

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

1. ANNIE R. ADAMS V. CHARLES D. MEINTZ

25FL0677

On October 14, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support and a variety of other orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on October 17th. The parties have since submitted a Judgment that appears to resolve all issues, though the Judgment has not yet been reviewed and signed. This matter is continued to 03/26/2026 at 1:30pm in Department 5 to allow additional time for the court to review and sign the Judgment. The court reserves jurisdiction to award support back to the date of filing the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 03/26/2026 AT 1:30PM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL TIME FOR THE COURT TO REVIEW AND SIGN THE JUDGMENT. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AWARD SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

2. JARROD ANDREASEN V. BRANDI ANDREASEN

25FL0567

On October 9, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on October 28th.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on January 6, 2026.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 13th and were able to reach agreements on all issues. A report with those agreements was prepared on January 8, 2026 and mailed to the parties on January 9th.

Respondent is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the minors with a week-on/week-off schedule and a proposed holiday schedule. She further requests guideline child and spousal support and \$7,500 in attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

Petitioner is in agreement with joint custody sharing a week-on/week-off schedule and Respondent's proposed holiday schedule. He does not oppose guideline child support but he does oppose Respondent's request for spousal support and attorney's fees.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements contained in the January 8, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. The holiday schedule set forth in Respondent's FL-341(C) is also found to be in the best interests of the minors and is therefore, also adopted as the order of the court.

Regarding support, the parties are in dispute only on the issue of spousal support. Petitioner maintains that he is paying for, among other things, the entirety of the home mortgage, utilities, and private school tuition for the youngest son. Respondent, however, seemingly also claims that she is paying for the aforementioned and therefore, requires spousal support. As such, the court is awarding guideline spousal support but the parties are ordered to equally split the cost of the mortgage, utilities for the home, and the youngest son's private school tuition.

Utilizing the figures as outlined in the attached Xspouse report, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$465 per month and child support is \$878 per month. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Petitioner to pay

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

Respondent \$1,344 per month as and for child support and 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 October 15, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$5,376 through and including January 15, 2026. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$448 on the 1st of each month commencing on February 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If any payment is late or missed the remaining balance shall become due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, 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). 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, there is a disparity in income between the parties which ultimately results in unequal access to legal representation. However, given that Petitioner is paying for the community tax debt and Respondent's vehicle, the court does find that this decreases his ability to pay for the fees of both parties. Accordingly, the court is ordering Petitioner to pay half of Respondent's attorney fees. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent's attorney \$3,750. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$625 commencing on February 1st and continuing on the 1st of each month until paid in full (approximately 6 months). If any payment is late or missed the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

Respondent 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 JANUARY 8, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE SET FORTH IN RESPONDENT'S FL-341(C) IS ALSO FOUND TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS AND IS THEREFORE ALSO ADOPTED AS THE ORDER OF THE COURT.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE COST OF THE MORTGAGE, UTILITIES FOR THE HOME, AND THE YOUNGEST SON'S PRIVATE SCHOOL TUITION.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

UTILIZING THE FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$465 PER MONTH AND CHILD SUPPORT IS \$878 PER MONTH. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$1,344 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND 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 OCTOBER 15, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,376 THROUGH AND INCLUDING JANUARY 15, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$448 ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE SHALL BECOME DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO PAY HALF OF RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY FEES. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY \$3,750. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$625 COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 1ST AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 6 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

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 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			
% time with NCP	49.99 %	0.00 %	GUIDELINE	Comb. net spendable	13206	13206
Filing status	MFJ->	<-MFJ	Nets(adjusted)	Percent change	0%	0%
# exemptions	1 *	3 *		Father		
Wages+salary	13334	6759	Father	Payment cost/benefit	-1344	-1344
Self-employed income	0	0	Mother	Net spendable income	6972	6972
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	Change from guideline	0	0
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support	% of combined spendable	53%	53%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	Total taxes	3401	3401
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Alameda SS	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	# withholding allowances	0w	0w
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-	Net wage paycheck	9749	9749
CS paid prev marriage	0	0		Mother		
Health insurance	218	145		Payment cost/benefit	1344	1344
Other medical expense	0	0		Net spendable income	6234	6234
Property tax expense	0	0		Change from guideline	0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0	Proposed	% of combined spendable	47%	47%
Charitable contributions	0	0	Tactic 9	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	Total taxes	1724	1724
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Required union dues	466	0	Total	# withholding allowances	0w	0w
Mandatory retirement	933	0		Net wage paycheck	5406	5406
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving			
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases			
Child care expenses	0	0				

