payment cost/benefit	-1547	-1547
Net spendable income	2109	2109
Change from guideline	0	0
% of combined spendable	44%	44%
% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Total taxes	144	144
Dep. exemption value	0	0
# withholding allowances	0	0
Net wage paycheck	3185	3185
Mother		
Payment cost/benefit	1547	1547
Net spendable income	2639	2639
Change from guideline	0	0
% of combined spendable	56%	56%
% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Total taxes	43	43
Dep. exemption value	0	0
# withholding allowances	0	0
Net wage paycheck	1033	1033

Father pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
All children	30 - 70	0	0	0	Father	1131	Father	1131	Father
	30 - 70	0	0	0	Father	488	Father	488	Father
	30 - 70	0	0	0	Father	643	Father	643	Father

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

5. TYLER C. MAIN V. KAITLYN A. MAIN 25FL0065

On September 2, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support and property control orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Both documents were served on September 10th along with the Notice of Tentative Ruling. The required blank FL-320 was not served. There is another Proof of Service showing all required documents, including the blank FL-320, were served on October 23rd, however service on the 23rd is late.

Petitioner filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on October 2nd, however there is no Proof of Service for either document therefore the court has not read or considered them.

Due to Petitioner's failure to file a Proof of Service for his Income and Expense Declaration the court cannot calculate support. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

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

6. NIKOLAS PAECH V. CAROLINE GIROUX **PFL20210276**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 26, 2025 seeking a modification of child support as well as reimbursement of child support add-ons and payment of arrears. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent's counsel and Minors' Counsel were mail served on December 9, 2026. The court finds this does not comply with Family Code section 215, as this is a post-judgment request for modification.

Respondent filed an RFO on January 6, 2026, requesting entry of judgment on reserved issues. Proof of Service shows Petitioner's counsel was mail served on January 6, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Minors' Counsel was served. The court finds this does not comply with Family Code section 215, as this is a post-judgment request for modification.

Both matters were originally set to be heard March 5, 2026, however they have been continued twice at the request of the parties.

On October 26, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a declaration in support of his RFO, a declaration regarding Respondent's RFO for entry of judgment, and his Income and Expense Declaration. He did not utilize the FL-320 which is a mandated form therefore, the court cannot consider his declaration in response to Petitioner's RFO.

On October 28th, Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, a declaration in opposition to Petitioner's request, and her Income and Expense Declaration. None of these documents were served on Minor's Counsel therefore, the court cannot read or consider them.

Minor's Counsel has not filed a responsive declaration to either request for order.

This matter is continued to Thursday, January 7th at 8:30 am in Department 5 to allow the parties additional time to remedy the aforementioned procedural deficiencies.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 7TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW THE PARTIES ADDITIONAL TIME TO REMEDY THE AFOREMENTIONED PROCEDURAL DEFICIENCIES.

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

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

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

7. THOMAS ROBERT PULVINO V. AMBUR MICHELLE MORRISON 23FL0764

On September 4, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel discovery responses. She filed a supplemental declaration on October 14th. Both documents were served on October 14th, however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

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

Respondent is requesting an order compelling Petitioner to provide complete, verified, code-compliant responses, without objections, to Requests for Production of Documents, Form Interrogatories, and Special Interrogatories. She requests discovery sanctions in an amount not less than $1,000.

On July 7, 2026, Respondent served Petitioner with Requests for Production of Documents, Form Interrogatories, and Special Interrogatories. On August 20th, Petitioner emailed an Excel spreadsheet with hyperlinks to documents, however no code-compliant responses were provided nor were verifications.

"The party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory ..." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.210(a). Generally speaking, responses to interrogatories are due within 30 days of the date of service. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.260. If a party fails to provide timely responses, that party waives any right to object to the interrogatories, and waives the right to produce writings in response. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2030.290 (a). All responses to interrogatories, with the exception of objections only, are required to be made under oath signed by the party responding. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.250.

