## LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS DEPARTMENT 12 AUGUST 13, 2025 8:30 a.m.

#### 1. AMORITA BUSTOS V. DAVID MARION

SFL20170102

This matter is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on July 02, 2025. The RFO asks the court to enforce the existing orders regarding Custody and Visitation of the parties' daughter CM (Age 13). Counsel for CM and the Respondent were mailed copies of the RFO on July 09, 2025, according to Proofs of Service by Mail (and a Declaration Regarding Address Verification) which were filed July 09, 2025.

The Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on July 28, 2025, copies of which were mailed to the Petitioner and counsel for CM that same date according to the Proof of Service by mail, also filed on July 28, 2025.

Counsel for CM filed a Responsive Declaration on July 31, 2025. There is no Proof of Service of Minor's counsel's Responsive Declaration.

It is unclear to the court what is requested by the Petitioner. The RFO does not seek modification of the current orders, nor does it ask that the Respondent be held in contempt for alleged violations.

Respondent's declaration states that ". . .[l]aw enforcement is urging that there be no specific orders so that they do not have to repeatedly come out."

Minor's counsel's declaration states that counsel will discuss the situation with her client in advance of the hearing.

In order to hear from minor's counsel, the court orders the parties to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

## LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS DEPARTMENT 12 AUGUST 13, 2025 8:30 a.m.

### 2. MONIQUE INSHAW V. FRANCOIS INSHAW

23FL0924

This matter is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on June 30, 2025, and for a Trial Readiness Conference. The RFO asks for "clarification of the most recent court order." The RFO does not provide the date of the order, the subject of the order or an explanation of what needs clarification. A copy of the RFO was mailed to counsel for the Petitioner on July 09, 2025, per the Proof of Service by Mail filed on July 30, 2025.

No Responsive Declaration was filed by the Petitioner.

A full day evidentiary hearing is set for August 21, 2025, and a Settlement Conference is set for August 14, 2025.

The parties are ordered to appear to confirm the pending court dates and to address the clarification request posed by the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

# LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS DEPARTMENT 12 AUGUST 13, 2025 10:00 a.m.

### 1. TOMAS PULIDO V. ARACELI VIVAS SANDOVAL

22FL0418

This matter is before the court on the Respondent's Request for Order (RFO) to modify child custody and visitation, including a request for temporary emergency orders, filed on January 23, 2025. That same day, the court issued a temporary emergency order (which is currently in effect) granting temporary sole legal and physical custody of the parties' son (EP, age 5) to Respondent and at least two visits per week with the Petitioner from 4:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

There is no proof of service for the RFO in the court's file. However, Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on February 04, 2025, that was served upon Respondent by mail the same day.

The court originally referred the parties to a CCRC session set for February 14, 2025. However, only the Respondent attended that CCRC session, for which reason the CCRC counsellor could not make a recommendation to the court. The parties were re-referred to a CCRC session set for April 11, 2025. However, on that date, only the Petitioner attended, for which reason again, the CCRC counsellor could not make a recommendation to the court.

The court made a third referral for the parties to attend CCRC on July 03, 2025. The court received a CCRC report dated July 11, 2025, indicating that both parties attended this CCRC session. A copy of the report was mailed to both parties on July 14, 2025, according to Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed the same day.

The court finds that the agreements and recommendations in the CCRC report are in the best interest of the parties' child and so adopts them as its orders, with the following modification: in addition to the Petitioner's two weekday visitations, the Petitioner shall also have one visitation per weekend (either Saturday or Sunday, as agreed upon between the parties) from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., under the same conditions as the weekday visitations; pick-up and drop-off for the weekend visitation shall take place at the Respondent's residence.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE CCRC REPORT SUBMITTED ON JULY 11, 2025, IS ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION: IN ADDITION TO THE PETITIONER'S TWO WEEKDAY VISITATIONS, THE PETITIONER SHALL ALSO HAVE ONE VISITATION PER WEEKEND (EITHER SATURDAY OR SUNDAY, AS AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE PARTIES) FROM 10:00 A.M. TO 6:00 P.M., UNDER THE SAME CONDITIONS AS THE WEEKDAY VISITATIONS; PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF FOR THE WEEKEND VISITATION SHALL TAKE PLACE AT THE RESPONDENT'S RESIDENCE.

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) 573-3042 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.4<sup>TH</sup> 1232 (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.