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

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

All children	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
	49 - 51	0	0	0	Father	878	Father	878	Father
	49 - 51	0	0	0	Father	336	Father	336	Father
	49 - 51	0	0	0	Father	542	Father	542	Father

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

3. HEIDI BALEME V. PAUL BALEME

PFL20190344

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 30, 2025. She filed a Declaration of Nicholas Musgrove, and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities Concurrently therewith and a Declaration of Heidi Baleme on October 3rd. All required documents were served by mail on October 15th. However, this is a post-judgment request and therefore service was required to comply with Family Code § 215. Nevertheless, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Declaration of Attorney Amber White thereby waiving any potential defect in service. Respondent's documents were filed and served on January 8, 2026. Petitioner filed and served her Reply Declaration on January 14th.

Petitioner is requesting the following orders: (1) Respondent to indemnify Petitioner and hold her harmless from any tax liability, penalties, or interest arising from the 2020 return and amended return, and for the court to retain jurisdiction on this issue; (2) Either equal division of the omitted community assets or, in the event Respondent is found to have acted fraudulently, maliciously, or in bad faith, then the entirety of the omitted assets to be awarded to Petitioner; (3) Respondent to pay Petitioner \$781.55 plus interest, in unpaid bonus support for the period of March 1, 2024 through August 31, 2024; (4) Attorney's fees and costs; (5) Monetary sanctions; and (6) Reservation of jurisdiction over any additional omitted assets.

Respondent does not oppose the request for indemnification regarding the 2020 tax returns. Likewise, he does not oppose the request for reimbursement of timeshare income but he does oppose the request for interest on that amount. Respondent opposes all other requests and asks that he be awarded \$12,824 for the necessity of defending the present motion.

It is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code § 2550. Inherent in that authority is the court's broad discretion to "...make any orders [it] considers necessary..." Fam. Code § 2553. In accordance with that discretion, the court is granting Petitioner's request for indemnification. Respondent is ordered to indemnify and hold Petitioner harmless from any and all tax liability, penalties, or interest arising from the 2020 tax return and the amendment thereto. The court is retaining jurisdiction on this issue.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing on the remaining issues. The court reserves jurisdiction over the requests for sanctions made by both parties.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT IS GRANTING PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR INDEMNIFICATION. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO INDEMNIFY AND HOLD PETITIONER HARMLESS FROM ANY AND ALL TAX LIABILITY, PENALTIES, OR INTEREST ARISING FROM THE 2020 TAX RETURN AND THE AMENDMENT THERETO. THE COURT IS RETAINING JURISDICTION ON THIS ISSUE.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON THE REMAINING ISSUES. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE REQUESTS FOR SANCTIONS MADE BY BOTH PARTIES.

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 22, 2026

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

4. COLBY BROWN V. AMY PARKKO

PFL20180460

On October 15, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and an order for co-parenting counseling. All required documents were personally served on Petitioner on October 22nd.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 17th and were able to reach agreements on some, but not all, issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on November 19th, it was mailed to the parties on November 20th.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 6th.

Respondent is requesting an order for the minor to attend counseling and she asks that she be the parent to select the counselor. She has provided a completed FL-341 which she asks the court to adopt as its orders. She also asks that Petitioner be ordered to provide a certificate of completing a co-parenting course within 60 days if he has not completed one since June of 2024. Finally, she asks that all orders be consolidated to the Findings and Orders After Hearing for this hearing.

Petitioner asks the court to adopt the agreements and recommendations with some modifications. His Responsive Declaration provides a discussion of his proposed modifications.

