

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**1. JACINTA LASHAE BADELITA V. BOGDANEL BADELITA**

**22FL0797**

On October 16, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as stated in her moving papers. All required documents were served on October 24<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 13, 2026.

The Supplemental Declaration of Attorney Amber White and Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner were both filed and served on January 16<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed his Reply to Supplemental Declaration on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner brings her RFO requesting the following orders: (1) That judgment be entered without signature of Respondent; (2) That Respondent be ordered to pay Petitioner reimbursement of \$8,275.85 plus interest as an offset to the \$100,000 owed by Petitioner to Respondent; (3) Respondent be ordered to pay Petitioner, from the \$100,000 owed to him by Petitioner, \$236.41; (4) Enforcement of the August 18, 2025 stipulation; (5) that the court sign as elisor on behalf of Respondent to transfer into Petitioner's name the title of any asset awarded to Petitioner; and (6) Respondent be ordered to pay Petitioner attorney's fees in an amount no less than \$50,000 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 for the necessity of filing this motion.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**2. CORAL ERICSON (fka BRUNET) V. WILFRED BRUNET**

**PFL20210050**

On October 20, 2025, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on the Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) filed by Petitioner. The DVRO was granted and the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). A review hearing was set for the present date. A hearing on compliance with the court's firearms order was set to join with the review hearing.

On October 22, 2025, Respondent filed a completed Receipt for Firearms, Firearm Parts, and Ammunition.

The parties attended CCRC on November 20<sup>th</sup>, but they were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was prepared on November 25<sup>th</sup>. It was mailed to the parties on December 1<sup>st</sup>.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Regarding CCRC Report was filed and served on January 16, 2026.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find that Respondent has complied with the court's order to relinquish his firearms.

Regarding custody, the court shares Petitioner's concerns with CCRC's recommendation for unsupervised visits. Given the history of abuse, the lack of contact between Respondent and the minors, and the DVRO, the court finds unsupervised visits to be premature and not in the best interests of the children at this time. The remainder of the CCRC recommendations, however, are found to be in the best interests of the children. As such, the court is adopting the recommendations contained in the November 25, 2025 CCRC report as the orders of the court with the exception of paragraph 3 of the Parenting Time section.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE FIREARM ORDERS. THE COURT FURTHER FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE NOVEMBER 5, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE PARENTING TIME SECTION. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**3. DEBRA FANCHER PERCHEVITCH V. ALEX PERCHEVITCH**

**PFL20020636**

On October 16, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees, enforcement of the judgment, and orders to sign the QDROs. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Respondent was personally served with all required documents on October 30<sup>th</sup>. He has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

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

Petitioner asks the court to compel Respondent to comply with the terms of the Judgment, this includes signing the QDROs and paying his equalization payment. In the event Respondent does not comply, she asks the court to appoint the clerk as elisor to sign in Respondent's place. She requests 10% interest on the outstanding equalization payment due to Respondent's delay, and attorney's fees and sanctions in the amount of \$10,060 due to Respondent's failure to comply with the Judgment.

Petitioner's requests regarding the QDROs are granted. Respondent is ordered to sign the QDROs no later than February 12, 2026. Should he fail to do so, the court clerk is appointed as elisor to sign on behalf of Respondent.

Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner the outstanding equalization payment with 10% interest.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the court is not inclined to award over \$10,000 in fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 271 where Petitioner has failed to establish that the entire amount requested was incurred as a result of Respondent's failure to comply with the terms of the Judgment. Instead, the court is ordering Respondent to pay Petitioner's attorney \$2,500 as and for attorneys' fees and sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$500 commencing on February 15<sup>th</sup> and continuing until paid in full (approximately 5 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

The request for attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2030 is denied. 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, Petitioner states that there is a disparity in income, but she does not provide the court with an estimate of Respondent's income and Respondent did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. Without this information the court is unable to make the requisite findings. As such, the request is denied.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: PETITIONER'S REQUESTS REGARDING THE QDROS ARE GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SIGN THE QDROS NO LATER THAN FEBRUARY 12, 2026. SHOULD HE FAIL TO DO SO, THE COURT CLERK IS APPOINTED AS ELISOR TO SIGN ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT.**

**RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER THE OUTSTANDING EQUALIZATION PAYMENT WITH 10% INTEREST.**

**THE COURT IS ORDERING RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY \$2,500 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$500 COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 15<sup>TH</sup> AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 5 MONTHS). IF ANY AMOUNT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.**

**THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2030 IS DENIED.**

**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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 29, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**4. STEVE GIRDLESTONE V. ASHLEY A. GIRDLESTONE**

**PFL20160763**

On October 27, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO and all other required documents were electronically served on October 29<sup>th</sup>, however this is a post-judgment request, and service was required to comply with Family Code § 215. Nevertheless, Minor's Counsel filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on November 24, 2025. It was served on November 20<sup>th</sup>. And Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 15<sup>th</sup>. Given the filings of Petitioner and Minor's Counsel, the court finds any potential defect in service was waived and the matter may be reached on the merits.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 4, 2025. They reached agreements on some, but not all, issues therefore a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on January 20, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on January 21<sup>st</sup>.

On January 20<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed a Response and Opposition to Respondent's Request for Sanctions and Appointment of Special Master. On January 21<sup>st</sup> he filed and served a Request for Leave to File Overlength Reply Declaration.

On January 21<sup>st</sup>, Respondent filed and served Points and Authorities Re: Request to Strike/Objection to Pleading.

Petitioner is requesting final decision-making authority on issues of legal custody if the parties cannot agree within ten days. Alternatively, he requests final decision-making authority pending co-parenting counseling or consultation with Minor's Counsel. He also asks the court for clarification regarding the existing order for midweek overnight visits. He is also requesting a week-on/week-off schedule for the summer from Monday to Monday at 9am.

Minor's Counsel proposes the following orders. The parties are to continue sharing joint legal custody, in the event that the parents are unable to reach agreement on any educational, custody, or visitation related issue within five (5) calendar days of initiating discussion, the parties are to schedule and attend a session with the co-parenting counselor within the subsequent five (5) calendar days. Should the parties remain unable to resolve the matter following co-parenting counseling, Petitioner to have final decision-making authority on the outstanding issue. Regarding the mid-week visit, Minor's Counsel proposes a designated day for the visit to take place each week to be agreed upon by the parties. If a fixed day is not feasible, then the parties are to coordinate the visit with a

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

minimum of 72-hours advance notice and the visit must be scheduled on an evening when the child does not have a preexisting obligation including, but not limited to, academic responsibilities, extracurricular activities, social engagements, or family events. Minor's Counsel agrees with the request for a week-on/week-off schedule during the summer.

Respondent asks the court to deny Petitioner's requests in whole. She further requests a special master be appointed to have final decision-making authority. She asks that the court limit extracurricular expenses to no more than \$1,200 per parent and she requests \$5,000 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Respondent objects to Petitioner's Reply Declaration as it exceeds the page limit as set by California Rule of Court Rule 5.111. Petitioner requests leave for the court to consider the entirety of his Reply or, alternatively, he asks that the court consider the first five pages. Respondent's objection is sustained. However, the court is not striking the entirety of the pleading. The court has read and considered only the first five pages of Petitioner's Reply Declaration.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the January 20, 2026 CCRC report are in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the exception of the summer schedule. The court finds Petitioner's request to be a Motion for Reconsideration as this issue was already ruled upon at the trial in July of last year.

Any party may move for reconsideration of a court's order where the moving party (1) has been affected by the court's order; and (2) moves for reconsideration within 10 days of the service upon the moving party written notice of the entry of the order. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1008. The moving party must establish "...new or different facts, circumstances, or law..." that would warrant reconsideration of the order..." *Id.* Here, not only was Petitioner's motion untimely, but he did not provide any new or different facts, circumstances, or law that would warrant changing the summer schedule. As such, the request to change the summer schedule is denied.

