

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. COLLEEN SIDEY V. BRYAN YERIAN

22FL0437

This matter is on calendar for review following the Stipulation and Order entered by the court on November 20, 2025. Since then, the court has received no new filings concerning the Stipulation and Order. As such, the court intends to drop the matter from the calendar.

The court notes that, there currently exists a “Status Only Judgment” in this case, issued on October 23, 2024. The Stipulation and Order entered November 20, 2025, has not been reduced to a Judgment on Reserved Issues.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE 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) 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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. ELIETH VASQUEZ MEDINA V. EDGAR INVAN TREJO MENDOZA 25FL0711

This matter is before the court on the Petition to declare minors free from the Respondent filed by the Petitioner on July 23, 2025. The original Citation to Appear was issued that same day and set a hearing date of October 29, 2025.

On October 23, 2025, the court investigator submitted its report per Family Code section 7851, subdivision (a).

On October 29, 2025, the Petitioner informed the court she had been unable to personally serve the Citation to Appear upon Respondent. The court continued the matter to January 14, 2026. On October 31, 2025, the court issued an Amended Citation to Appear for the January 14, 2026, hearing date.

On November 13, 2025, the court granted Petitioner's application requesting an order directing service of the Citation to Appear by posting it at the South Lake Tahoe Branch of the El Dorado Superior Court for 28 continuous days; and mailing the documents to Respondent's last known address (identified in the court's November 13, 2025, order).

On November 14, 2025, Petitioner submitted Proof of Service indicating she mailed the Citation to Appear and Order for Posting to Respondent's last known address that same day. To date, however, there is no proof of service by posting in the court's file (Judicial Council Form FL-985).

The Petitioner is ordered to appear to provide proof of posting or, in the alternative, for setting of a new hearing date.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO APPEAR TO PROVIDE PROOF OF POSTING OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, SETTING OF A NEW HEARING DATE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. JEFFREY STEVEN VANHEE V. ASHLEY NICHOLE VANHEE

25FL0526

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on November 26, 2025, requesting spousal support and child support, specifically, that the court start the process of liquidating assets to ensure Petitioner's compliance with the court's support orders, and requesting that the court hold Petitioner in contempt for failing to make support payments previously ordered by this court.

The same day Respondent filed her RFO, the court issued an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt with a hearing date of January 14, 2026.

Proof of service filed December 04, 2025, shows the RFO and supporting documents were served upon Petitioner's counsel electronically that same day. The Proof of Service does not show that the court's Tentative Ruling notice was served on Petitioner's counsel.

There is a Proof of Service filed January 12, 2026, showing personal service on the Petitioner of a "Request for Order." It is not clear to the court, however, if that refers to the OSC Re: Contempt being served on the Petitioner. Additionally, Proofs of Service must be filed at least five court days before the hearing. (Cal. Rules of Ct., R. 3.1300, subd. (c).)

No Responsive pleading has been filed by the Petitioner.

Due to the defects noted above, both the RFO and the OSC Re: Contempt are dropped without prejudice to refiling.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: CONTEMPT ARE DROPPED WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO THE ERRORS SET FORTH ABOVE.

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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. LESLIE EDMONDS V. JEFFREY EDMONDS

23FL1077

This matter is before the court 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, JANUARY 14, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO SET TRIAL AND MANDATORY
CONFERENCE SETTLEMENT DATES.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

5. MATTHEW VANHORN V. KYLIE VANHORN

SFL20180216

This matter is on calendar for review following the August 06, 2025, hearing wherein the court adopted the agreements and recommendations in the CCRC report dated July 25, 2025, and ordered additional terms (as outlined in the court's August 06, 2025, minute order). The court ordered the parties to file and serve supplemental declarations on or before January 05, 2026.

The only supplemental declaration the court received was filed by the Petitioner on January 05, 2026. Proof of service filed the same day shows said declaration was served upon the Respondent via mail on January 05, 2026.

Having read and considered the Petitioner's supplemental declaration, the court intends to drop the matter from the calendar, leaving all existing orders in place.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR. ALL EXISTING ORDERS SHALL 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) 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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

6. NICHOLAS SAMARAS V. CARLY SAMARAS

23FL1149

This action was filed on November 22, 2023. To date, there is no proof of service of summons on the Respondent in the court's file. Code of Civil Procedure section 583.420 authorizes the court to dismiss an action for delay in prosecution where service is not made within two years after the action is commenced. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.420, subd. (a)(1).)

On November 14, 2024, the court mailed the Petitioner notice of this two-year dismissal hearing.

Due to the lack of service, the court intends to dismiss the action without prejudice at the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
SECTION 583.420, THE COURT DISMISSES THE ACTION.**

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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

7. NICOLE COOLEY V. IAN COOLEY

23FL0862

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on November 10, 2025, to modify child custody and visitation. This prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for December 05, 2025.