According to Petitioner, the parties are close to resolving their remaining issues, however, counsel is unavailable for the hearing as currently scheduled. As such, the matter is continued to 02/19/2026 at 8:30am in Department 5 to allow the parties additional time to confer on all issues. Supplemental Declarations, if any, are due to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 02/19/2026 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ALLOW THE PARTIES ADDITIONAL TIME TO CONFER ON ALL ISSUES. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, ARE DUE TO BE FILED AND SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE.

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 22, 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 22, 2026

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

5. LISABETH GOLD V. JEREMY GOLD

24FL1131

On October 15, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 6344. He filed a Declaration of Felix G. Poggemann, a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and a Request for Judicial Notice concurrently therewith. His Income and Expense Declaration was filed on October 23rd. All documents were served on October 23rd however he did not serve the requisite Notice of Tentative Ruling or a blank FL-320.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order or her Income and Expense Declaration. 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, it appears the RFO was properly served on Petitioner. She had notice of the pending request and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat her failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Respondent is requesting a total of \$53,801.64 in attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 6344.

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).

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court does find that Petitioner's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) was frivolous and filed with the intent to harass and intimidate Respondent. Accordingly, Respondent is awarded \$53,801.64 as and for attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 6344. The payment may be made directly to Respondent's counsel in one lump sum or in monthly payments. Monthly payments are set at \$2,000 per month beginning February 1, 2026, and are due on the first of each month until paid in full (approximately 27 months). If there is any missed or late payment, the full amount is due and owing with legal interest.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: RESPONDENT IS AWARDED \$53,801.64 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 6344. THE PAYMENT MAY BE MADE DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS. MONTHLY PAYMENTS ARE SET AT \$2,000 PER MONTH BEGINNING FEBRUARY 1, 2026, AND ARE DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 27 MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT, THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING 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 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 22, 2026

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

6. STEVEN GROVES V. CHERYL GROVES

PFL20110815

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 17, 2025 seeking arrears and reimbursement for orthodontia treatment. The RFO and other documents were served on Petitioner's attorney on December 1st. There is no Proof of Service for the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), nevertheless, DCSS filed and served their Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 29th.

This is a post-judgment request for support 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 failure to properly serve the RFO in accordance with Family Code Section 215.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE THE RFO IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAMILY CODE SECTION 215.

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 22, 2026

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

7. AMY KNIERIEM V. BEAU MICHAEL LEMIRE

24FL0133

On August 25, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to amend the Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) to reflect joint legal custody. The parties attended a hearing on the issue in Department 8 on September 25, 2025 at which time the court referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on November 14th but were unable to reach agreements. A report with recommendations was prepared on December 30, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on December 31, 2025. A revised report was prepared on January 5, 2026.

On January 8th, CCRC interviewed the minor and prepared a Child Interview report. That report was mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner's Updating Declaration was filed and served on January 12th.

Petitioner asks that the current orders remain in place pending her appeal on the court's decision that Respondent rebutted the Section 3044 presumption. Her request for a stay is currently set to be heard in March. She asks for no overnight visits and Respondent's parenting time to be supervised with a neutral supervisor. She asks the court to remove "Mike" as the supervisor and limit third party attendance at the visits.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the January 5, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JANUARY 5, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

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 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 22, 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 22, 2026

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

8. SARAH LAVAGNINO V. ANTHONY LAVAGNINO

PFL20090640

On October 14, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to enforce the court's prior orders. The RFO and Notice of Tentative Ruling were served by mail on October 16th. This is a post-judgment request and as such, the RFO was required to be personally served pursuant to Family Code § 215.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

9. ALEAH MCNABB V. TYLER SWINNEY

22FL0507

On October 15, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were mail served on October 16th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 20th and were able to reach some agreements but they could not agree on all issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on November 26, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on December 2nd.

Petitioner did not file a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order but she did file an RFO seeking sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure § 128.5. That RFO is set to be heard on March 19th.

Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Aleah McNabb in Support of FCS Recommendations on January 8, 2026.

Respondent is requesting primary physical custody of the minor.