Regarding legal custody, the court is adopting the CCRC recommendations for legal custody. On all issues of legal custody that are not addressed in the CCRC recommendations, the parties are ordered to meet and confer for a period of five calendar days from the date of initiating the discussion. If the parties are unable to agree, they are to meet with their co-parenting counselor within the subsequent five (5) calendar days. If they are still unable to agree then the party who has primary physical custody of the minor



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

(Petitioner during the school year and Respondent during the summer) shall be the party to have final decision-making authority on the unresolved issue.

Respondent's request for Section 271 sanctions is denied. Family Code section 271 states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys." Fam. Code § 271(a). The court does not find that the entirety of the RFO was frivolous and filed solely to frustrate the policy of the law. As such, the request is denied.

The court is declining to address Respondent's request for a cap on extracurricular activity costs as this request is outside the scope of the original RFO. If Respondent wishes to bring this request before the court a new RFO will need to be filed.

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 #4: RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED. HOWEVER, THE COURT IS NOT STRIKING THE ENTIRETY OF PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION. THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED ONLY THE FIRST FIVE PAGES OF THE PLEADING.**

**AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JANUARY 20, 2026 CCRC REPORT ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SUMMER SCHEDULE. THE REQUEST TO CHANGE THE SUMMER SCHEDULE IS DENIED.**

**REGARDING LEGAL CUSTODY, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE CCRC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGAL CUSTODY. ON ALL ISSUES OF LEGAL CUSTODY THAT ARE NOT ADDRESSED IN THE CCRC RECOMMENDATIONS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE CALENDAR DAYS FROM THE DATE OF INITIATING THE DISCUSSION. IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO AGREE, THEY ARE TO MEET WITH THEIR CO-PARENTING COUNSELOR WITHIN THE SUBSEQUENT FIVE (5) CALENDAR DAYS. IF THEY ARE STILL UNABLE TO AGREE THEN THE PARTY WHO HAS PRIMARY PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINOR (PETITIONER DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR AND RESPONDENT DURING THE SUMMER) SHALL BE THE PARTY TO HAVE FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY ON THE UNRESOLVED ISSUE.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED.**

**THE COURT IS DECLINING TO ADDRESS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A CAP ON EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITY COSTS AS THIS REQUEST IS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO. IF RESPONDENT WISHES TO BRING THIS REQUEST BEFORE THE COURT A NEW RFO WILL NEED TO BE FILED.**

**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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**5. LAURA GREGORIO V. MATTHEW GREGORIO**

**23FL0636**

On April 3, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support and attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on December 16, 2025.

This matter has been continued several times since its initial filing. However, Respondent has failed to file an updated Income and Expense Declaration. "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).

At this point, Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration is exceedingly stale and therefore the court cannot calculate support and attorney's fees. The requests are therefore denied without prejudice.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND ATTORNEY'S FEES ARE DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO HIS FAILURE TO FILE A CURRENT INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**6. ALEXANDER R. HILL V. SABRINA LEE HILL**

**23FL0714**

*Custody and Visitation Review Hearing*

On April 24, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. On August 28, 2025, the court made orders on all issues and set a review hearing for the present date.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Petitioner's Visitation Step-Up Plan was filed and served on December 19<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Petitioner's Visit Step-Up Plan was filed and served on December 29<sup>th</sup>.

According to Respondent, Petitioner has not complied with any of the court's August 28<sup>th</sup> orders. She therefore requests the court find that a step-up plan is not in the best interests of the children.

Petitioner requests an order allowing his brother, Jason, to be the non-professional supervisor for visits. He asks that he be allowed to continue using BACtrack testing as opposed to SoberLink before and after his visits. He further asks that Respondent be ordered to choose a reunification therapist from Cameron Park Counseling Center. Finally, he asks that the order for an AOD assessment be vacated so he can use the funds for reunification therapy.

Given the recent setbacks in Petitioner's compliance with the court's prior orders, the court does not find a step-up plan to be in the best interests of the children at this time. As such, the request for a step-up plan is denied.

Petitioner's brother Jason may act as the non-professional supervisor for visits after he has completed and filed an FL-324(NP).

