

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

1. EDC DCSS V. BENJAMIN DAVID WOOD

23FL1216

On October 9, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and property control orders as well as a change of venue. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: 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

January 15, 2026

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

2. ASHLEY BARTON-SCHIELE V. JASON MCKERCHER

25FL0800

On September 30, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and support orders. She filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail-served on October 2nd.

Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on October 16th. Both documents were served on October 17th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 20th and were able to reach several agreements. A report containing those agreements was prepared on November 20th. It was mailed to the parties on November 24th.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on December 2nd. She filed and served Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Income on January 8, 2026.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements contained in the November 20, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Utilizing the figures as set forth in the parties' Income and Expense Declarations, the court finds that child support is \$1,496 per month. (See attached XSpouse report.) The court adopts the attached XSpouse report and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$1,496 per month as and for child support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of October 1, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$5,984 through and including January 1, 2026. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$166.22 on the 15th of each month commencing on February 15, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 36 months). If any payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Petitioner has requested an *Ostler/Smith* table however it is unclear if she is requesting a monthly overtime table or an annual bonus table. Additionally, it does not appear from Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration that he earns either. Accordingly, the court is not ordering an *Ostler/Smith* table at this time.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to maintain the children on Petitioner's insurance and equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children, as well as childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures set forth in the attached FL-192.

Given that Petitioner has primary physical custody of the children, she may continue claiming both children on her annual tax returns.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE NOVEMBER 20, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$1,496 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,496 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,984 THROUGH AND INCLUDING JANUARY 1, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$166.22 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 15, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 36 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

THE COURT IS NOT ORDERING AN OSTLER/SMITH TABLE AT THIS TIME.

IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING MONTHLY SUPPORT PAYMENTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MAINTAIN THE CHILDREN ON PETITIONER'S INSURANCE AND EQUALLY SHARE IN ANY UNINSURED MEDICAL CARE COSTS FOR THE CHILDREN, AS WELL AS CHILDCARE COSTS WHEN SUCH COSTS ARE INCURRED AS A RESULT OF EMPLOYMENT OR NECESSARY EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE ATTACHED FL-192.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

**GIVEN THAT PETITIONER HAS PRIMARY PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE CHILDREN,
SHE MAY CONTINUE CLAIMING BOTH CHILDREN ON HER ANNUAL TAX RETURNS.**

**PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER
HEARING.**

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

| Fixed Shares | Father | Mother | Monthly figures | Cash Flow | Guideline | Proposed |
|--------------------------|---------|--------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
| #of children | 0 | 2 | 2026 | Comb. net spendable | 10116 | 10116 |
| % time with NCP | 15.00 % | 0.00 % | GUIDELINE | Percent change | 0% | 0% |
| Filing status | SINGLE | HH/MLA | Nets(adjusted) | Father | | |
| # exemptions | 1 * | 3 * | | Payment cost/benefit | -1496 | -1496 |
| Wages+salary | 6400 | 7240 | Father | Net spendable income | 3298 | 3298 |
| Self-employed income | 0 | 0 | Mother | Change from guideline | 0 | 0 |
| Other taxable income | 250 | 0 | Total | % of combined spendable | 33% | 33% |
| TANF+CS received | 0 | 0 | Support | % of saving over guideline | 0% | 0% |
| Other nontaxable income | 0 | 0 | Addons | Total taxes | 1556 | 1556 |
| New spouse income | 0 | 0 | Guideln CS | Dep. exemption value | 0 | 0 |
| 401(k) employee contrib | 0 | 0 | Alameda SS | # withholding allowances | 0 | 0 |
| Adjustments to income | 0 | 0 | Total | Net wage paycheck | 4699 | 4699 |
| SS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | | Mother | | |
| CS paid prev marriage | 300 | 0 | | Payment cost/benefit | 1496 | 1496 |
| Health insurance | 0 | 563 | | Net spendable income | 6818 | 6818 |
| Other medical expense | 0 | 0 | | Change from guideline | 0 | 0 |
| Property tax expense | 0 | 0 | Proposed | % of combined spendable | 67% | 67% |
| Ded interest expense | 0 | 0 | Tactic 9 | % of saving over guideline | 0% | 0% |
| Charitable contributions | 0 | 0 | | Total taxes | 805 | 805 |
| Misc tax deductions | 0 | 0 | CS | Dep. exemption value | 0 | 0 |
| Qual bus income ded | 0 | 0 | SS | # withholding allowances | 0 | 0 |
| Required union dues | 0 | 0 | Total | Net wage paycheck | 5677 | 5677 |
| Mandatory retirement | 0 | 550 | | | | |
| Hardship deduction | 0 * | 0 * | Saving | | | |
| Other GDL deductions | 0 | 0 | Releases | | | |
| Child care expenses | 0 | 0 | | | | |