In addition to interrogatories, the Civil Discovery Act authorizes all parties to request documents from the opposing party by way of a Request for Production of Documents. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2031.210. As with interrogatories, responses to requests for production are due within 30 days of the date of service, where a party fails to provide timely responses the party to whom the discovery was directed waives "any objection...including one based on

privilege or on the protection of work product…" and "[t]he party making the demand may move for an order compelling response[s]…" Cal Civ. Pro. §2031.300(a).

Here, Respondent has sufficiently established Petitioner's failure to comply with his discovery obligations. Respondent has provided the court with copies of the discovery as well as the proofs of service thereof. As such, Respondent's Motion to Compel is granted. Petitioner shall provide full and complete verified responses, without objections, to Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents no later than November 19, 2026.

Under the circumstances it appears monetary sanctions are also warranted. Where a party engages in the misuse of the discovery process, the court "shall" impose monetary sanctions "unless it finds that one subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Cal. Civ. Pro. 2023.030(a)(emphasis added) & 2023.020. Misuse of the discovery process includes, but is not limited to, failing to respond or submit to an authorized method of discovery. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.010. A party requesting sanctions for reasonable expenses that were incurred as a result of discovery abuse must already be liable for those expenses before the court can award the costs as sanctions. *See* Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Servs., 186 Cal. App. 4th 1548 (2010) (anticipated costs for future deposition could not be included in award of sanctions).

"… [I]n addition to any other sanctions imposed …a court *shall* impose a one-thousand-dollar ($1,000) sanction, payable to the requesting party…" if the court finds that the noncompliant party did not respond in good faith to a request for production of documents or failed to make a reasonable good faith attempt to informally resolve a discovery dispute. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.050(a).

By failing to provide full and complete, verified responses within the allotted timeframe, Petitioner has engaged in misuse of the discovery process. He also failed to respond to Requests for Production of Documents, which results in a mandated sanction of $1,000. However, after reviewing Petitioner's most recent Income and Expense Declaration, from April of 2025, the court is concerned that awarding any additional amount would be unjust as Petitioner likely does not have the ability to pay. As such, the request for discovery sanctions is granted in the amount of $1,000. Sanctions may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of $100 due and payable on the 1st of each month commencing with December 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately

10 months). Payments are to be made directly to Respondent's attorney. If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

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 #7: RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED. PETITIONER SHALL PROVIDE FULL AND COMPLETE VERIFIED RESPONSES, WITHOUT OBJECTIONS, TO FORM INTERROGATORIES, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 19, 2026.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS IS GRANTED IN THE AMOUNT OF $1,000. SANCTIONS MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF $100 DUE AND PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING WITH DECEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). PAYMENTS ARE TO BE MADE DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY. IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

8. GINNY ANNE SILVER V. MICHAEL JAMES SILVER 24FL0997

On August 26, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support, and to modify the Judgment. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is a Proof of Service indicating that a "Notice of Hearing" and an Income and Expense Declaration were personally served on Petitioner on September 11th however, there is no indication that the RFO or any of the other required documents were served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on October 15, 2026. She objects to the court hearing the RFO as it has not been properly served.

Petitioner's objection is sustained and the RFO 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.

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

9. JENNIFER SOMERS V. BENJAMIN PINKHAM 26FL0022

On May 7, 2026, Petitioner appeared before the court for hearing on her Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). Respondent did not appear at the hearing therefore, the court took testimony from Petitioner, granted a 5-year DVRO and set the matter for hearing on the issue of spousal support. Respondent was ordered to file his Income and Expense Declaration no later than 10 days prior to the date for the support hearing.

The parties appeared before the court on August 20th requesting a continuance. The request was granted and the matter was continued to the present date.