Petitioner's request to use BACtrack testing instead of SoberLink is granted. Petitioner must test 30 minutes prior to any visits and within 30 minutes following any visits. Documentation of all tests shall be sent directly to Respondent and her attorney. Respondent is admonished that the results of the tests are confidential and not to be shared with anyone other than her attorney and the court. If Petitioner tests positive at any time, his next scheduled visit shall be forfeited, and he will not be given a make-up visit.

The request to vacate the order for an AOD assessment is denied.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

*Request for Order*

On December 16, 2025, Respondent filed an RFO seeking bifurcation, an order compelling disclosures, and sanctions. He filed an Amended RFO the same day. All required documents were served on December 18<sup>th</sup>.

On January 13, 2026, Petitioner filed a Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and Income and Expense Declaration. He filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 14<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed and served on January 21<sup>st</sup>.

Respondent is requesting an order compelling Petitioner to comply with his obligation to produce his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure pursuant to Family Code § 2104. She further requests an order bifurcating and terminating the marital status. Finally, she requests sanctions in the amount of \$1,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

According to Petitioner, his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure was served on January 13, 2026. Though he notes that Respondent's disclosures are incomplete. He is agreeable to bifurcation of the issue of marital status. Finally, he asks that the court deny Respondent's request for monetary sanctions.

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

After reviewing the filings, it does appear that Respondent filed all requisite documentation and there are no pension plans that require joinder. Thus, the court finds good cause to bifurcate the case and grant a separate trial on the issue of marital status only. The court orders parties to appear on this issue.

Regarding the motion to compel, the court declines to rule on this request as Petitioner has served his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure and the issue is now moot.

Finally, turning to the issue of sanctions, Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). “[T]he court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney’s fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust.” Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Given that Petitioner’s failure to comply with his disclosure obligations for an extended period of time after filing the Petition, the court does find monetary sanctions to be warranted. Petitioner is ordered to pay, directly to Respondent’s attorney, \$1,500 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 2107. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$125 commencing on February 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT DOES NOT FIND A STEP-UP PLAN TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AT THIS TIME. AS SUCH, THE REQUEST FOR A STEP-UP PLAN IS DENIED.**

**PETITIONER’S BROTHER JASON MAY ACT AS THE NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR FOR VISITS AFTER HE HAS COMPLETED AND FILED AN FL-324(NP).**

**PETITIONER’S REQUEST TO USE BACTRACK TESTING INSTEAD OF SOBERLINK IS GRANTED. PETITIONER MUST TEST 30 MINUTES PRIOR TO ANY VISITS AND WITHIN 30 MINUTES FOLLOWING ANY VISITS. DOCUMENTATION OF ALL TESTS SHALL BE SENT DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT AND HER ATTORNEY. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT THE RESULTS OF THE TESTS ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND NOT TO BE SHARED WITH ANYONE OTHER THAN HER ATTORNEY AND THE COURT. IF PETITIONER TESTS POSITIVE AT ANY TIME, HIS NEXT SCHEDULED VISIT SHALL BE FORFEITED AND HE WILL NOT BE GIVEN A MAKE UP VISIT.**

**THE REQUEST TO VACATE THE ORDER FOR AN AOD ASSESSMENT IS DENIED.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE BIFURCATION.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON THE REQUEST FOR AN ORDER COMPELLING PETITIONER'S PRELIMINARY DISCLOSURE AS THE REQUEST IS MOOT.**

**PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY, DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY, \$1,500 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2107. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$125 COMMENCING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.**

**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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**7. CHRISTOPHER KINGSLEY V. DIANE KINGSLEY**

**PFL20030287**

On August 18, 2025, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt. It was personally served on September 20, 2025.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

**TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT.**



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**8. FRANK B. LAROSA V. MARIANNA LAROSA**

**PFL20180720**

On October 16, 2025, Petitioner filed an Application for Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem. All required documents were served by mail on Respondent on November 7, 2025.

“A guardian ad litem may be appointed in any case when it is deemed by the court...expedient to appoint a guardian ad litem to represent...the person who lacks legal capacity to make decisions...” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 372(2)(A). “[A] person who lacks legal capacity to make decisions” is defined as either “(A) A person who lacks capacity to understand the nature or consequences of the action or proceeding. (B) A person who lacks capacity to assist the person’s attorney in the preparation of the case. [or] (C) A person for whom a conservator may be appointed pursuant to Section 1801 of the Probate Code.” *Id.* at (4).