Petitioner opposes the request and instead asks the court to adopt the agreements and recommendations contained in the CCRC report. She further asks that electronic devices be withheld from the minor until the parties agree.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the November 20, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the child; as such, they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE NOVEMBER 20, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD; AS SUCH, THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

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 TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 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 22, 2026

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

10. CLARA STEWART V. FRANCISCO MARIN

SFL20190229

This matter has been pending receipt and review of the 3111 report. The parties last appeared before the court on November 20, 2025 at which time the court made several orders regarding custody and visitation, admonished Petitioner for her failure to file court orders, ordered Petitioner to file an 827 motion, and continued the review hearing to the present date. The court reserved jurisdiction over the issue of Section 271 sanctions against Petitioner.

On December 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to modify the court's order for Petitioner to file the 827 motion. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on December 9th.

Respondent also filed an RFO on December 10th, seeking custody and visitation orders and the appointment of Minor's Counsel. Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on December 9th. The RFO was filed on an ex parte basis and the request to appoint Minor's Counsel was granted in that capacity. The remainder of the requests were set to join with the already scheduled hearing date.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Custody/Visitation was filed on January 12, 2026. It was served on January 8th.

Minor's Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions and Request for Orders was also filed and served on January 12th.

Petitioner also filed and served a Declaration on January 12th, asking the court to utilize her MSC Statement as a Supplemental Statement. Petitioner's Statement of Issues and Contentions was filed and served on December 31st.

According to Petitioner, the WIC 827 motion has been filed and is currently set to be heard in March though in her ex parte she requested modifications to the order for an 827 motion. She asks that no changes be made to the current custody and visitation orders until trial on the 3111 evaluation. She further asks that trial be continued until after the hearing on the 827 motion.

Minor's Counsel is recommending joint legal and physical custody. She proposes a 2-2-5-5 parenting plan with Respondent to have Mondays from drop off at school (or 9am if no school) to Wednesdays drop off at school (or 9am if no school). Petitioner to have Wednesdays at school (or 9am if no school) to Friday at school (or 9am if no school). The

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

parties are then to alternate weekends from Friday at school (or 9am) until Monday at school (or 9am). For any exchanges taking place outside of school, the parties are to meet at the Sheriff's substation in Town Center in El Dorado Hills. The non-custodial parent may have a 15 minute telephone call with the child on Saturdays at 7pm. She further proposes the following: (1) the child's watch to remain at Petitioner's home and shall not go with the child while she is at Respondent's home; (2) no restrictions regarding the paternal grandfather spending time with the minor; (3) The parties to participate in co-parenting counseling. Petitioner to propose the names of 3 providers within one week of the order and Respondent to select one of the three within one week after receipt of the proposed names; (4) Neither party to speak to the minor about this case and neither party shall disparage or allow others to disparage the other parent and/or their extended family to the minor or in her presence; and (5) Neither party shall interrogate the minor regarding her time at the other parent's home.

Respondent requests sole custody of the minor with Petitioner to have supervised visits every other Saturday and Sunday. Alternatively, he requests at least a minimum 50% custody split and he proposes a 2-2-3 schedule.

Given that Petitioner has already prepared and filed the 827 motion, Petitioner's requests to modify the court's prior order are denied as they are now moot.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in Minor's Counsel's report to be in the best interests of the child with one modification. Instead of practicing a 2-2-5-5, the parties are to follow a 2-2-3 schedule. Exchanges shall take place at school drop off or, 9am at the Sheriff's substation in Town Center in El Dorado Hills when there is no school. All other recommendations are adopted as stated in Minor's Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions.

Given that the court still does not have the 3111 evaluation, the trial currently set to commence on February 3rd is vacated. The parties may file a Request for Trial Setting once the matter is ready to proceed.

