1. COLLEEN SIDEY V. BRYAN YERIAN

22FL0437

This matter is before the court on contempt proceedings against the Respondent. After the last hearing on June 25, 2025, Respondent filed a substitution of attorney.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025, IN DEPARTMENT 12 FOR ARRAIGNMENT.

2. JOHN RUDOLPH LABRADO V. KILEIGH ERIN LABRADO 24FL0537

This matter is on calendar for a trial setting conference. The issues to be addressed at trial include: property division, debt allocation, child and spousal support, attorney fees, and *Epstein*¹ credits.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO SELECT TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES.

¹ In re Marriage of Epstein (1979) 24 Cal.3d 76.

3. KIMBERLY FROCK V. AUSTIN LAWRIE

24FL1187

This case is before the court for hearing on the Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO) filed June 03, 2025, seeking an order permitting her to take the parties' child AL (age 1) on trips out of California without obtaining written permission from the Respondent. The Petitioner filed an amended RFO on June 09, 2025, which slightly modifies the language of the proposed order.

The amended RFO was personally served on the Respondent on June 20, 2025, according to the Proof of Personal Service filed June 25, 2025.

There is no Responsive Declaration filed by the Respondent.

Petitioner's RFO attaches transcripts of several days of text message exchanges between the parties on various topics, including the Petitioner's request of the Respondent that he approve a planned trip to Hawaii in August 2025 for her mother's 50th birthday. The first message making the request was on March 18, 2025.

The Respondent ignores the initial request and several texts after reminding him of the request until April 08, 2025, when he writes: "I don't feel good about it."

There is no explanation as to why the Respondent "doesn't feel good about" the proposed trip.

The trip is reasonable, was announced well in advance, and the Respondent expresses no valid reason for opposing it. Additionally, as noted above, the Respondent has not filed opposition to the Petitioner's RFO.

The Petitioner's RFO is granted. The Petitioner is directed to prepare and submit a Findings and Order Arter Hearing (FOAH) consistent with this Ruling.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PETITIONER'S RFO IS GRANTED. THE PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A FOAH CONSISTENT WITH THIS RULING.

4. LESLIE EDMONDS V. JEFFREY EDMONDS 23FL1077

This matter is on calendar for a trial setting conference. The issues to be addressed at trial include: real property division, bank and retirement account division, alleged breach of fiduciary duty, and child custody / parenting time.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO SET TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES.

5. LINDSEY CARMONA V. NATHAN CARMONA 23FL0662

On June 17, 2025, the Petitioner filed a request for status and trial setting conference.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO SELECT TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES.

6. NICOLE COOLEY V. IAN COOLEY

23FL0862

This case is before the court on the Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO) filed February 25, 2025, raising the issue of Visitation of the parties' children MC (age 13) and EC (age 8).

The RFO was served on the Respondent by mail on February 24, 2025, per the Proof of Service filed February 25, 2025.

The Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 04, 2025. A copy was served on the Petitioner by mail on April 04, 2025, per the Proof of Service filed that same date.

The Respondent did not attend the first scheduled CCRC session for which reason they were re-referred to CCRC with a session set for May 09, 2025. Both parties attended the May 09 session and reached a complete agreement. The agreements are set forth in the CCRC report submitted to the court on May 09, 2025. Copies of the CCRC report were mailed to the parties on May 12, 2025, according to the Clerk's Certificate of mailing filed on that same date.

The court has read and considered all the above-referenced documents. The court finds that the agreements reached by the parties set forth in the CCRC report are in the children's best interests and so adopts them as the orders of the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES, AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT OF MAY 09, 2025, ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

7. RAEANNE ISABELL WILSON V. PAUL EDWARD LYNFOOT 22FL1155

This case is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner seeking modification of the custody and visitation orders for the parties' children AL (age 13) and BL (age 10). The parties were referred to CCRC with the appointment set for June 06, 2025.

There is no Proof of Service in the court's file showing service of the RFO on the Respondent.

Neither party attended the CCRC session.

The hearing is dropped from calendar due to lack of service on the Respondent.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE HEARING IS DROPPED DUE TO LACK OF SERVICE ON THE RESPONDENT.

8. WILFRIDO HERNANDEZ BAUTISTA V. JOANNA T. ROJAS 23FL1226

This case is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on May 08, 2025, seeking modification of the parties' custody and visitation orders for their son JB (age 8). The court referred the parties to CCRC with an appointment set on June 05, 2025.

There is no Proof of Service in the court's file to show that the Respondent has been served a copy of the RFO.

Neither party attended the CCRC session.

The court drops this matter from calendar due to lack of service on the Respondent.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE HEARING IS DROPPED DUE TO LACK OF SERVICE ON THE RESPONDENT.

9. VIRIDIANA GONZALEZ V. JOSE ANTONIO DIAZ RODRIGUEZ 24FL0864

This case is on calendar for review of the Custody/Visitation orders for the parties' three children JG (age 13), AG (age 10), and JG (age 8) entered April 04, 2025, and of the Child Support Ruling filed February 06, 2025. This review was set for April 02, 2025, but was continued at the request of the Petitioner to this date.

The parties had been referred to CCRC with an appointment set for February 20, 2025. Only the Petitioner attended the CCRC session for which reason the CCRC counsellor could not make a recommendation.

The parties are ordered to appear. If there are no appearances, the existing orders will remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.