Petitioner is requesting his son, Chris Larosa, be appointed as his guardian ad litem. The request is granted. The court will sign the submitted Order Appointing Guardian Ad Litem.

**TENTATIVE RULING #8: PETITIONER IS REQUESTING HIS SON, CHRIS LAROSA, BE APPOINTED AS HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM. THE REQUEST IS GRANTED. THE COURT WILL SIGN THE SUBMITTED ORDER APPOINTING GUARDIAN AD LITEM.**

**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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**9. JUSTIN SIMARRO V. YAJAIRA SIMARRO**

**PFL20200099**

On November 6, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking payment of credit card debt by Petitioner. There is no Proof of Service for this document and Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order therefore the matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**10. KELLY SPENCER V. MATTHEW SPENCER**

**23FL0529**

On October 22, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking reimbursement of credit card and tax return expenses. All required documents were mail-served on November 14<sup>th</sup>. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

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

Petitioner’s requests for reimbursement are granted. Respondent is ordered to pay one-half of the Chase credit card debt from February of 2023 in the amount of \$3,653.50, one half of the Bank of America credit card balance from February 2023 in the amount of \$5,374, one half of the Hot Tub Outdoor Wells Fargo balance from February 2023 in the amount of \$3,105, and one half of the 2023 tax return balance in the amount of \$3,487. In sum, Respondent is ordered to reimburse Petitioner \$15,619.50. This amount is to be paid out of Respondent’s portion of the funds from the family residence which are currently being held in Petitioner’s attorney’s trust account.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #10: PETITIONER’S REQUESTS FOR REIMBURSEMENT ARE GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY ONE-HALF OF THE CHASE CREDIT CARD DEBT FROM FEBRUARY OF 2023 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,653.50, ONE HALF OF THE BANK OF AMERICA CREDIT CARD BALANCE FROM FEBRUARY 2023 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,374, ONE HALF OF THE HOT TUB OUTDOOR WELLS FARGO BALANCE FROM FEBRUARY 2023 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,105, AND ONE HALF OF THE 2023 TAX RETURN BALANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,487. IN SUM, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO REIMBURSE PETITIONER \$15,619.50. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID OUT OF RESPONDENT’S PORTION OF THE FUNDS FROM THE FAMILY RESIDENCE WHICH ARE CURRENTLY BEING HELD IN PETITIONER’S ATTORNEY’S TRUST ACCOUNT.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**11. TODD STANLEY V. HANNAH COLE**

**24FL0221**

On December 29, 2025, at the conclusion of trial on the issues of § 3044 and a move away request, the court found that Petitioner had not overcome the 3044 presumption and Respondent was granted her request to relocate with the minor. The court noted the automatic 30-day stay on move away orders and made several orders to be completed prior to the move away. A review hearing was set for the present date. The review hearing is to ensure all conditions have been met prior to relocating the minor and to address the issue of sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 and Civil Procedure § 128.5.

On January 16, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Christie B. Mitchell, Esq. in Support of Order to Show Cause Re Sanctions, a Declaration of Micaela Van Done, in Support of Response to Order to Show Cause Re Sanctions, and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Response to Order to Show Cause Re Sanctions.

On January 20<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed and served a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Request for Sanctions and a Declaration of Rebekah A. Frye in Support of Request for Sanctions.

On January 22<sup>nd</sup>, Petitioner filed his Supplemental Brief Regarding Sanctions. It was served on January 19<sup>th</sup>.

The Declaration of Respondent, Re Updates for Compliance With Orders Prior to Relocation was filed and served on January 26<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration for Hearing was filed on January 27<sup>th</sup> though it was served on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent is requesting sanctions against Petitioner and/or his counsel for release of CPS records for an unauthorized purpose and the failure of the records recipient to immediately return or destroy the records. She further requests sanctions against Petitioner and/or his attorney for failure to comply with Local Rule 8.20.03(C) due to his failure to provide copies of exhibits within the prescribed timeframe before trial. Regarding the move away, she states that she has substantially complied with all conditions the court placed on the move away though some orders must be complied with once she has moved.