Neither party has filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Without them, the court cannot calculate support therefore this matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS NEITHER PARTY HAS FILED AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

10. CORY THOMAS-MANZO V. PABLO MANZO PFL20100378

On June 2, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking enforcement of the judgment and sanctions. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were personally served on Petitioner on July 27th in accordance with Family Code § 215, however the required Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 10, 2026. Respondent was served by mail on August 10, 2026. She filed an amended Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 25th. There is a Proof of Service however, the Proof of Service seems to be a copy of the proof for the initial responsive declaration with the words "Amended 8.25.26" handwritten in and the date of service crossed out and no new date written in. The court is concerned with the veracity of this document. Additionally, because the date of service is crossed out the court is unable to confirm timely service therefore, the amended response has not been read or considered.

On October 15, 2026, Petitioner filed another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. It was served on October 16th.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on October 26th, the court deems this to be a reply declaration. It was served the same day.

Respondent initially requested an order for Moon, Schwartz and Madden to prepare a QDRO and an MDRO pursuant to the terms of the March 10, 2011 Judgment. Once completed, he asked that Petitioner be ordered to sign the QDRO and MDRO within 10 days or else the clerk of the court be appointed as elisor to sign on her behalf. Respondent requested sanctions in the amount of $3,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Petitioner opposed the requests stating that the division of the retirement accounts was moving forward. She asked the court to reserve on any disputed issues concerning interpretation of the March 10, 2011 Judgment, valuation methodology, calculations, offsets, retirement account identification, or implementation should a genuine dispute later arise.

As of the date of Respondent's supplemental declaration the QDRO for Petitioner's CalSTRS account has been completed and sent to the plan for review. The MDRO for Respondent's military retirement cannot be prepared and the parties are working to remedy the issue. Furthermore, Respondent is concerned that Petitioner will refuse to sign

the QDRO for her retirement. In light of the foregoing, Respondent asks that the matter be continued.

This matter is continued to Thursday, February 4th at 8:30 am in Department 5 to allow the parties additional time to complete the QDRO and resolve the issues with Respondent's military retirement. The parties are to file and serve supplemental declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW THE PARTIES ADDITIONAL TIME TO COMPLETE THE QDRO AND RESOLVE THE ISSUES WITH RESPONDENT'S MILITARY RETIREMENT. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING TO UPDATE THE COURT ON THE STATUS OF THE DIVISION OF THE RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

11. JENNIE VICTORIANO V. DANIEL VICTORIANO **PFL20200111**

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on April 1, 2026, alleging six counts of contempt by Respondent. Respondent was personally served on May 16, 2026.

Parties appeared for the arraignment on June 11, 2026. The court appointed the office of the Public Defender to Respondent and continued the matter to August 27. The parties once again appeared for the arraignment at which time the court appointed Rebecca Esty-Burke as counsel for Respondent. The arraignment was continued to the present date.

On September 14th, Petitioner filed a second OSC alleging additional counts of contempt. It was personally served on September 25th.

Parties are ordered to appear for arraignment on both OSCs.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT ON BOTH OSCs.

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

12. WILLIAM ADKINS VS. AMY ANN STINNETT 26FL0718

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on July 28, 2026. A Summons was issued the same day. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) concurrently with the petition, seeking genetic testing. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

The court drops the matter from calendar, as the court has not obtained jurisdiction over the parties due to the lack of service of the petition and Summons. Further, the RFO is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR, AS THE COURT HAS NOT OBTAINED JURISDICTION OVER THE PARTIES DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE OF THE PETITION AND SUMMONS. FURTHER, THE RFO 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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

13. EL DORADO DCSS VS. CODI DONOVAN SALASCHRISTMAN (OTHER PARENT: NICOLE LOPEZ) 23FL0251

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 14, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as the current child support order. Other Parent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 21, 2026 and a review hearing on November 5, 2026. Proofs of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on September 3, 2026 and Respondent was personally served on August 18, 2026.

Only Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was prepared on September 21, 2026 and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on September 22, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner requests the child support issue be heard by the child support commissioner pursuant to Family Code section 4251.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

14. PATRICIA DAVY V. CHARLES DAVY PFL20200494

Respondent filed an RFO following the court's denial of his ex parte application for emergency orders on August 17, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served with some, but not all of the required documents on August 25, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to the ex parte.