This matter is continued to March 19, 2026 at 8:30 AM in Department 5 for receipt and review of the 3111 evaluation. The parties are ordered to file and serve Supplemental Declarations, if any, no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

Respondent's request for sanctions is continued to join with the Order to Show Cause hearing which is currently set for March 19, 2026 at 8:30am in Department 5.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

The court vacates the current trial set for February 3 and 4, 2026, as the 3111 evaluation has not been completed. The court sets a hearing on March 19, 2026, for trial setting.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: GIVEN THAT PETITIONER HAS ALREADY PREPARED AND FILED THE 827 MOTION, PETITIONER'S REQUESTS TO MODIFY THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER ARE DENIED AS THEY ARE NOW MOOT.

AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN MINOR'S COUNSEL'S REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD WITH ONE MODIFICATION. INSTEAD OF PRACTICING A 2-2-5-5, THE PARTIES ARE TO FOLLOW A 2-2-3 SCHEDULE. EXCHANGES SHALL TAKE PLACE AT SCHOOL DROP OFF OR, 9AM AT THE SHERIFF'S SUBSTATION IN TOWN CENTER IN EL DORADO HILLS WHEN THERE IS NO SCHOOL. ALL OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ADOPTED AS STATED IN MINOR'S COUNSEL'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND CONTENTIONS.

GIVEN THAT THE COURT STILL DOES NOT HAVE THE 3111 EVALUATION, THE TRIAL CURRENTLY SET TO COMMENCE ON FEBRUARY 3RD IS VACATED. THE PARTIES MAY FILE A REQUEST FOR TRIAL SETTING ONCE THE MATTER IS READY TO PROCEED.

THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO MARCH 19, 2026 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 FOR RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF THE 3111 EVALUATION. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS, IF ANY, NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING WHICH IS CURRENTLY SET FOR MARCH 19, 2026 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

THE COURT VACATES THE CURRENT TRIAL SET FOR FEBRUARY 3 AND 4, 2026, AS THE 3111 EVALUATION HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED. THE COURT SETS A HEARING ON MARCH 19, 2026, FOR TRIAL SETTING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

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 22, 2026

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

11. KRISTINE WALLEMAN V. MERLE WALLEMAN

PFL20040449

On October 14, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding an equalization payment and sanctions. She filed a Declaration of Callie B. Cambridge and a Motion in Limine concurrently therewith but she did not file a declaration specifying exactly what relief is being sought. The RFO and a blank Responsive Declaration to Request for Order were served on October 15th, however Petitioner did not serve the requisite Notice of Posting Tentative Ruling.

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

Petitioner's RFO is denied as it fails to articulate what relief is being requested.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: PETITIONER'S RFO IS DENIED AS IT FAILS TO ARTICULATE WHAT RELIEF IS BEING REQUESTED.

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 22, 2026

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

12. STEVEN CASS V. PAMELA CASS

24FL0586

On May 23, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel disclosures and discovery responses. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and a Declaration of Attorney concurrently therewith. All required documents were personally served on July 22nd.

On June 30th, the parties filed a stipulation vacating the trial date and agreeing to the appointment of Christopher Whitaker to provide forensic services.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 30th.

The Declaration of Attorney Layla Cordero in Support of Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed and served on August 7th.

Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed on August 13th.

Respondent asks that Petitioner be ordered to produce his full and complete Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) and sanctions in the amount of \$6,300 pursuant to Family Code § 2107. She argues that Respondent's initial PDD is legally deficient, and Respondent must be compelled to correct the deficiencies. She states she has incurred a total of \$3,370 in attorney fees associated with the preparation and filing of her Motion to Compel. She anticipates incurring an additional \$1,987.50 preparing a Reply declaration and appearing for the hearing. She asks for \$882.50 in sanctions in excess of her attorney's fees as a deterrent to Petitioner's continued evasiveness.