Petitioner opposes the sanctions. Petitioner further opposes the move away arguing that the orders have not been complied with and there has been no Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH) for the December 29<sup>th</sup> orders. He requests a stay of the move away order.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Family Law orders are effective at the time they are made. The lack of a FOAH is irrelevant and not grounds to stay the move away. The parties are ordered to appear on the issue of compliance with the court's move away orders.

Regarding the issue of sanctions for failure to exchange exhibits before trial, the court is not awarding sanctions. While admittedly, it was in bad form on the part of Petitioner's attorney not to comply with the local rules, the objection was raised late and the failure to exchange documents resulted in no prejudice to Respondent. That said, Petitioner's counsel is admonished to comply with the local rules moving forward. Future failure to do so may result in sanctions.

Moving to the issue of sanctions for disclosing the CPS records. The court does not find that the disclosure was done in bad faith. In fact, Petitioner's counsel and Ms. Van Dine both confirmed that no records were provided to Ms. Van Dine by counsel that she did not already have therefore, the court does not find grounds to sanction counsel. Regarding Petitioner's disclosure of the records to his therapist, he is admonished that the records were to be solely used for the family law case, not his own therapy. However, because Ms. Van Dine has since complied with the court's order to destroy or return the records, the court does not see grounds for monetary sanctions at this time.

Both requests for monetary sanctions are denied.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S MOVE AWAY ORDERS. BOTH REQUESTS FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS ARE DENIED. 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12. JAMES VERANDES V. ALLISON VERANDES**

**PFL20170788**

The parties appeared before the court on October 23, 2025 for receipt and review of the 3111 evaluation. They presented the court with a signed stipulation which included setting a review hearing on the present date. The court adopted the stipulation and ordered the parties to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on January 22<sup>nd</sup>. The court finds this to be late filed and therefore, it cannot be considered.

This matter is dropped from calendar.

**TENTATIVE RULING #12: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR.**

**NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12 A. B. KELLY HUNT V. MARINELL HUNT**

**PFL20150770**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 22, 2025, seeking an order reopening discovery. Respondent concurrently filed a Declaration of Counsel as well as a Memorandum of Points and Authorities. All documents were served on Petitioner by mail on October 24, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on January 16, 2026. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all opposition papers are to be filed at least 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 made January 15<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Respondent filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on January 16, 2026, along with a Declaration of Counsel. Both were mail served on January 16<sup>th</sup>. Respondent requests the court strike Petitioner’s late filed Responsive Declaration.

Petitioner filed a Response to Respondent’s motion to strike on January 20, 2026. It was mail and electronically served the same day. Petitioner requests the court consider the Responsive Declaration as there were server errors at his office, which were not restored until the late afternoon on January 14<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed a Reply on January 22, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent reiterates the request to strike Petitioner’s Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court grants Respondent’s request to reopen discovery pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) section 2024.050. According to CCP section 2024.020, every party is “entitled as a matter of right” of have discovery under the Discovery Act completed and motions concerning discovery head no later than the specified cutoff dates irrespective of continuance or postponements. However, the Act recognizes that circumstances may arise that justify extending these cutoff dates or reopening discovery after the trial date has been postponed. Civil Procedure section 2024.050 (a) provides that on motion of any party, a judge may grant leave to complete discovery proceedings or...to reopen discovery after a new trial date has been set. This motion must be accompanied by a meet and confer declaration under Civil Procedure section 2016.040. Here the court finds that the meet and



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

confer component has been met. Further, the court finds it is necessary to reopen discovery as this matter was originally set for trial in 2018, when parties vacated the trial dates in anticipation of reaching a full settlement agreement. That has not come to fruition in nearly eight years. Additionally, Respondent has been diligent in seeking the discovery. See Cottini v. Enloe Med. Ctr., 226 CA4th 401, 423 (2014). The court finds there remains unadjudicated matters of property, and as such, discovery is necessary. Last, the court finds there is no prejudice to Petitioner, as there is no trial date currently set, and discovery is necessary to adjudicate the reserved property issues.