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

| | Timeshare | cce(F) | cce(M) | Addons | Payor | Basic CS | Payor | Pres CS | Payor |
|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|
| All children | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Father | 1496 | Father | 1496 | Father |
| | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Father | 544 | Father | 544 | Father |
| | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Father | 952 | Father | 952 | Father |

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

Your child support order may include a provision for payment of childcare or uninsured health care costs. Childcare costs may be included as part of the monthly child support payment or reimbursable as a percentage of the costs. If the childcare costs are included as part of the monthly child support payment, you must pay that amount each month until the court changes (modifies) the child support order. If you need to change your child support order because there has been a change in the cost of childcare, see page 2.

If you have a child support order that includes a provision for the reimbursement of a percentage of childcare costs or a portion of the child's or children's health care costs and those costs are not paid by insurance, the **law says**:

- 1. Notice.** You must give the other parent an itemized statement of the charges that have been billed for any childcare costs or health care costs not paid by insurance. You must give this statement to the other parent within a reasonable time, but no more than 90 days after those costs were given to you.
- 2. Proof of full payment.** If you have already paid all of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid them and (2) ask for reimbursement for the other parent's court-ordered share of those costs.
- 3. Proof of partial payment.** If you have paid only your share of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid your share, (2) ask that the other parent pay his or her share of the costs directly to the childcare or health care provider, and (3) give the other parent the information necessary for that parent to be able to pay the bill.
- 4. Payment by notified parent.** If you receive notice from a parent that a childcare or uninsured health care cost has been incurred, you must pay your share of that cost within the time the court orders; or if the court has not specified a period of time, you must make payment (1) within 30 days from the time you were given notice of the amount due, (2) according to any payment schedule set by the health care provider, (3) according to a schedule agreed to in writing by you and the other parent, or (4) according to a schedule adopted by the court.
- 5. Going to court.** Sometimes parents get into disagreements about childcare and health care costs. If you and the other parent cannot resolve the situation after talking about it, you can request that the court make a decision.

- Disputed requests for payment.** If you dispute a request for payment made by the other parent, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute, but only if you pay the requested amount before filing your request.
- Nonpayment.** If you claim that the other parent has failed to pay you back for a payment, or they have failed to make a payment to the provider after proper notice, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute.
- Paid charges.** The court will presume that if uninsured health care costs or childcare costs for employment or necessary training for job skills have been paid, those costs were reasonable. If you want to dispute paid charges, you will have to show the court that the costs were unreasonable.
- Attorney's fees.** If the court decides one parent has been unreasonable, it can order that parent to pay the other parent's attorney's fees and costs.
- Court forms.** Use forms FL-300 and FL-490 to get a court date. See form FL-300-INFO for information about completing, filing, and serving your court papers.
- Court-ordered insurance coverage.** If a parent provides health care insurance as ordered by the court, that insurance must be used at all times to the extent that it is available for health care costs.
 - Burden to prove.** The parent claiming that the coverage is inadequate to meet the child's needs has the burden of proving that to the court.
 - Cost of additional coverage.** If a parent purchases health care insurance in addition to that ordered by the court, that parent must pay all the costs of the additional coverage. In addition, if a parent uses alternative coverage that costs more than the coverage provided by court order, that parent must pay the difference.
- Preferred health providers.** If the court-ordered coverage designates a preferred health care provider, that provider must be used at all times consistent with the terms of the health insurance policy. When any parent uses a health care provider other than the preferred provider, any health care costs that would have been paid by the preferred health provider if that provider had been used must be the sole responsibility of the parent incurring those costs.
- Need help?** Contact the family law facilitator in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

The court has made a child support order in your case. This order will remain the same unless one of the parents requests that the support be changed (modified). An order for child support can be modified by filing a request to change child support and serving the other parent. If both parents agree on a new child support amount, they can complete, sign, and file with the court a *Stipulation to Establish or Modify Child Support and Order* (form FL-350). (Note: If the local child support agency is involved in your case, it must be served with any request to change child support and approve any agreement.)