Parties appeared for the hearing on September 3, 2026. Respondent requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to perfect service. The court granted the request and continued the matter to November 5, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

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

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

15. GINA ELIAS VS. PHIL PALMQUIST 26FL0096

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 8, 2026, seeking an order compelling Respondent to serve his preliminary declarations of disclosure. Respondent was served with some, but not all, of the required documents on September 24, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service. However, Respondent is reminded Family Code sections 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosures of assets (PDD) within the specified timeframes. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1).

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

16. CATHERINE GARAVITO VS. FRANK GARAVITO 24FL1127

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 3, 2026, seeking modification of the parenting plan orders. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: 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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

17. PETER KASHUBA V ALLISON KASHUBA PFL20200214

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on August 18, 2026. On August 19, 2026, the court granted the ex parte in part. The court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) session and set a review hearing for October 8, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was electronically served on August 21, 2026.

Both parties and the minor participated in the CCRC appointment. A report with recommendations was prepared on September 24, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Declaration on September 8, 2026. It was served the same day. The court finds this declaration to be irrelevant to the matter at hand and therefore, has not considered it.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Parties appeared at the hearing on October 15, 2026. At that time, the parties stipulated to the appointment of Minor's Counsel and agreed to continue the matter to allow Minor's Counsel to meet with her client and review the CCRC report.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

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

18. JORDAN MCGILL VS. CHRISTOPHER ASHTON LEE MCGILL 25FL0230

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 15, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. Additionally, Petitioner is requesting the court strike Respondent's Response to the Petition or in the alternative waive his preliminary declarations of disclosure. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 23, 2026, and a review hearing on November 5, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on July 15, 2026.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was prepared on September 23, 2026, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Upon review of the file, the court finds custody and parenting plan orders were made in Department 8 on October 20, 2026, at the conclusion of a hearing on Petitioner's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order. This court has reviewed the orders and finds they are in the best interest of the minor. These orders remain in full force and effect.

As to Petitioner's request to strike Respondent's Response to the Petition for Dissolution, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served with the Response. Therefore, the court finds the Response was never served on Petitioner. As such, the court finds good cause to strike the Response and orders it stricken.

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 #18: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE OCTOBER 20, 2026 CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS FROM DEPARTMENT 8 AND FINDS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

AS TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO STRIKE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO THE PETITION FOR DISSOLUTION, THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE SHOWING PETITIONER WAS PROPERLY SERVED WITH THE RESPONSE. THEREFORE, THE COURT FIND THE RESPONSE WAS NEVER SERVED ON PETITIONER. THEREFORE, THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO STRIKE THE RESPONSE AND ORDERS IT STRICKEN.

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

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.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

19. ADAM MINOR VS. 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.

Parties appeared for the hearing on October 29, 2026. Respondent requested additional time to review the CCRC report and file a Reply. The court granted the request and continued the matter to November 5, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court directed that any Supplemental Declarations be filed and served on or before November 2, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on November 2, 2026. It was served on Respondent the same day. Petitioner requests the court adopt the recommendations of the CCRC report as interim orders pending return on the Evidence Code section 730 evaluation.

Respondent filed a Declaration on November 2, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent requests the current orders remain in full force and effect pending return on the Evidence Code section 730 evaluation.

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

Petitioner filed an additional Declaration on November 3, 2026. It was served the same day. This is outside the timeframe the court allowed for Declarations to be filed. As such, the court has not considered it.

The court is deeply concerned with Respondent's actions in this matter. In particular, the potential of subjecting the minor to numerous investigations and interviews, that can be traumatic to a child of her age. The court is further concerned by the statements made by the minor to the CCRC counselor regarding Respondent. However, the court is reluctant to disrupt the stability and continuity of the minor's schedule pending the results of the Evidence Code section 730 evaluation. Therefore, the court finds the best interest of the minor is to keep the current parenting plan in place. Respondent is strongly cautioned that discussion of the case with the minor is prohibited. Respondent is also strongly cautioned about subjecting the minor to any further investigations or interviews outside the pending Evidence Code section 730 evaluation. Failure to abide by court orders may result in a change in custody orders, as well as other remedies.