Petitioner opposes the motion. He argues that the parties agreed to retain the assistance of a forensic accountant given his inability to obtain the requested documents. He further argues that the motion was filed in bad faith and has caused him to incur unnecessary attorney's fees. He requests sanctions in the amount of \$15,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

On August 14th the parties appeared before the court for the hearing on the RFO. At that time the parties requested to continue the matter as the parties were of the belief that they may be able to resolve all issues informally. The request was granted, and the hearing was continued to the present date.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

Neither party has filed a declaration updating the court on the status of their agreements and whether or not the issues in the RFO have been resolved. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO UPDATE THE COURT ON WHETHER OR NOT THE PARTIES HAVE BEEN ABLE TO RESOLVE ALL ISSUES IN THE RFO.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

13. ANNE MCNELIS V. FERRIS NUESMEYER

PFL20160411

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt on November 3, 2025, alleging one count of contempt for Respondent's failure to obtain the court ordered life insurance policy. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on November 16, 2025. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services, who is a party, was served.

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

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 22, 2026

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

14. BROHEM MONTES DE OCA V. LINDA MEDINA

25FL1142

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on November 20, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting custody and parenting time orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC), as Petitioner had not included a copy of the minor's birth certificate with the Petition.

Respondent was personally served with the Petition and Summons as well as the RFO on November 22, 2025. The Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: 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 22, 2026

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

16. BROOKE ROGERS V. ZACHARY PODESTA

24FL0781

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on October 24, 2025. On October 28, 2025, the court denied the request on an ex parte basis. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 28, 2025, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 1, 2025, and a review hearing on January 22, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with all the necessary documents on October 28, 2025.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on December 11, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

17. ASHLEY SAMADANI V. ANTHONY SAMADANI

PFL20200775

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt on October 8, 2025. On October 23, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request to Reschedule the hearing. The court granted the Request to Reschedule the hearing and set a hearing date of January 22, 2026. The court specifically ordered service was to be accomplished through personal service.

Proof of Service shows electronic service on Respondent's counsel. "Service of an order to show cause to bring a party into contempt is insufficient if made by mail on the party's attorney of record." Koehler v. Superior Court, 181 Cal.App.4th 1153, 1169 (2010). The matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: 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 22, 2026

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

18. ZVISINEY SANCHEZ V. MILTON SANCHEZ

25FL0187

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 3, 2025, seeking orders for the former marital residence to be sold and for the refrigerator to be delivered to Petitioner forthwith. This is a post-judgment request for order. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on November 11, 2025. As a post-judgment request for modification, Family Code section 215 applies. The public policy behind Family Code § 215 is to ensure actual notice to a party where matters such as custody are often ongoing past final judgment in a case. The policy is to treat the new motion as akin to a newly filed Complaint. Therefore, personal service was required.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on December 15, 2025. It was mail served on December 12, 2025.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #18: 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

19. MALINA STAMM V. NATHAN STAMM

PFL20210358

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 1, 2025, seeking a modification of the current child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on September 10, 2025 and a review hearing on October 30, 2025. Upon review of the Proof of Service, the court finds Respondent was not served with all the necessary documents.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on October 17, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on October 21, 2025.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Both parties appeared for the hearing on October 30, 2025. The court rereferred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on December 3, 2025 and set a further review hearing on January 22, 2026. The court directed Petitioner to properly serve Respondent. The court further directed that any Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on January 8, 2026 and copies were mailed to the parties on January 9th.

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

The court finds good cause to proceed despite the lack of proper service as Respondent appeared for the October 30th hearing and the December 3rd CCRC appointment and fully participated. The court finds Respondent has actual notice of the requested orders.

The court has read and considered the January 8th CCRC report and finds the recommendations to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the January 8th CCRC 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 #19: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS RESPONDENT APPEARED FOR THE OCTOBER 30TH

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 22, 2026

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

HEARING AND THE DECEMBER 3RD CCRC APPOINTMENT AND FULLY PARTICIPATED. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS ACTUAL NOTICE OF THE REQUESTED ORDERS. THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE JANUARY 8TH CCRC REPORT AND FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JANUARY 8TH CCRC 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 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 22, 2026

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

20. LU SUN V. DARUI JIANG

25FL0340

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 24, 2025, seeking an order compelling Respondent's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure. In the body of the FL-300, Petitioner makes additional requests for orders, including orders regarding childcare costs, and arrears payments, as well as requests regarding loan payments and reimbursements of mortgage payments. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with the RFO and blank FL-320 on October 26, 2025. The Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling as required.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #20: 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.