Online Self-Help Guide

For more information about how child support works, visit: <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support>.

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

The court considers several things when ordering the payment of child support.

- First, the number of children is considered, along with the percentage of time each parent has physical custody of the children.
- Next, the net disposable incomes of both parents are determined (which is how much money is left each month after taxes and certain other items like health insurance, union dues, or other child support ordered and paid are subtracted from a parent's paycheck). The court can also look at a parent's earning ability.
- The court considers both parents' tax filing status and may consider hardships, such as the cost of raising the parent's child from another relationship who lives with the parent.

A parent can request to change an existing order for child support when circumstances change significantly. For example if the net disposable income of one of the parents changes, parenting time changes, or a new child is born.

Examples

- You have been ordered to pay \$500 per month in child support. You lose your job. You will continue to owe \$500 per month, plus 10 percent interest on any unpaid support, unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a lower amount and the court orders a reduction.
- You are currently receiving \$300 per month in child support from the other parent, whose net income has just increased substantially. You will continue to receive \$300 per month unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a higher amount and the court orders an increase.
- You are paying child support based on having physical custody of your children 30 percent of the time. After several months it turns out that you actually have physical custody of the children 50 percent of the time. You may file a motion to modify child support to a lower amount.

How to Change a Child Support Order

To change a child support order, you must file papers with the court. Remember: You must follow the order you have now.

What forms do I need?

If you are asking to change a child support order, you must fill out one of these forms:

- Form FL-300, *Request for Order* or
- Form FL-390, *Notice of Motion and Motion for Simplified Modification of Order for Child, Spousal, or Family Support*

You must also fill out one of these forms, and attach proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs):

- Form FL-150, *Income and Expense Declaration* or
- Form FL-155, *Financial Statement (Simplified)*

What if I am not sure which forms to fill out?

Contact the family law facilitator in your county. You can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

After you fill out the forms, file them with the court clerk and ask for a hearing date. Write the hearing date on the form. The clerk may ask you to pay a filing fee. If you cannot afford the fee, fill out these forms, too:

- Form FW-001, *Request to Waive Court Fees and*
- Form FW-003, *Order on Court Fee Waiver (Superior Court)*

You must serve the other parent. If the local child support agency is involved, serve it too.

- This means someone 18 or over—not you—must deliver copies of your filed court forms to the other parent, at least **16 court days** before the hearing. Add **5 calendar days** if delivered by mail within California (see Code of Civil Procedure section 1005 for other situations).
- **Court days** are weekdays when the court is open for business (Monday through Friday except court holidays). **Calendar days** include all days of the month, including weekends and holidays. To find court holidays, go to: www.courts.ca.gov/holidays.htm.

Blank copies of both of these forms must also be served:

- Form FL-320, *Responsive Declaration to Request for Order*
- Form FL-150, *Income and Expense Declaration*

Then the server fills out and signs a *Proof of Service*. Take this form, plus one copy, to the clerk and file it at least one week before your hearing.

Go to your hearing and ask the judge to change the support. Bring your tax returns from the last two years and your proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs). The judge will look at your information, listen to both parents, and make an order. After the hearing, fill out:

- Form FL-340, *Findings and Order After Hearing and*
- Form FL-342, *Child Support Information and Order Attachment*

Need help?

Contact the family law facilitator in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

- Child support.** As of September 27, 2022, child support automatically stops if the parent who has to pay is confined against their will for more than 90 days in a row in jail, prison, juvenile detention, a mental health facility, or other institution.

Exception. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay has money available to pay child support.

- Past confinement.** Child support also automatically stops during past confinement if it was ordered from October 8, 2015, through December 31, 2019, or January 1, 2021, through September 26, 2022, and the parent who has to pay was confined for more than 90 days in a row during the same time frame.

Exceptions for past confinement. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay was in jail or prison for failing to pay child support or for domestic violence against the other parent or the child, or if they had money available to pay support.

- Timing.** The date child support automatically restarts will depend on the parent's release date. If you need to change your child support order, see page 2.

- If released before January 1, 2024,** child support automatically restarts the first day of the first full month after the parent is released.
- If released after January 1, 2024,** child support will automatically restart the first day of the 10th month after the parent is released.

Employment before the 10-month period ends: If the parent who has to pay support starts working before the date child support is set to automatically restart, the person who is owed support or the local child support agency can request the court restart the child support order early. The court may order a different amount of child support if appropriate.

- More info.** For more information about child support and incarcerated parents, see Family Code section 4007.5 or go to <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support/incarcerated-parent>. You can also contact the family law facilitator in your county and can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

3 & 4. KARA BLANKENSHIP V. ADAM BLANKENSHIP

25FL0210 & 25FL0233

On March 5, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). A Temporary DVRO was granted on July 1, 2025 naming Petitioner and the children as protected parties. The parties were ordered to attend Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) which they did on August 7, 2025. They were unable to reach agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on September 8th, it was mailed to the parties on September 9th.

Respondent filed and served a Declaration of Adam Blankenship Regarding Child Custody and Visitation on August 6th.

Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner Regarding Child Custody and an Income and Expense Declaration on September 8th.

Respondent requests joint legal and joint physical custody with unsupervised parenting time during his off days from work for at least 2-3 days. Eventually he would like to move to a 50/50 parenting plan.

Petitioner is requesting the court make orders regarding the marital residence consistent with her proposed settlement agreement dated August 29, 2025.

On June 30, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was originally set to be heard on September 11th, however, given that a CCRC review hearing was already set for the present date under the DVRO matter, the parties stipulated to continue the hearing on the RFO to join with the CCRC review.

The parties appeared for the hearing on September 18, 2025. The court continued the custody and parenting time issues to allow Minors' Counsel additional time to complete her investigation. The court also continued the issues of child and spousal support and continued to reserve jurisdiction to retroactively modify support back to the date of the request.

On October 2, 2025, Minors' Counsel filed an ex parte application for emergency visitation orders, seeking a suspension in Respondent's parenting time. Both Petitioner and Respondent filed Responsive Declarations. The court granted Minors' Counsel's request on an ex parte basis, temporarily suspending Respondent's parenting time, pending the hearing on October 30th. Minors' Counsel filed an RFO on October 6, 2025, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

Minors' Counsel filed a Declaration on October 9, 2025. Parties were served the same day.

The parties again appeared for the hearing on October 30th and again requested a continuance. The continuance was granted, and parties were ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on January 6th. Respondent has not filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3 & 4: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

5. CANDICE CHURCHILL V. JON CHURCHILL

24FL0358

On November 20, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel discovery responses, to continue the trial date, and sanctions. She filed her Memorandum of Points and Authorities, her Separate Statement, and a Declaration of Candice Churchill in support of her RFO. All required documents were served on November 25th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 7th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b), which states all opposition papers are to be filed nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, “[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have January 2nd the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration. Due to its lateness, the court cannot consider this document.

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

January 15, 2026

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

6. MERCEDES DAVIS V. SHATIZ MELONSON

24FL0236

On October 16, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a change of venue. There is no Proof of Service for this document and Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order therefore this matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

8. DEBRA KACZOR V. ROBERT KACZOR

PFL20100757

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 9, 2025 seeking orders regarding child support arrears. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the matter is dropped from calendar.

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

January 15, 2026

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

9. MADISON MEXIA V. JOSEPH MEXIA

25FL0339

On October 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) and an Income and Expense Declaration. Both documents were mail served on December 1st.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on January 8th and his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 9th. There is no Proof of Service for these documents therefore the court cannot consider them.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the children, as well as guideline child and spousal support. She is also seeking \$6,500 in attorney's fees and an order for the parties to exchange addresses where the children will be during visits. Petitioner further asks that Respondent's visits with the children be supervised or, alternatively, that the parties be ordered to refrain from drugs and alcohol use at least 24 hours before and during, their respective parenting time.

"For all hearings involving child, spousal, or domestic partner support, both parties must complete, file, and serve a current Income and Expense Declaration." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(1); See also Cal. Fam. Code §2100. "Current" means the form has been completed within the past three months providing no facts have changed." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(3).

Because Petitioner's Income and Expense Declaration is just outside the three month period, and because Respondent failed to serve his Income and Expense Declaration so it cannot be considered, the court is continuing this matter.

This matter is continued to 02/26/2026 at 8:30 AM in department 5. Respondent is ordered to serve his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration with the required supporting documents and file Proofs of Service with the court. Petitioner is ordered to file and serve her updated Income and Expense Declaration. Parties are to file Supplemental Declarations, if any, no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date. The court reserves jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the date of the filing of the RFO.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 02/26/2026 AT 8:30 AM IN
DEPARTMENT 5. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE HIS RESPONSIVE
DECLARATION TO REQUEST FOR ORDER AND HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE
DECLARATION WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AND FILE PROOFS OF
SERVICE WITH THE COURT. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE HER
UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. PARTIES ARE TO FILE**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THE RFO.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

10. CASSANDRA SAENZ V. BRITTANY GARCIA

24FL0925

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO), on July 9, 2025, seeking child custody orders as well as child and spousal support orders. The parties appeared for the hearing on September 18, 2025, at which time the court granted the request for a 3111 evaluation and a review hearing was set for the present date. The court reserved jurisdiction on the issues of child and spousal support and ordered both parties to file updated Income and Expense Declarations no later than ten days prior to the hearing.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on December 23rd.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration and her Income and Expense Declaration were both filed and served on December 30th.

According to Respondent, the 3111 evaluation is anticipated to be completed in early February. As such, the court is setting a review hearing on 3/12/2026 at 8:30 AM in department 5 for receipt and review of the 3111 custody evaluation. The parties are to submit Supplemental Declarations, if any, no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Regarding support, Respondent's request to impute Petitioner with income in the amount of \$7,720.26 per month is granted. Given the offer letter attached to Petitioner's Income and Expense Declaration, the court finds that Petitioner has the ability and opportunity to earn the aforementioned amount and therefore, imputation of income is warranted.

Respondent's request to set spousal support to \$0 is denied.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined above, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$575 per month from Respondent to Petitioner but child support is \$1,273 per month from Petitioner to Respondent. This works out to a net monthly payment of \$698 per month paid by Petitioner to Respondent. The court adopts the attached XSpouse report and orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$698 per month as and for child support, payable on the 15th of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of July 15, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$4,188 through and including January 15, 2026. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$174.50 on the 1st of each month commencing on February 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

(approximately 24 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable within five (5) days, with legal interest.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: ACCORDING TO RESPONDENT, THE 3111 EVALUATION IS ANTICIPATED TO BE COMPLETED IN EARLY FEBRUARY. AS SUCH, THE COURT IS SETTING A REVIEW HEARING ON 03/12/2026 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 FOR RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF THE 3111 CUSTODY EVALUATION. THE PARTIES ARE TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.

REGARDING SUPPORT, RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO IMPUTE PETITIONER WITH INCOME IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,720.26 PER MONTH IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO SET SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO \$0 IS DENIED.

THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$575 PER MONTH FROM RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER BUT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$1,273 PER MONTH FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT. THIS WORKS OUT TO A NET MONTHLY PAYMENT OF \$698 PER MONTH PAID BY PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOSUE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$698 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF JULY 15, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,188 THROUGH AND INCLUDING JANUARY 15, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$174.50 ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS, WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

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.

2026 Guideline Summary Monthly Figures

| Fixed Shares | Party_A | Party_B | Monthly Figures | | Cash Flow |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Number of children | 0 | 2 | 2026 | Combined net spendable | 14660 |
| Percent time with NCP | 15.00% | 0.00% | | | |
| Filing status | MFJIN | MFJIN | | | |
| Number of exemptions | 1 | 3 | | | |
| Wages and salary | 7720 | 12738 | Party_A | Payment cost/benefit | -698 |
| Self employed income | 0 | 0 | Party_B | Net spendable income | 4922 |
| Other taxable income | 0 | 0 | Total | Federal income tax | 1002 |
| TANF CS received | 0 | 0 | | Federal employment tax | 591 |
| Other nontaxable income | 0 | 0 | | State income tax | 415 |
| New spouse income | 0 | 0 | | State employment tax | 93 |
| Employee 401-k contribution | 0 | 0 | | Total taxes | 2100 |
| Adjustments to income | 0 | 0 | | Federal filing status | MFJIN |
| SS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | | State filing status | MFJIN |
| CS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Health insurance | 0 | 233 | | | |
| Other medical expenses | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Property tax expenses | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Ded interest expense | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Contribution deduction | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Misc tax deductions | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Qualified business income deduction | 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 | | | |

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

| DOB | Timeshare | cce(F) | cce(M) | Addons Payor | Basic CS Payor | Pres CS Payor |
|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| All children | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 Party_A | 1,273 Party_A | 1,273 Party_A |
| 0000-00-00 | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 Party_A | 483 Party_A | 483 Party_A |
| 0000-00-00 | 15 - 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 Party_A | 790 Party_A | 790 Party_A |

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

11. MELANIE SCHWARTZLER V. ROBERT CLINTON

PFL20170631

On October 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and orders regarding Petitioner's alleged refusal to follow court orders. A Supplemental Declaration of Robert Clinton was filed on December 11th. All required documents were electronically served on December 11, 2025 and served by mail on December 15th. However, this is a post-judgment request for modification of custody orders. As such, it was required to be personally served or, if served by mail, Petitioner was required to complete and file a Declaration Regarding Address Verification – Post Judgment Request to Modify a Child Custody, Visitation, or Child Support Order, which she has not done. See Fam. Code § 215.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #11: 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

January 15, 2026

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

12. JASON WARDEN V. JULIE WARDEN

23FL1211

On October 8, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and sanctions. All required documents were electronically served on Respondent on October 20th. A Declaration Regarding Address Verification was also filed, as required by Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed and served an additional Declaration on November 17th.

Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) was scheduled for November 21st, however Respondent refused to participate therefore no recommendations could be made.

On December 2, 2025, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging one cause of action for failure to comply with court orders. The OSC was personally served on December 8th.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on December 12th.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on December 31st.

Petitioner's Reply Declaration was filed on January 7th and served on January 6th.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor. He proposes Respondent's visits take place only at the discretion of the minor. Additionally, he seeks \$3,000 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 for Respondent's failure to comply with custody orders.

Respondent is refusing to participate in mediation and is requesting trial be set on the issue of custody. She further requests the court enforce its prior order for the minor to attend therapy.

The parties are ordered to appear to select trial and MSC dates.

While the court is granting the request to set trial in this matter, the court has significant concern regarding the minor's fear of talking with Petitioner on the phone while at Respondent's home, as well as Respondent's refusal to allow the minor to participate in wrestling and her failure to ensure the minor's attendance at school. As such, pending the trial date, Petitioner shall have sole physical custody of the minor. Respondent shall have visitation with the minor at the minor's sole discretion.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

The parties are to continue sharing joint legal custody however, the parties are ordered to ensure that the minor continues his enrollment at his current school. The parties are further ordered to ensure the minor continues to participate in wrestling if he so chooses. Petitioner is to ensure the minor attends therapy.

The court reserves on the request for Section 271 sanctions until the time of trial on the OSC. The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment on the OSC.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT TRIAL AND MSC DATES FOR THE ISSUE OF CUSTODY. PENDING THE TRIAL DATE, PETITIONER SHALL HAVE SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINOR. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE VISITATION WITH THE MINOR AT THE MINOR'S SOLE DISCRETION.

THE PARTIES ARE TO CONTINUE SHARING JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY HOWEVER THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ENSURE THAT THE MINOR CONTINUES HIS ENROLLMENT AT HIS CURRENT SCHOOL. THE PARTIES ARE FURTHER ORDERED TO ENSURE THE MINOR CONTINUES TO PARTICIPATE IN WRESTLING IF HE SO CHOOSES.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL ON THE OSC. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT ON THE OSC.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

13. ESPERANZA WOOLEVER V. CHRISTOPHER WOOLEVER

PFL20180325

Respondent filed a Request for Order on October 22, 2025, seeking an order compelling Petitioner's responses to discovery as well as sanctions. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on January 5, 2026. They were served on January 2, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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 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

January 15, 2026

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

14. HOLLY CHARLES V. JOSEPH CHARLES

23FL0516

On October 20, 2025, Respondent filed an ex parte application for an emergency order requesting the court's October 16, 2025 orders be vacated. The court denied the request on October 21, 2025. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 21, 2025, seeking an order vacating the October 16, 2025 orders, resetting of oral argument, and stay of enforcement of the October 16th orders. Proof of Service shows the RFO was served on October 21, 2025, however, there is no indication all the required documents were served.

Respondent also filed an RFO on October 20, 2025, requesting sanctions for filing false documents and missing disclosure. Upon review of the court file, the court is unable to locate a Proof of Service which correlates to this RFO.

Respondent filed another RFO on October 27, 2025, requesting reconsideration of the court's October 16, 2025 orders. Proof of Service shows it was served on Petitioner on December 28, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on January 2, 2026. It was served on January 2, 2026.

Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on January 5, 2026. It was served the same day.

The court drops Respondent's October 21st filed RFO from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Petitioner with all required documents. Even if the court were to reach the issue on the merits, the request would be denied. Pursuant to Civil Procedure § 473(b), “[t]he court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 473(b). Where, as here, a mistake in law (such as Respondent's failure to call for a hearing) gives rise to the order in question, the court must determine whether the mistake is grounds to set aside the order under Section 473(b). Generally, a pro per litigant is held to the same standard as a practicing attorney. Goodson v. Bogerts, Inc., 252 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40 (1967) (“One who voluntarily represents himself is not, for that reason, entitled to any more (or less) consideration than a lawyer. Thus, any alleged ignorance of legal matters or failure to properly represent himself can hardly constitute ‘mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect’ as those terms are used in section 473”). As such, relief may be

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

properly denied where the record shows only ‘ignorance of the law coupled with negligence in ascertaining it.’ [Citations omitted]. In considering whether a mistake of law furnishes grounds for relief, ‘the determining factors are the reasonableness of the misconception and the justifiability of lack of determination of the correct law.’ Hopkins & Carley v. Gens, 200 Cal. App. 4th 1401, 1412-1413 (2011).”

The court finds Respondent’s alleged mistakes to not only be unreasonable but also unjustifiable. All RFOs are served with a Notice of Tentative Ruling explaining the procedures. Additionally, every tentative ruling issued by the court specifies that no hearing will be held unless requested by the parties.

The court drops Respondent’s October 20, 2025 filed RFO from calendar as it was not properly served.

Likewise, the court drops Respondent’s October 27, 2025 RFO from calendar as it was not properly served. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states: “Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. December 22, 2025 was the last day for personal service, as such the service on December 28th was late.

Last, the court reserves on Petitioner’s request for Family Code section 271 sanction until the time of trial.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: RESPONDENT’S OCTOBER 20TH, 21ST, AND 27TH, 2025 RFOS ARE DROPPED FROM CALENDAR FOR FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE PETITIONER. THE COURT NOTES THAT EVEN IF IT HAD REACHED THE ISSUES ON THE MERITS, RESPONDENT’S REQUESTS WOULD BE DENIED FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE. THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER’S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

**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

January 15, 2026

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

15. MARY CROWDER V. JEFFERY CROWDER

PFL20120584

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on October 7, 2025. Petitioner asserts five counts of contempt due to Respondent's failure to pay spousal support. This matter was set to be heard on December 4, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on October 22, 2025.

Petitioner filed an application for an Order Shortening Time (OST) and RFO requesting sanctions under the Code of Civil Procedure on October 24, 2025. The court granted the request on October 24th, setting the RFO to join with Respondent's RFO. Petitioner was directed to serve Respondent by no later than October 24th. The court directed Respondent to file a Responsive Declaration by no later than October 28th. Respondent was served electronically on October 24th.

On October 30, 2025, the court continued Petitioner's request for sanctions until the December 4th hearing.

On November 6, 2025, parties submitted a stipulation to continue the December 4th hearings to January 15, 2026, due to the unavailability of Respondent's counsel.

Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration as well as a Supplemental Declaration on December 31, 2025. Both were mail served on December 31st.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on December 31st. It was served the same day.

Petitioner filed a further Supplemental Declaration on January 5, 2026, along with another Income and Expense Declaration. Both were served on January 2, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

16. CARLA FORREST V. GARY FORREST

PFL20180899

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 17, 2025, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on November 17, 2025, and a review hearing on January 15, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared for the CCRC appointment and fully participated. Additionally, the minor was interviewed by the CCRC counselor. The court finds good cause to proceed with the hearing, despite the lack of proper service, as Respondent fully participated and is aware of the requests being made by Petitioner.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

A CCRC report with recommendations was filed with the court and mailed to the parties on January 2, 2026.

The court has read and considered the CCRC report and finds the recommendations to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the January 2nd report.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THE HEARING, DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE, AS RESPONDENT FULLY PARTICIPATED AND IS AWARE OF THE REQUESTS BEING MADE BY PETITIONER. THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE CCRC REPORT AND FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JANUARY 2ND REPORT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

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

January 15, 2026

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

17. MIKE MEDINA V. LEILANI SANCHEZ

25FL1037

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on October 21, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation with the minor. Respondent was served with the Petition and Summons, as well as the RFO and all necessary documents on December 5, 2025.

Respondent filed a Response as well as a Responsive Declaration on December 23, 2025. Respondent confirms Petitioner is the parent of the minor Evangeline. Respondent objects to the requested name change of the minor. Additionally, Respondent is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor and for Petitioner to have professionally supervised parenting time only, due to domestic violence perpetrated by Petitioner during Respondent's pregnancy with the minor. Respondent asserts there is a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) in place protecting her.

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

January 15, 2026

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

18. CHELSEY ROMERO V. ROBERT ROMERO

PFL20190274

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 6, 2025, requesting to augment the current orders. Petitioner was mail served on November 6th. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), who is a party to the case, was properly served. Additionally, this is a post-judgment request for modification and as such compliance with Family Code section 215 is required.

Neither Petitioner nor DCSS have filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

19. KAYLA STABILE V. CAMERYN PESTERFIELD

25FL0603

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on June 27, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 4, 2025, requesting to establish paternity. Proof of Service shows the Petition, Summons, RFO and all required documents were personally served on Respondent's next of kin on November 18, 2025.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

20. ERIC TAYLOR V. LINDSEY TAYLOR

PFL20210087

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 24, 2025, seeking a modification of the current parenting plan. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on November 21, 2025, and a review hearing on January 15, 2026. Petitioner was electronically served on October 20, 2025. The court notes, this is a post-judgement request for modification and as such Family Code section 215 applies. Respondent is requesting a week on/week off schedule with exchanges on Monday after school.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on November 14, 2025. Respondent was electronically served on November 14, 2025. Petitioner does not raise the issue of the defect in service; therefore, the court deems it to be waived. Petitioner objects to the requested change and requests the current parenting plan remain in effect.

Both parties attended CCRC on November 21, 2025, and were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as additional recommendations was filed with the court on December 30, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the parties' agreements and the recommendations as set forth in the December 30th CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE DECEMBER 30TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 15, 2026

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

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

January 15, 2026

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

21. RYAN TOPP V. HAIDEE ANDERSEN

25FL0538

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 27, 2025, seeking to quash the Petition and Summons in this matter. Petitioner was served on December 9, 2025. However, it is unclear whether all the necessary documents were properly served as the Proof of Service is vague.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court notes there is a current case regarding the same parties pending in Florida where Respondent resides with the minor. The courts have scheduled a UCCJEA conference for January 26, 2026. As such, the court finds good cause to continue this hearing until after the UCCJEA conference. The court notes there is currently a review hearing set for March 12th. For judicial economy, the court continues this request to join with the review hearing set on March 12, 2026, at 8:30 AM in Department 5.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT CONTINUES THIS REQUEST TO JOIN WITH THE REVIEW HEARING SET ON MARCH 12, 2026, AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

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