The court sets a review hearing Thursday, February 4th at 8:30 AM in Department 5 to assess the progress toward completion of the Evidence Code section 730 evaluation. Parties are to share in the costs of the evaluation equally, subjection to reallocation. Petitioner shall propose the names of three potential evaluators to Respondent on or before November 19, 2026. Respondent shall select one of the three by no later than November 30, 2026. Parties are to select the earlies available appointments to begin the evaluation. Parties shall sign any and all necessary releases for the evaluator.

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 #19: THE COURT FINDS THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR IS TO KEEP THE CURRENT PARENTING PLAN IN PLACE. RESPONDENT IS STRONGLY CAUTIONED THAT DISCUSSION OF THE CASE WITH THE MINOR IS PROHIBITED. RESPONDENT IS ALSO STRONGLY CAUTIONED ABOUT SUBJECTING THE MINOR TO ANY FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS OR INTERVIEWS OUTSIDE THE PENDING EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 730 EVALUATION. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY COURT ORDERS MAY RESULT IN A CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS, AS WELL AS OTHER REMEDIES.

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

THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ASSESS THE PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLETION OF THE EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 730 EVALUATION. PARTIES ARE TO SHARE IN THE COSTS OF THE EVALUATION EQUALLY, SUBJECTION TO REALLOCATION. PETITIONER SHALL PROPOSE THE NAMES OF THREE POTENTIAL EVALUATORS TO RESPONDENT ON OR BEFORE NOVEMBER 19, 2026. RESPONDENT SHALL SELECT ONE OF THE THREE BY NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 30, 2026. PARTIES ARE TO SELECT THE EARLIES AVAILABLE APPOINTMENTS TO BEGIN THE EVALUATION. PARTIES SHALL SIGN ANY AND ALL NECESSARY RELEASES FOR THE EVALUATOR.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

20. RYAN S. MUNYER VS. RYAN E. ROGERS 25FL0232

Petitioner filed an ex parte request seeking abatement of the dissolution action due to the death of Respondent. The court set the matter on a shortened time basis. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 16, 2026. Petitioner filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, with a copy of the death certificate attached as Exhibit A on October 23, 2026. Respondent's next of kin was served on October 22, 2026.

There has been no Responsive Declaration filed on behalf of Respondent.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court notes under Family Code section 310 a marriage is dissolved by the death of one of the parties. Except in circumstances where a bifurcated judgment has been entered, any dissolution action abates and the court no longer has jurisdiction to make any further determinations on the action. Here, there is no bifurcated judgment. Therefore, the dissolution is abated as a matter of law, and the Family Court no longer has jurisdiction in this matter.

The court lifts the stay. The court grants Petitioner's request to abate the dissolution. The pending judgment shall not be entered. All future hearing dates are vacated.

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 LIFTS THE STAY. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO ABATE THE DISSOLUTION. THE PENDING JUDGMENT SHALL NOT BE ENTERED. ALL FUTURE HEARING DATES ARE VACATED. 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

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

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

21. JUSTIN NEFF VS. KAYLA LATTIMER 22FL0990

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 27, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to this particular RFO.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

22. KERRY STAMOS VS. SPIRO STAMOS 26FL0300

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 8, 2026, seeking property control orders. Proof of Service show Respondent was mail served on October 5, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court grants Petitioner's request for exclusive use and control of the property located at 1130 White Rock Road El Dorado Hills, CA 95762. Respondent shall vacate the residence on or before December 7, 2026 at 5:00 PM. The court reserves jurisdiction over the characterization of the property until the time of trial.

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 #22: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1130 WHITE ROCK ROAD EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762. RESPONDENT SHALL VACATE THE RESIDENCE ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 7, 2026 AT 5:00 PM. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE PROPERTY UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

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.

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
November 5, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM