11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

1. ESPERANZA WOOLEVER V. CHRISTOPHER WOOLEVER PFL20180325

On July 22, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation orders. The FL-300, M-1 and Application for OST were all served on July 21st, and the CCRC referral form was served on September 21st.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 21st. Minor's Counsel also filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 21st.

Petitioner is requesting a change to the visitation time. Specifically she asks that the parties be referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC), which they were.

Respondent and Minor's Counsel both oppose the motion and ask that all current visitation orders remain in place.

The parties attended CCRC on October 2, 2026 and were able to reach agreements. A report with those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties on October 5th.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and finds the agreements contained in the October 5, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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 #1: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE AND FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE OCTOBER 5, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

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

11/12/26

Department 5

Tentative Rulings

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

2. OMAR ATEBAR V. MINA ATEBAR **PFL20140638**

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and child support. Ultimately, the parties agreed to set an evidentiary hearing which took place on May 5, 2026. At that time, the court found that there was not a preponderance of the evidence to establish abuse and the parties were awarded joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor. The parties were referred back to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for July 23, 2026.

At the July hearing, the court re-referred the parties to CCRC and ordered that the minor be interviewed. Another review hearing was set for the present date.

CCRC did interview the minor on September 30, 2026 and a report was prepared on October 26, 2026. However, the CCRC counselor maintains that she is unable to make any recommendations pending further assessment. She asks the court to order Respondent to execute the appropriate authorizations permitting communication with the child's individual therapist and school counselor. The CCRC report was mailed to the parties on October 28th.

After reviewing the file the court finds the current custody and visitation orders remain in the best interests of the minor with one change. The minor may, in his sole discretion, decline any of his visits with Petitioner. However, the minor may only decline one visit at a time and must give Petitioner notice of the declined visit during the week that visit is scheduled to take place. He may not make a blanket declaration that he will not be attending any visits. The minor may also, in his sole discretion, extend his visits with Petitioner.

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

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILE THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS REMAIN IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR WITH ONE CHANGE. THE MINOR MAY, IN HIS SOLE DISCRETION, DECLINE ANY OF HIS VISITS WITH PETITIONER. HOWEVER, THE MINOR MAY ONLY DECLINE ONE VISIT AT A TIME AND MUST GIVE PETITIONER NOTICE OF THE DECLINED VISIT DURING THE WEEK THAT VISIT IS SCHEDULED TO TAKE PLACE. HE MAY NOT MAKE A BLANKET DECLARATION THAT HE WILL NOT BE ATTENDING ANY VISITS. THE MINOR MAY ALSO,

IN HIS SOLE DISCRETION, EXTEND HIS VISITS WITH PETITIONER. ALL ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

3. BRIAN CAMERON V. CHRISTINA CAMERON 25FL0616

On September 17, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on September 23rd with the exception of the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

On September 23, 2026, Respondent filed another RFO, this time seeking to bifurcate the issue of marital status. All required documents were served on September 25th however, once again, the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order in response to either RFO. 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 RFOs were both 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 RFOs are meritorious.

Regarding the request to bifurcate, a party may request bifurcation of the issue of marital status, however prior to doing so the party must ensure that "[a]ll pension plans that have not been divided by court order that require joinder …" have been joined. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(d)(1). A party seeking bifurcation is to submit a completed FL-315. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(a).

Here, according to the FL-315 Respondent has no information regarding Petitioner's retirement or pension accounts. As such, the court cannot grant the bifurcation without first ensuring that all pension plans, if there are any, are joined. Without that assurance, the request for bifurcation is denied without prejudice.

Turning to the issue of spousal support, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing. Petitioner is ordered to bring with him a completed Income and Expense Declaration with supporting documents.

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 REQUEST TO BIFURCATE IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO BRING WITH HIM A COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

4. ANGELA CAROCCI V. NICOLAS CAROCCI **25FL1254**

September 10, 2026 RFO

On September 10, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for visitation, spousal support and attorney's fees. Respondent did not concurrently file his Income and Expense Declaration however the court had a current Income and Expense Declaration for Respondent at the time of filing the RFO. The RFO and other required documents were served on October 6th; the required Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

Respondent filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration on October 16th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on October 27th.

Respondent is requesting guideline spousal support payable by Petitioner to Respondent as well as need-based attorney's fees in the amount of $15,000. He further requests modification of the current visitation order to extend weekend visits through Monday at school drop-off (3:30pm if no school). With the exception of a bona fide emergency regarding the health or safety of the child, Respondent asks that any changes to the parenting time schedule/exchange schedule be agreed to in writing (text or email) at least 48 hours in advance. He asks that the parties be ordered to refrain from appearing at one another's residences unannounced or without consent.

Petitioner opposes Respondent's requests and asks the court to deny all of the requests outright. In the event the court is inclined to award support, Petitioner asks the court to impute income to Respondent in the amount of $6,250 per month.

Regarding the request to change the exchange day, the request is denied. Respondent is admonished that the court has already ruled on this issue in its August 20th ruling stating that the Sunday exchange time was "…being made expressly in light of Respondent's repeated failures to get the children to school on time. Respondent is admonished to ensure the children are dropped at school timely. If, moving forward, Respondent consistently gets the children to school on time during his parenting time, the court may consider extending the Sunday visits to Monday morning but Respondent would need to file another RFO to make that change." Respondent filed this RFO just 21 days after the court's order and he made no mention of the timeliness of his school drop-offs since the court's order. Even if he had addressed the issue, just three weeks is not sufficient to show that Respondent has actually remedied this issue and that a Monday exchange would therefore be in the best interests of the children. Instead, his declaration seems to address

his preferences regarding weekend visits and school exchanges. For these reasons, the request to amend the visitation schedule is denied.

Respondent's requests regarding written changes to the visitation schedule and showing up at the other party's residence unannounced are likewise denied. Respondent did not address either of these requests in his moving papers and therefore failed to meet his burden of showing that the requests are in the best interests of the children.

Turning to the issue of support, the request for guideline support is granted, as is the request for imputation of income. An award of temporary spousal support lies solely within the trial court's discretion regarding each party's respective need and ability to pay. *See* Marriage of Tong & Samson*,* 197 Cal. App. 4th 23, 29 (2011). Support may be reduced based on the imputation of income to the lower earning spouse. The amount of income imputed is to be based on that spouse's measurable earning capacity which is determined by (1) the ability of the spouse to earn consistent with the spouse's health, age, education, marketable skills, and employment history; and (2) the opportunity available for employment. In re Marriage of Simpson*,* 4 Cal. 4th 225 (1992).

Here, Petitioner has sufficiently established Respondent's ability to earn more than his current earnings, given his Class A driver's license, mechanical degree and additional certifications as well as his history working with Waste Connections. Petitioner has further established the opportunity for Respondent to earn more, especially in light of the current opening with his former employer. The opening with Waste Connections is for a position earning between $27.50 and $32 per hour. Averaging those two equals $29.75. $29.75 per hour for 40 hours per week is $1,190, times 52 weeks per year amounts to $61,880. This equals $5,156 per month. The court deems this to be a reasonable amount for the imputation of income.

Utilizing the imputation figure as outlined above, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is $830 per month. See attached Xspouse report. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Petitioner to pay Respondent $830 per month as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the 15th of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of September 15, 2026.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of $1,660 through and including October 15, 2026. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner $276.67 on the 1st of each month commencing on December 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 6 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable, with legal interest, within 5 days.

Finally, regarding the request for attorney's fees, the request is granted. The public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In Re Marriage of Keech,75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. It "is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party," but rather "parity." Alan S. v. Sup. Ct., 172 Cal. App. 4th 238,251(2009). 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).

Here, the court finds that not only is there a disparity in income, but Petitioner does have the ability to pay both her fees and those of Respondent. Petitioner herself concedes that she has access to the equity in her business to help pay for attorney's fees. Accordingly, Petitioner is ordered to pay $15,000 directly to Respondent's attorney. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments, of $1,000 commencing on December 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 15 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

September 29, 2026 RFO

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

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

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

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

Respondent opposes the requests and asks that the court deny them and award him $2,000 in attorney's fees for having to respond to the motion. He asks that the key to the mailbox be returned and that the lender statements from Bear Rock properties be directed to him. He states that once support is ordered he will be able to pay the mortgage

on the home more easily without late payments. Finally, he asks the court to order Petitioner to provide Respondent with written notice and an accounting of any improvements or extraordinary expenditures related to the 1093 Goyan Ave. property.

The matter came before the court for hearing on October 22nd, at which time the court made several orders and the request to sell the home was continued to the present date to join with the hearing on spousal support. The court reserved jurisdiction on each party's request for sanctions.

The court holds broad discretion to "[a]t any time during the proceeding…order the liquidation of community or quasi-community assets so as to avoid unreasonable market or investment risks…" Cal. Fam. Code § 2108. This includes the authority to order the sale and division of proceeds of the marital residence. Marriage of Holmgren, 60 Cal. App. 3d 869 (1976); *See also* In re Marriage of Horowitz, 159 Cal. App. 3d 368 (1984).

Here, it is inarguable that Respondent has failed to make the payments on the property and it is in danger of foreclosure. Accordingly, in order to preserve the assets, the court is ordering the property to be liquidated. The parties are to place the property located at 1750 Bear Rock Road in Placerville, up for sale forthwith. Net proceeds of the sale are to be placed in a trust account at River City Bank in the name of Dosh Law APC. There shall be no withdrawals from the account until further court order or written agreement of the parties. The court reserves jurisdiction over all aspects of the sale and distribution of the net proceeds of the sale.

Regarding the request for sanctions, an award for attorney's fees and sanctions may be made pursuant to Family Code section 271 which states, in pertinent part, "…the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a). While the purpose of Section 271 is to impose a punitive sanction, the court is not to impose a sanction that would create an "unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed." *Id*.

In reviewing the most recent Income and Expense Declaration of Respondent, dated October 16, 2026, the court is concerned that imposing a sanction on Respondent would place an unreasonable financial burden on him. That said, an award of sanctions may be payable from the net proceeds of the home sale, depending on the amount thereof. Accordingly, the court reserves jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for sanctions until such time as the court orders the division of the net proceeds of the home.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

The request for an additional $2,000 in attorney's fees is denied as the court has already awarded Respondent attorney's fees.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: REGARDING THE REQUEST TO CHANGE THE EXCHANGE DAY, THE REQUEST IS DENIED. RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS REGARDING WRITTEN CHANGES TO THE VISITATION SCHEDULE AND SHOWING UP AT THE OTHER PARTY'S RESIDENCE UNANNOUNCED ARE LIKEWISE DENIED. RESPONDENT DID NOT ADDRESS EITHER OF THESE REQUESTS IN HIS MOVING PAPERS AND THEREFORE FAILED TO MEET HIS BURDEN OF SHOWING THAT THE REQUESTS ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN.

TURNING TO THE ISSUE OF SUPPORT, THE REQUEST FOR GUIDELINE SUPPORT IS GRANTED, AS THE REQUEST FOR IMPUTATION OF INCOME. THE COURT DEEMS $5,156 PER MONTH TO BE A REASONABLE AMOUNT FOR THE IMPUTATION OF INCOME. THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS $830 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT $830 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2026.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF $1,660 THROUGH AND INCLUDING OCTOBER 15, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER $276.67 ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON DECEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 6 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE, WITH LEGAL INTEREST, WITHIN 5 DAYS.

FINALLY, REGARDING THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES, THE REQUEST IS GRANTED. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY $15,000 DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS, OF $1,000 COMMENCING ON DECEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 15 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

THE PARTIES ARE TO PLACE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1750 BEAR ROCK ROAD IN PLACERVILLE, UP FOR SALE FORTHWITH. NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE ARE TO BE PLACED IN A TRUST ACCOUNT AT RIVER CITY BANK IN THE NAME OF DOSH LAW APC. THERE SHALL BE NO WITHDRAWALS FROM THE ACCOUNT UNTIL FURTHER COURT ORDER OR WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE.

THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COURT ORDERS THE DIVISION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE HOME.

THE REQUEST FOR AN ADDITIONAL $2,000 IN ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED AS THE COURT HAS ALREADY AWARDED RESPONDENT ATTORNEY'S FEES.

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

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

Fixed Shares	Father		Mother	
#of children	0		3	
% time with NCP	44.00	%	0.00	%
Filing status	SINGLE		HH/MLA	
# exemptions	1	*	4	*
Wages+salary	5156		5000	
Self-employed income	0		9254	
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	700		635	
Ded interest expense	600		0	
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	4204
Mother	10479
Total	14682

Support

Addons	0
Guideln CS	0
Alameda SS	830
Total	830

-

Settings changed

Proposed

Tactic 9

CS	0
SS	830
Total	830
Saving	0
Releases	0

Cash Flow

	Guideline	Proposed
Comb. net spendable	14682	14682
Percent change	0%	0%
Father		
Payment cost/benefit	830	830
Net spendable income	5034	5034
Change from guideline	0	0
% of combined spendable	34%	34%
% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Total taxes	952	952
Dep. exemption value	0	0
# withholding allowances	0	0
Net wage paycheck	3964	3964
Mother		
Payment cost/benefit	-830	-830
Net spendable income	9648	9648
Change from guideline	0	0
% of combined spendable	66%	66%
% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Total taxes	3775	3775
Dep. exemption value	0	0
# withholding allowances	0w	0w
Net wage paycheck	4069	4069

Mother pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
All children	44 - 56	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father
	44 - 56	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father
	44 - 56	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father
	44 - 56	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

5. LISA MARIE CURLEE V. ERIC BRISTER **24FL1116**

On July 27, 2026, Counsel for Respondent filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. The motion was served on Respondent the same day as filing however there is no Proof of Service showing service of the opposing party.

This matter is continued to Thursday, December 17th at 8:30 am in Department 5 to allow time to properly serve the opposing party and file a Proof of Service with the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW TIME TO PROPERLY SERVE THE OPPOSING PARTY AND FILE A PROOF OF SERVICE 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.

6. SHAWN EVANS V. SHALENE EVANS **24FL0159**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 5, 2026, seeking a change in venue from El Dorado County to San Joaquin County. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service in the file which corresponds to this RFO. The court notes, there is a Proof of Service which was filed on July 1, 2026, which shows electronic service of an FL-300; FL-305; FL-303; "all exhibits"; and a declaration. It does not specify which FL-300 was served. Further, the court finds this service to be deficient, as all required documents were not served.

Petitioner filed an RFO on April 1, 2026, seeking attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code section 271. Petitioner concurrently filed a declaration of counsel as well as an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served. Nevertheless, Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration, Income and Expense Declaration, and Declaration on July 23, 2026 thereby waiving any potential defect in service.

On October 29th Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. This was filed in response to the March 5th RFO therefore the court finds any objection to a potential defect in service was waived and the RFO may be heard on the merits. Petitioner concurrently filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent filed and served her reply on November 3rd.

Change of Venue

Respondent is requesting this matter be transferred to San Joaquin County Superior Court. She argues that she and the child have resided there since 2025 and it is a more convenient forum.

Petitioner opposes the request arguing that Respondent is forum shopping and she frequently relocates. He further argues the minor's medical providers are located in El Dorado County and any who reside out of the county may appear in proceedings remotely.

California Civil Procedure section 395 governs the proper venue for dissolution proceedings. According to Section 395, the proper venue in a proceeding for dissolution of marriage is the superior court in the county where either the petitioner or the respondent resided for at least three months prior to the commencement of the proceeding. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 395(a). However, the court may, upon a properly noticed motion, transfer any matter where the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 397(a). The burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for a change of venue. *Fontaine v. Sup. Ct.*, 175 Cal. App. 4th 830 (2009).

Here, it is clear that El Dorado County was the proper court when filed. While the court recognizes that there are custody issues as part of the dissolution proceeding, ultimately this is a dissolution matter and there is property located in El Dorado County that needs to be addressed as part of the dissolution proceedings before any change of venue would be warranted. For that reason, the court finds that El Dorado County remains the proper venue for the time being. The request to change venue is denied without prejudice pending resolution of the dissolution.

Attorney's Fees

Petitioner is requesting attorney's fees and costs in the amount of $17,967 pursuant to Family Code § 271, though he notes that the request is to cover fees he incurred as a result of Respondent's unsuccessful filing for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). While Petitioner's request cites Section 271, Counsel's supporting declaration also cites Family Code § 6344 as a basis for the request.

Respondent opposes the request and argues that she did not bring the request for DVRO for improper purposes. She further argues that she does not have the ability to pay Petitioner's fees and costs.

Family Code section 6344 is the mechanism by which a prevailing party on a DVRO request may recover their attorney's fees and costs. If the prevailing party was the party that defended against the DVRO the court "may" issue an order for the payment of attorney's fees "only if the respondent establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the petition or request is frivolous or solely intended to abuse, intimidate, or cause unnecessary delay." Fam. Code § 6344(b).

In the matter at hand, Petitioner has not established that the DVRO request was brought solely with the intent to abuse, intimidate, or cause unnecessary delay. In fact, the temporary restraining order was granted with the court noting that both parties presented evidence to support their version of the facts. Accordingly, the request for attorney's fees and costs is denied pursuant to Section 6344.

To the extent Petitioner is making his request pursuant to Family Code § 271, this section states, in pertinent part, "…the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a). While the purpose of Section 271 is to impose a punitive sanction, the court is not to

impose a sanction that would create an "unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed." *Id*.

Again, the court cannot find a basis for an award of attorney's fees and costs. It does not appear that Respondent's actions were intended to increase the cost of litigation or hinder any potential settlement. Given that Respondent did have an evidentiary basis for the filing of her request for DVRO, the court does not find that her actions were sanctionable pursuant to Section 271. The request is denied on this basis as well.

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 #6: THE REQUEST TO CHANGE VENUE IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE PENDING RESOLUTION OF THE DISSOLUTION.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS IS DENIED.

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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

7. JAMIE GOSSETT V. JOSHUA GOSSETT **24FL1225**

On May 5, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support orders, a seek-work order and an order for Petitioner to undergo a vocational evaluation. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served by mail on May 13, 2026. Given that this is a post-judgment request, Respondent filed a Declaration Regarding Address Verification on May 19th in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Only Respondent appeared at the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on June 12, 2026. A single parent report without recommendations was prepared on June 12th and mailed to the parties on June 15th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 10th. She filed an Amended Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 13th.

On July 16th Respondent filed and served a reply declaration along with a Stipulation and Order Regarding Vocational Evaluation of Petitioner.

This matter came before the court for hearing on July 23rd at which time the parties were referred back to CCRC, the court declined to rule on the issue of a vocational evaluation as moot, and the court reserved jurisdiction over the issue of support back to the date of filing the RFO.

Respondent filed and served his updated Income and Expense Declaration on October 23rd.

The parties attended CCRC on October 20th and were able to reach some agreements. A report with those agreements and recommendations was prepared on October 23, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on October 26th.

Petitioner filed and served her updated Income and Expense Declaration and an updating declaration on November 2nd. The court deems this to be a supplemental declaration.

Respondent filed his supplemental declaration on November 3rd. Petitioner objects to the declaration as it is late filed. The objection is sustained. The court has not read or considered Respondent's supplemental declaration.

Respondent objects to Petitioner's November 2nd declaration as untimely and improper pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2015.5. The objection is sustained pursuant to El Dorado County Local Rule 8.05.04 which states "[i]f the Supplemental Declaration is served by electronic means…the required 10-day period of notice before the hearing shall

be increased by two calendar days." Accordingly, the declaration has not been read or considered.

Petitioner filed and served a corrected supplemental declaration on November 3rd. The court finds this to be untimely pursuant to El Dorado County Rule 8.05.04 therefore it has not been read or considered.

The vocational evaluation of Petitioner was filed on November 6th.

Given that the court has not been able to read or consider either party's supplemental declaration, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: PETITIONER'S OBJECTION TO RESPONDENT'S NOVEMBER 3, 2026 DECLARATION IN SUSTAINED. THE COURT HAS NOT READ OR CONSIDERED THE DECLARATION. RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION TO PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION IS SUSTAINED AND THE COURT HAS NOT READ OR CONSIDERED THE DECLARATION.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

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

8. DCSS V. ERIC HILL (OTHER PARENT: ANA ROSE FERRO) PFS20150143

On April 20, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It is unclear if the RFO was served. There is a Proof of Service indicating service of an "FL-300, FL-305, and F-27" on April 17th but that seems to be service of the ex parte paperwork and it is unclear if the filed RFO with the hearing date on it was actually served. Regardless, there is no indication that the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) referral form, Notice of Tentative Ruling, or blank FL-320 were served.

Despite the defect in service, both parties did participate in CCRC and they were able to reach some agreements. A report containing those agreements was prepared on June 8, 2026; it was mailed to the parties on June 9th. There are no recommendations contained in the report as the CCRC counselor was unable to make recommendations without speaking with the child.

This matter came before the court for hearing on July 23rd at which time the court adopted the agreements of the parties and re-referred the parties to CCRC for further recommendations. The court ordered the parties to make the minor available to CCRC for an interview. A review hearing was set for the present date and parties were ordered to file any supplemental declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

Only Respondent appeared remotely at the reset CCRC appointment indicating that he was unclear on the order to have the minor interviewed. He scheduled another CCRC appointment for an interview with the minor on October 6th though neither he nor the minor appeared at that appointment.

Given that Respondent is the moving party and he failed to comply with court orders and failed to appear at CCRC, this matter is dropped from calendar.

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 #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER AND MAKE THE MINOR AVAILABLE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY CCRC.

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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

10. CELESTE SPINA V. ANTHONY CATALANO **24FL0448**

Request for Order filed June 12, 2026

On June 5, 2026, the Court entered a Judgment in this action to which was attached the Court's Findings and Order After Trial for the trial of March 16, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Respondent filed a Motion to Vacate Judgment and Enter Different Judgment, or in Alternative Motion to Reconsider and/or Clarify Judgment. The Motion seeks a modification of the Judgment on three separate issues.

1. Valuation of Little Hurricane LLC at $10,000

As noted in the Findings and Order, the Petitioner stated that she did not want to be awarded Little Hurricane LLC, but nevertheless valued it at $150,000. The Respondent asked that it be awarded to him, but at zero or nominal value. For the reasons stated in the Findings and Order, the Court awarded the asset to the Respondent at a value of $10,000.

Neither party presented at trial any expert opinion or other valuation evidence. From the totality of the evidence presented at the trial, the Court believes that it would be unfair to the Petitioner to award it entirely to the Respondent at zero or nominal value. The Court recognized in the Order that the parties offered the Court little evidence on this issue, but found that $10,000 was reasonably within the range of values estimated by each party.

To be fair to both parties, the Court continues to believe that it would be unfair to award the asset to either party at zero or nominal value. However, the Cour finds the alternative suggested by the Respondent in the current motion to be a reasonable approach to protect the interests of both parties, which would render an evaluation of this asset by the Court to be moot.

The parties shall divide the existing vinyl record inventory of the business equally in-kind, with each party receiving one-half of the physical inventory and thereafter retaining all proceeds from his or her respective share independently.

The Court will modify the existing Judgment to delete the $10,000 valuation of Little Hurricane and to reflect this equal in-kind division and to award each party their respective share of the inventory as their sole and separate property. This modification would result in the equalization payment owing from the Respondent to the Petitioner being reduced by the sum of $5,000 from $57,091 to $52,091.

2. *Watt* Charges to the Respondent of $33,000

As between the parties, the Respondent had the exclusive use of the community property family residence for twenty-two months. In the Findings and Order, the Court found the

reasonable rental value of the residence to be $1,500 per month for a total *Watt* charge of $33,000 owing from the Respondent to the community.

In the current motion, the Respondent claims that the *Watt* charges should be set at zero, because the Court noted in the Findings and Order After Trial that "little or no evidence was presented at trial of the reasonable rental value of the residence."

However, there was substantial evidence presented at trial of the fair market value of the residence. The Court accepted the opinion of the Respondent's expert that the fair market value of the residence was $340,000.

Under these circumstances, the Court is not left with the only alternative being to deny the Petitioner her right to compensation for the Respondent's exclusive use of this community property asset for twenty-two months. Instead, the Court is obligated to use its best judgment from the evidence presented at trial to be fair to both parties. If this were a residence valued at $1,000,000, the Court would find the fair rental value to be much greater than $1,500 per month. Likewise, if this were a residence valued at $100,000, the Court would find the fair rental value to be much less than $1,500 per month. From all of the evidence presented at trial, the Court continues to find the reasonable rental value of this $340,000 residence to be the amount of $1,500 per month.

In the alternative, the Respondent argues that the *Watt* charge should be entered into the property ledger as being one-half the amount of the *Watt* charge, because this community property was already one-half owned by the Respondent himself.

The Court disagrees with this position of the Respondent in the present motion. The $33,000 is owed by the Respondent to the community. One-half of this amount is owed by the Respondent to the Petitioner. By including the full $33,000 on the column of that which is being awarded to the Respondent, it has the effect of increasing the equalization payment owed by the Respondent to the Petitioner by the amount of $16,500, which is correct. Conversely, if only the amount of $16,500 were included on the column of that which is being awarded to the Respondent, it would have the effect of increasing the equalization payment owed by the Respondent to the Petitioner by only $8,250, which is incorrect.

Finally, the evidence presented trial was that, as between the parties, the Respondent had the exclusive use of the community property family residence for twenty-two months. The Court does not believe that it is appropriate to reduce the *Watt* charges due to the fact that the minor children of the parties resided in the residence during the custodial time of the Respondent.

Therefore, there is no change to the *Watt* charges as included in the existing Judgment.

3. Intellectual Property, Licensing, and Synchronization Revenue

The Court agrees with the position of the Respondent raised in the current motion. While it remains true that each party is entitled to one-half of any and all income received by either party attributable to jointly created intellectual property, neither party presented to the Court at trial a fair and equitable means of accomplishing this division without maintaining an ongoing business relationship between the parties. Absent evidence to the contrary, the Court finds that the remedy proposed by the Respondent in the current motion is reasonable.

The existing Judgment is modified to delete the paragraph headed Intellectual Property, Licensing, and Synchronization Revenue, and to replace it with the following:

1. The parties shall divide all existing vinyl record inventory of Little Hurricane LLC equally in kind. Each party shall receive one-half of the physical inventory, by unit count, as agreed or as determined by the Court. Each party shall thereafter own his or her respective inventory as sole and separate property and shall retain one hundred percent of all proceeds from the sale of his or her inventory.

2. Each party's individually registered publishing rights, mechanical royalty accounts, and performance royalty accounts (including but not limited to ASCAP, BMI, and Songtrust accounts registered in each party's name) shall be confirmed as each party's sole and separate property. The parties shall cooperate to correct any misregistrations, including any compositions registered under a party's name on Songtrust that should be corrected to reflect individual ownership.

3. In the event a third party makes a rights purchase offer specifically for jointly created musical composition (i.e., a composition on which both parties hold a co-authorship credit), the parties shall share equally in the net proceeds of such transaction, after deduction of any applicable fees, commissions, or legal costs. Such transactions are separately identifiable and shall be addressed on a case-by-case basis without need for ongoing quarterly accounting.

4. The quarterly accounting requirement of the Judgment shall be vacated. Because mechanical royalties and publishing income are separately collected and

distributed by each party's individual accounts, and because the inventory division as provided herein eliminates any ongoing joint commercial enterprise, there is no continuing basis for mutual accounting obligations between the parties.

Request for Order filed October 8, 2026

On October 8, 2026, the Petitioner filed in this action a Request for Order seeking "Enforcement and Clarification/Sanctions." On October 12, 2026, the Petitioner filed in this action a Proof of Electronic Service, showing electronic service of the Request for Order on the Respondent's attorney at Jason@westcoastdivorce.com. On October 13, 2026, the Respondent's attorney filed a Notice of Limited Scope Representation, stating that his representation of the Respondent was thereafter limited to the Request for Order filed by the Respondent on June 12, 2026. Neither the Respondent nor his attorney have responded to the Request for Order filed by the Petitioner on October 8, 2026.

The Request for Order filed by the Petitioner on October 8, 2026, raises issues which are related to the Request for Order filed by the Respondent on June 12, 2026, and which are directly affected by the Court's ruling on those issues. Therefore, the Court is continuing the hearing on the Request for Order filed by the Petitioner on October 8, 2026, to January 21, 2027, at 8:30 a.m. in Department 5 (Judge Oakley).

Both parties are ordered to comply with all orders in this action as modified by the rulings by the Court on the Request for Order of June 12, 2026. The Respondent shall file and appropriately serve a Responsive Declaration to the Request for Order of October 8, 2026, no later than December 30, 2026. The Petitioner shall file and appropriately serve a Reply no later than January 14, 2027.

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4;00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

11. N. TRUXLER V. C. TRUXLER **23FL0639**

On April 29, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking submission of the Judgment, passport issues, and child support orders. The matter came before the court for hearing on July 23rd, at which time the court re-referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and the parties agreed that Respondent may begin the process of obtaining a passport for the child but no international travel was to take place pending the next hearing. The issue of support was continued to be heard in Department 10 by the Child Support Commissioner. A review hearing was set for the present date on all remaining issues.

On July 29th, Petitioner filed an RFO seeking child custody and child support orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Both documents were served on Respondent on July 29th, however she failed to serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling and the required blank FL-320. DCSS has not been served. This matter is dropped from calendar due to Petitioner's failure to serve DCSS.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration on November 2nd. Once again, only Respondent was served.

The parties attended CCRC on October 2nd and were able to reach some agreements. A report with those agreements, and recommendations, was prepared on October 27, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on October 28th.

Respondent filed and served a reply to the CCRC report on November 4th.

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody with professionally supervised visits to Petitioner. Alternatively, he requests sole decision-making authority regarding the minor's passport and international travel. He also asks that the Judgment, which was prepared in 2024, be submitted to include the October 2025 custody orders and any orders regarding Respondent's requests made herein.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: PETITIONER'S JULY 29, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO HER FAILURE TO SERVE ALL PARTIES TO THE ACTION. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE REMAINING ISSUES.

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*

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

12. EDC DCSS V. BENJAMIN WOOD (OTHER PARENT: SYDNEY GANN) 23FL1216

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 11, 2026, following the denial of an ex parte application for emergency orders. Other Parent is requesting modification of the current custody and parenting time orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 30, 2026 and a review hearing on November 12, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing either Petitioner or Respondent were properly served.

Other Parent filed a declaration on September 28, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, it has not been considered.

Respondent filed a declaration on September 30, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Only Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was prepared on September 30th and mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Declaration on October 5, 2026, there is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, it has not been considered.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

13. STEPHANIE AMMONS V. KYLE CATLIN PFL20190640

On July 22, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as child support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on October 1, 2026 and a review hearing on November 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served with some, but not all the required documents, on September 26, 2026.

Neither party appeared for the CCRC appointment.

Respondent filed a declaration on October 1, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

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 #13: 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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

14. PAMELA DEHERRERA V. JULIAN DEHERRERA 23FL0888

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 11, 2026, seeking a stay of the order to sell the former family residence. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served, as such the September 11th RFO is dropped from calendar.

Petitioner filed an amended RFO on October 16, 2026, seeking property control orders, attorney's fees and costs, as well as reimbursement costs. Petitioner did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on October 18, 2026.

Petitioner filed a declaration on October 20, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on October 29, 2026. Proof of Service shows personal service on Petitioner on October 29, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration and objections on October 30, 2026. Proof of Service shows personal service on Respondent on November 1, 2026.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. Petitioner's objections are noted. The court has not considered any hearsay statements offered by either party. The court finds the issues raised by Petitioner are res judicata, meaning there are current orders in place regarding the property control as well as the sale of the home. There was a trial on the issue of the sale of the home, and the court made orders at the conclusion of trial. The court ordered the sale of the home in 2024. That order remains in full force and effect. The home is to be listed for sale forthwith. The parties are ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home in furtherance of its sale. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional to make the home available for showings and to communicate with the real estate professional as needed. The real estate professional is authorized to determine the listing price for the home. The parties are ordered to accept any reasonable offer for the purchase of the home if one is received. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner. The parties are to comply with the judgment regarding the proceeds of the sale of the home. The court has previously denied Petitioner's request for *Watt's* charges and *Epstein* credits. That issue is res judicata and Petitioner's request remains denied.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

As to Petitioner's request for attorney's fees, the court finds Petitioner failed to file an Income and Expense Declaration as required. As such, any request for attorney's fees under Family Code section 2030, is denied. Further, Petitioner failed to include the requisite FL-319 and FL-158. It is unclear to the court if Petitioner is seeking Family Code section 271 attorney's fees. If that is the case, the request is likewise denied, as Petitioner failed to file an Income and Expense Declaration. Further, Petitioner is self-represented. As such, an award of attorney's fees would be inappropriate. In re Marriage of Erndt and Terhorst, 59 Cal. App. 5th 898 (2023).

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 #14: PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS ARE NOTED. THE COURT HAS NOT CONSIDERED ANY HEARSAY STATEMENTS OFFERED BY EITHER PARTY. THE COURT FINDS THE ISSUES RAISED BY PETITIONER ARE RES JUDICATA, MEANING THERE ARE CURRENT ORDERS IN PLACE REGARDING THE PROPERTY CONTROL AS WELL AS THE SALE OF THE HOME. THERE WAS A TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF THE SALE OF THE HOME, AND THE COURT MADE ORDERS AT THE CONCLUSION OF TRIAL. THE COURT ORDERED THE SALE OF THE HOME IN 2024. THAT ORDER REMAINS IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE HOME IS TO BE LISTED FOR SALE FORTHWITH. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL IS AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE THE LISTING PRICE FOR THE HOME. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. THE PARTIES ARE TO COMPLY WITH THE JUDGMENT REGARDING THE PROCEEDS OF THE SALE OF THE HOME. THE COURT HAS PREVIOUSLY DENIED PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR *WATT'S* CHARGES AND *EPSTEIN* CREDITS. THAT ISSUE IS RES JUDICATA AND PETITIONER'S REQUEST REMAINS DENIED.

AS TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES, THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER FAILED TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AS REQUIRED.

AS SUCH, ANY REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES UNDER FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030, IS DENIED. FURTHER, PETITIONER FAILED TO INCLUDE THE REQUISITE FL-319 AND FL-158. IT IS UNCLEAR TO THE COURT IF PETITIONER IS SEEKING FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 ATTORNEY'S FEES. IF THAT IS THE CASE, THE REQUEST IS LIKEWISE DENIED, AS PETITIONER FAILED TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. FURTHER, PETITIONER IS SELF-REPRESENTED. AS SUCH, AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE. IN RE MARRIAGE OF ERNDT AND TERHORST, 59 CAL. APP. 5TH 898 (2023).

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.

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

15. KRISTIN LAMINSKI-WADLE V. DANE WADLE 23FL0536

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 14, 2026, requesting a change in venue from El Dorado County to Placer County. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215, though it does not appear Respondent was served with a blank FL-320.

The matter was originally set to be heard on September 10, 2026, at which time it was continued to allow Petitioner additional time to properly serve Respondent.

Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with all required documents on October 13, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on October 16, 2026. It was served on Petitioner on October 16, 2026. Respondent object to the transfer to Placer County.

Pursuant to Civil Procedure Section 397, the court may, upon a properly noticed motion, transfer any matter where the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 397(a). The burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for a change of venue. Fontaine v. Sup. Ct., 175 Cal. App. 4th 830 (2009). The court finds the convenience of the parties and the interest of justice are served by transferring the matter to Placer County. Neither party nor the minors have resided in El Dorado County since 2024. The court, therefore, grants the request to transfer venue to Placer County. Petitioner is ordered to pay the fees or obtain a fee waiver to effectuate the transfer to Placer County.

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 #15: THE COURT FINDS THE CONVENIENCE OF THE PARTIES AND THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE ARE SERVED BY TRANSFERRING THE MATTER TO PLACER COUNTY. NEITHER PARTY NOR THE MINORS HAVE RESIDED IN EL DORADO COUNTY SINCE 2024. THE COURT, THEREFORE, GRANTS THE REQUEST TO TRANSFER VENUE TO PLACER COUNTY. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY THE FEES OR OBTAIN A FEE WAIVER TO EFFECTUATE THE TRANSFER TO PLACER COUNTY.

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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

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

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

16. GREGORY MALLEY V. AMBER MALLEY **26FL0657**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 20, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, following the denial of an ex parte application for emergency custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 28, 2026, and a review hearing on November 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on August 27, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on October 23, 2026. It was served the same day.

Both parties and the minors participated in the CCRC appointment. A report with a partial agreement and further recommendations was prepared on October 23, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on October 26th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on October 28, 2026. It was served by mail on October 24, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on October 30, 2026. It was served the same day.

Respondent filed two additional Declarations on November 4, 2026. Neither has a Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

The court finds the custody and parenting plan orders necessitate a move-away analysis. As such, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to select Mandatory Settlement Conference and trial dates.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS THE CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN ORDERS NECESSITATE A MOVE-AWAY ANALYSIS. AS SUCH, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

17. MADISON MOODY V. MAURICE MOODY 25FL1089

On July 2, 2026, parties appeared for the hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO). The parties reached agreements, including setting a review hearing for a step-up in parenting time and child support. Parties were directed to file and serve updated Income and Expense Declarations as well as Supplemental Declarations at least 10 day prior to the hearing. The court reserved jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the sate of the filing of the RFO.

On September 2, 2026, parties agreed by stipulation to continue the October 1, 2026 review hearing to November 12, 2026.

Upon review of the court file, neither party has filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration nor a Supplemental Declaration. As such, the court drops the review hearing from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: NEITHER PARTY HAS FILED AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION NOR A SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION. AS SUCH, THE COURT DROPS THE REVIEW HEARING FROM CALENDAR. 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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

18. JESSICA RUBACALVA V. ISIAH RUBALCALVA 24FL0018

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 21, 2026, seeking an order deeming Petitioner to be a vexatious litigant. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was electronically served with only the FL-300.

Respondent filed a declaration on September 29, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was electronically served on September 29, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on October 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing this document was properly served, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service. However, Petitioner is strongly cautioned, that her litigation tactics and repeated misuse of the ex parte process may result in a finding of vexatious litigant or other sanctions. The court limits the number of ex parte proceedings daily; Petitioner has repeatedly reserved an ex parte hearing and failed to file. This has resulted in other matters seeking ex parte applications not being scheduled, that otherwise would have had an opportunity to be heard earlier. Further, Petitioner has repeatedly filed ex parte applications, when there have been no exigent circumstances and the application did not meet the requirements of Family Code section 3064 (a) or California Rule of Court 5.151. Should Petitioner's patterns continue, the court may make a finding of vexatious litigant and/or impose sanctions.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: 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.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

19. KIP WEBER V. KATHERINE WEBER **PFL20180264**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 16, 2026, seeking modification of the current child support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was mail served on September 28, 2026. The court finds this is a post-judgment request for modification, and therefore, Family Code section 215 applies. Upon review of the court file, there is no filed address verification.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration. on October 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to determine if there is a waiver in the defect in service of the RFO and Responsive Declaration.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO DETERMINE IF THERE IS A WAIVER IN THE DEFECT IN SERVICE OF THE RFO AND RESPONSIVE DECLARATION.

11/12/26
Department 5
Tentative Rulings

20. CHALLYN WILLIAMS V. MARK WILLIAMS **PFL20210389**

On January 7, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking final decision-making authority on the minor's school as well as medical decisions regarding vaccinations. This followed a denied ex parte application making the same requests. Respondent was personally served on January 8, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 26, 2026. It was mail served on Petitioner on the same day. Respondent is opposed to the request.

Petitioner filed another ex parte application on March 10th. The court authorized Petitioner to make legal decisions regarding the minor's need to extract a tooth only. On March 11, 2026, Petitioner filed an RFO, requesting legal decision-making authority regarding treatment for the minor. Proof of Service shows it was served on March 13th.

On March 12, 2026, the court adopted its tentative ruling referring the parties to CCRC with an appointment on April 6, 2026 and a review hearing on June 4, 2026.

Petitioner again filed an RFO on March 20th in conjunction with an ex parte request. Once again, the ex parte request was denied. The RFO was not set for a hearing.

Petitioner filed two declarations on March 20th. They were served on March 22nd.

Both parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 6, 2026. The parties were able to reach agreements. A report with the parties' agreements was filed with the court on April 8, 2026, and mail served on the parties the same day.

Both parties appeared at the hearing on June 4, 2026. The court rereferred the parties to CCRC to address this issues that were raised in the January 7th RFO, that were not addressed. The court set a CCRC appointment for July 17, 2026 and a review hearing for September 3, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

On August 31, 2026, Respondent filed a Request to Continue the review hearing to allow the minor to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor. The court granted the request and directed the parties to make the minor available for the interview per the CCRC counselors instructions. The court continued the review hearing to November 12, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

The minor was interviewed by the CCRC counselor. A report was prepared on September 28, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the September 28, 2206 CCRC report to be in the best

interest of the minor. The court notes the recommendations incorporate prior orders which remain in the minor's best interest.

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 #20: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2206 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT NOTES THE RECOMMENDATIONS INCORPORATE PRIOR ORDERS WHICH REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST.

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.

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.