There is no proof of service for the RFO or CCRC referral in the court's file. However, on November 21, 2025, the Respondent filed a request to reschedule the December 05, 2025, CCRC appointment to obtain legal counsel beforehand. That same day, the court denied the request, indicating CCRC does not allow for participation of attorneys, and that the Respondent may renew his request to continue following mediation, if necessary.

The Respondent filed no responsive declaration.

The court is in receipt of the CCRC Report dated December 09, 2025, a copy of which was mailed to both parties on December 10, 2025, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that same day.

The court has read and considered the Petitioner's RFO and the CCRC Report and Recommendation.

The court finds that the Agreements reached by the parties as set forth in the CCRC Report are in the parties' children's best interests and so adopts them as orders of the court. Similarly, the court finds that the Recommendations of the CCRC Report are also in the children's best interests and so also adopts them as orders of the court.

The above findings are with the caveat that the court may change the orders in the future if there is not compliance by the Respondent. The court finds the Respondent's failure to facilitate having the children see therapist to be disconcerting at best. This is especially true because the parties agree that MC (age 14) is experiencing issues in transitions between them, a topic which therapy is likely to address and, hopefully, resolve. Additionally, the court has been asked to consider switching custody from a 3/4, 4/3 pattern to a week-on, week-off schedule. The court wishes to know if that will be better for the children, including the transition issues experienced by MC.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT FINDS THAT BOTH THE AGREEMENTS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CCRC REPORT OF DECEMBER 09, 2025, ARE IN THE PARTIES' CHILDREN'S BEST INTERESTS AND THEREFORE ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A FINDINGS AND ORDER AFTER HEARING (FOAH) TO THE COURT AFTER HAVING SENT IT TO THE RESPONDENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

8. PAUL SEMONIAN V. JENNINA CHIAVETTA

25FL0459

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on December 03, 2025, to compel disclosures and request bifurcation. Proof of service filed December 04, 2025, shows the RFO was served upon Petitioner via mail that same day.

To date, the Petitioner has filed no responsive declaration.

The court grants the Respondent's request to compel the Petitioner to serve his Preliminary Disclosure and orders the Petitioner to serve his Preliminary Disclosure on the Respondent by January 30, 2026, and to file Judicial Council Form FL-141 (showing he has complied with the court's order) by February 06, 2026.

The court denies the request to bifurcate without prejudice to a subsequent request.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. THE PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO SERVE HIS PRELIMINARY DISCLOSURE ON THE RESPONDENT BY JANUARY 30, 2026, AND FILE JUDICIAL COUNCIL FORM FL-141 BY FEBRUARY 06, 2026. THE REQUEST TO BIRFURCATE IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

9. SARAH GARDNER V. KARL VOLOSIN, JR.

25FL1164

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on December 02, 2025, to require genetic testing. On December 16, 2025, Petitioner filed an Amended RFO to require genetic testing. Proof of service filed January 07, 2026, shows the RFO was personally served upon the Respondent on December 30, 2025.

Respondent filed no responsive declaration.

The court intends to grant the RFO at the hearing. Appearances are required to inquire the Petitioner regarding particular information to be included in the order (e.g., name of laboratory that will perform the genetic testing).

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE COURT INTENDS TO GRANT THE RFO AT THE HEARING. APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO INQUIRE THE PETITIONER REGARDING PARTICULAR INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ORDER (E.G., NAME OF LABORATORY THAT WILL PERFORM THE GENETIC TESTING).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
8:30 a.m.

10. SAVANNA ARNETT V. GAVIN NISHIHARA

25FL1181

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on December 12, 2025, to modify child custody. The RFO also included a request for Temporary Emergency Orders, which the court did not grant. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for December 23, 2025.

To date, there is no proof of service in the file showing service of the RFO or CCRC referral upon the Petitioner.

Additionally, the court is in receipt of a memorandum from the CCRC counsellor dated December 23, 2025, stating neither party appeared for the scheduled CCRC appointment.

Due to the lack of service, matter is dropped from the calendar without prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE, MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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.4TH 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JANUARY 14, 2026
10:00 a.m.

11. J GUZMAN PEREZ V. L MEDINA LOPEZ

SFL20150167

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on November 05, 2025, to enforce the custody and visitation orders issued in the court's December 12, 2022, Findings and Order After Hearing (FOAH). Proof of service filed November 06, 2025, shows the RFO and supporting documents were served upon Respondent via mail that same day.

To date, the Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO FURTHER DISCUSS THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORDER AND FOR POSSIBLE REFERRAL TO CCRC.