The court must impose a monetary sanction under CCP 2023.010-2023.050 against any party, person, or attorney who unsuccessfully makes or opposes a motion to extend or to reopen discovery, unless the court finds that the one subject to the sanctions acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make imposing the sanction unjust. CCP 2024.050 (c). The court is not imposing discovery sanctions on either party at this time. The court finds because Petitioner's Responsive Declaration was not considered, Petitioner did not unsuccessfully oppose the motion. The court reserves on the issue of sanctions under Family Code section 271 until the time of trial.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING 12A.: THE COURT HAS NOT CONSIDERED PETITIONER'S LATE FILED RESPONSIVE DECLARATION. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO REOPEN DISCOVERY IS GRANTED. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE MEET AND CONFER COMPONENT HAS BEEN MET. FURTHER, THE COURT FINDS IT IS NECESSARY TO REOPEN DISCOVERY AS THIS MATTER WAS ORIGINALLY SET FOR TRIAL IN 2018, WHEN PARTIES VACATED THE TRIAL DATES IN ANTICIPATION OF REACHING A FULL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT. THAT HAS NOT COME TO FRUITION IN NEARLY EIGHT YEARS. ADDITIONALLY, RESPONDENT HAS BEEN DILIGENT IN SEEKING THE DISCOVERY. SEE COTTINI V. ENLOE MED. CTR., 226 CA4TH 401, 423 (2014). THE COURT FINDS THERE REMAINS UNADJUDICATED MATTERS OF PROPERTY, AND AS SUCH, DISCOVERY IS NECESSARY. LAST, THE COURT FINDS THERE IS NO PREJUDICE TO PETITIONER, AS THERE IS NO TRIAL DATE CURRENTLY SET, AND DISCOVERY IS NECESSARY TO ADJUDICATE THE RESERVED PROPERTY ISSUES. THE COURT IS NOT IMPOSING DISCOVERY SANCTIONS ON EITHER PARTY AT THIS TIME. THE COURT FINDS BECAUSE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT CONSIDERED, PETITIONER DID NOT UNSUCCESSFULLY OPPOSE THE MOTION. THE COURT RESERVES ON THE ISSUE OF SANCTIONS UNDER**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER 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 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**13. BALI DINES V. JACOB DINES**

**25FL0867**

On December 11, 2025, the court granted Petitioner's request to appoint a Receiver to assess the business. A review hearing was set for January 29, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the court signed the order appointing the Receiver.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on January 8, 2026, requesting the review hearing be continued 45 days. Respondent was served by mail on January 8, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court finds good cause to continue the matter to April 9, 2026 at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE MATTER TO APRIL 9, 2026 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING. ALL PRIOR ORDERS 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. MELISSA FLANIGAN V. SHAUN FLANIGAN**

**23FL0255**

On October 3, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking modification of the custody and parenting plan orders as well as attorney's fees and sanctions. Respondent filed an Order Shortening Time and RFO seeking to compel and clarification of the current orders on November 14, 2025.

The parties were ordered to appear for hearing on both RFOs on December 4, 2025. The parties presented the court with an agreement which was accepted by the court and all issues were continued to the present date.

On November 26, 2025, Respondent filed an RFO for child custody, child visitation, child support, spousal support, and enforcement of the order for a vocational evaluation.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on January 2, 2026. He filed another declaration on January 16<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, a Supplemental Declaration, and an Income and Expense Declaration on January 20<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent's Reply Declaration, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and another Reply Declaration were all filed and served on January 20<sup>th</sup>.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
January 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**15. RACHEL GESSNER V. MATTHEW GESSNER**

**25FL1097**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 25, 2025 seeking child support. Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on November 26<sup>th</sup>.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been served with the Petition and Summons. As such, the court has not acquired jurisdiction over the parties. Further there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been served with the RFO and other required documents.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of jurisdiction over the parties, and the failure to properly serve Respondent with the RFO.

**TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF JURISDICTION OVER THE PARTIES, AND THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT WITH 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**16. JESSIC GOIN V. CHRISTOPHER MOUNT**

**PFL20210162**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 13, 2025, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had attended in the prior six months. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served some of the required documents on December 31, 2025. Respondent was not served with the blank Responsive Declaration form FL-320 as required.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on January 16, 2026. Respondent was mail served on January 15, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service. Respondent is admonished that failure to follow court orders may result in a change in custody, sanctions, and/or contempt of court. Each party is to ensure the minors' attendance at school during their parenting time. Each party is to ensure the minors are picked up from school timely and have appropriate childcare arrangements.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #16: 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**17. SARAH LESTER V. JASON LESTER**

**23FL1169**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 27, 2025 seeking reconsideration of the court's September 25, 2025 orders. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner or Minors' Counsel were properly served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on January 16, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served on January 16<sup>th</sup>. There is no Proof of Service showing Minors' Counsel was served. The court finds this to be late filed.

Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all opposition papers are to be filed at least 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 made January 15<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the Responsive Declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on January 16, 2026

The court drops Respondent's October 27<sup>th</sup> filed RFO from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on November 3, 2025. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent and Minors' Counsel were properly served. As such, the court drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #17: RESPONDENT'S OCTOBER 27, 2025 FILED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. PETITIONER'S NOVEMBER 3, 2025 FILED OSC IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

January 29, 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**18. CRAIG LORENZI V. NEILA LORENZI**

**24FL1137**

On December 1, 2025, the parties stipulated to return to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on December 26, 2025, and a review hearing on January 29, 2026.

Both parties attended CCRC on December 26<sup>th</sup> and were able to reach an agreement. A report with the parties' agreement as well as further recommendations was filed with the court on January 6, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on January 22, 2026.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the January 6<sup>th</sup> CCRC report and finds the agreement and recommendations to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the agreement and recommendation as set forth.

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 #18: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION AS SET FORTH IN THE 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**21. JENNIFER NEWMAN V. JOHN NEWMAN**

**24FL0608**

Parties appeared for the hearing on August 14, 2025, on Respondent's Request for Order (RFO). Parties reach agreements, including setting a review hearing for December 18, 2025, at 8:30 AM for review of the vocational evaluation and spousal support. Subsequently, the parties agreed to continue the December 18, 2025, review hearing to January 29, 2026.

On December 19, 2025, Petitioner filed a "Letter" with the court. There is no Proof of Service for this document and as such, the court has not read or considered it.

There have been no additional filings by the parties since December. The court notes the parties are set for trial for April 28-29, 2026, which includes the issues of spousal support and earning capacity. The court continues the review hearing to join with the trial set in this matter. The court continues to reserve jurisdiction to retroactively modify spousal support to May 13, 2025.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT NOTES THE PARTIES ARE SET FOR TRIAL FOR APRIL 28-29, 2026, WHICH INCLUDES THE ISSUES OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND EARNING CAPACITY. THE COURT CONTINUES THE REVIEW HEARING TO JOIN WITH THE TRIAL SET IN THIS MATTER. THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO MAY 13, 2025. ALL PRIOR 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 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**22. DANIEL STEVENSON V. MAUDENA STEVENSON**

**24FL0166**

Respondent filed two Motions on November 18, 2025; however, she failed to use the FL-300 which is a mandatory use form. See Cal. Rule Ct. 5.92(a)(1)(C). Petitioner was mail-served on November 18, 2025.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to Respondent's failure to use the mandatory use form.

**TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO USE THE MANDATORY USE FORM.**

**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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**23. LYDIA WALLACE V. RANDY GASHLER**

**25FL1090**

On November 6, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 5, 2025 and a review hearing on January 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO and referral to CCRC.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at CCRC and reached a full agreement. The parties submitted a stipulation to the court, which the court signed and adopted as its order on December 9, 2025.

The court maintains the current orders as set forth in the December 9, 2025 stipulation. The court drops the matter from calendar as moot.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #23: THE COURT MAINTAINS THE CURRENT ORDERS AS SET FORTH IN THE DECEMBER 9, 2025 STIPULATION. THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR AS MOOT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

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