

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. ELIDIA G. MANZO V. KEVIN A. BARRON

25FL1219

On December 12, 2025, the Petitioner filed Registration of Out-of-State or Tribal Custody Order and Notice of Registration (Judicial Council form FL-580), requesting registration of a Pennsylvania court child custody order issued July 17, 2024 (attached to Petitioner's filing). In the attached declaration, the Petitioner declares, "I would like to have the case transferred to So. Lake Tahoe, where I reside."

On January 06, 2026, the Respondent filed a Request for Hearing Regarding Registration of Out-of-State or Tribal Custody Order (Judicial Council form FL-585). The Respondent requests that the registration of custody be vacated because (1) this court does not have jurisdiction over the parties' child AB; (2) Petitioner did not accurately reflect the child's residence for the time-period stated in Petitioner's Declaration Under UCCJEA (Judicial Council form FL-105/GC-120); and (3) the parties agreed that the Pennsylvania court would retain jurisdiction over the parties' child.

Family Code section 3445 provides in pertinent part, "[a] child custody determination issued by a court of another state may be registered in this state, with or without simultaneous request for enforcement..." (Fam. Code, § 3445, subd. (a).) "On receipt of the documents required by subdivision (a), the registering court shall do both of the following: [¶] (1) Cause the determination to be filed as a foreign judgment, together with one copy of any accompanying documents and information, regardless of their form. [¶] (2) Serve notice upon the persons named pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) and provide them with an opportunity to contest the registration in accordance with this section." (Fam. Code, § 3445, subd. (b)(1)–(2).)

At the hearing contesting registration, "the court shall confirm the registered order unless the person contesting registration establishes any of the following: [¶] (1) That the issuing court did not have jurisdiction under Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 3421). [¶] (2) That the child custody determination sought to be registered has been vacated, stayed, or modified by a court having jurisdiction to do so under Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 3421). [¶] (3) That the person contesting registration was entitled to notice, but notice was not given in accordance with the standards of Section 3408, in the proceedings before the court that issued the order for which registration is sought." (Fam. Code, § 3445, subd. (d)(1)–(3).)

The Respondent does not allege that the issuing court in Pennsylvania did not have jurisdiction; that the out-of-state order has been vacated, stayed, or modified; or that the Respondent was not given notice as required in the proceedings in the out-of-state court. Therefore, the Respondent's request is denied; the out-of-state order is confirmed registered in this court. (Fam. Code, § 3445, subd. (d).)

///

///

The court notes it is not “transferring” the case as the Petitioner requested in her declaration. Pursuant to Family Code section 3445, the court is merely registering the out-of-state court order in this court, making the out-of-state order enforceable in California.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE RESPONDENT’S REQUEST TO CONTEST REGISTRATION OF THE OUT-OF-STATE ORDER IS DENIED. THE COURT CONFIRMS REGISTRATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COURT CHILD CUSTODY ORDER. 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. EMMA JIMENEZ V. GABRIEL JIMENEZ

SFL20210024

This action was filed on February 23, 2021. Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310 provides, "An action shall be brought to trial within five years after the action is commenced against the defendant." (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.310.) Because the case has not been brought to trial within five years as required under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310 the court intends to dismiss the action, unless the Petitioner appears and provides sufficient evidence of why it was impossible, impracticable, or futile to bring the action to trial during this time. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.340, subd. (c).)

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 583.310, 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. JOHNATHAN ROBERT MILTON V. KIMBERLY LESLEY NOBELLA 25FL0722

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on January 16, 2026, requesting the court to reconsider its January 07, 2026, order adopting the agreements of the parties and the recommendations of the CCRC counsellor in the CCRC report dated November 24, 2025. Respondent claims she attempted to timely request oral argument on the court's tentative ruling issued January 06, 2026, but was unsuccessful.

On January 20, 2026, the court issued an order shortening time. The court ordered the Respondent to serve the RFO on Petitioner on or before January 28, 2026; and ordered the Petitioner to file and serve a Responsive Declaration on Respondent on or before February 11, 2026.

To date, there is no proof of service for the RFO in the court's file. The court denies Respondent's motion for reconsideration. The court also notes that the Petitioner has filed a new RFO to modify custody and visitation, a hearing upon which is currently set for March 18, 2026.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE RFO IS DENIED. 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. LYDIA MARIE CAREL V. JEROME SILAS

22FL0110

This matter is before the court for review on two separate Requests for Order (RFO). On December 01, 2025, Respondent filed an RFO requesting he be granted joint physical custody of the parties' children, NS (age 8) and SC (age 7), as well as Temporary Emergency Custody pending the hearing, which was set for December 31, 2025. The court denied Respondent's request for Temporary Emergency Orders pending the hearing.

On December 12, 2025, the Petitioner filed an RFO to modify visitation and require the parties' minor children to be returned to Sacramento, California. Specifically, the Petitioner requested the court to set specific visitation dates for holidays and Summer. The RFO also included a request for Temporary Emergency Orders. On December 12, 2025, the court issued an order shortening time¹ and granted Petitioner Temporary Emergency Orders as follows: Respondent to return children to the Sacramento, California airport no later than December 14, 2025; Respondent shall text Petitioner the flight information at least 24 hours in advance of the flight departure; Respondent shall text Petitioner when the children are ready to be exchanged at the airport; the exchange shall take place at curbside at the airport.

At the hearing on December 31, 2025, the court amended the Temporary Emergency Orders, requiring both parties to cooperate in returning the minor children to the Petitioner no later than 5:00 p.m. on January 02, 2026. The court also referred the parties to a CCRC session set for January 12, 2026; and continued the hearing to February 25, 2026.

A CCRC "One Parent" report was submitted to the court on January 12, 2026, indicating that only the Petitioner appeared for CCRC, for which reason, the CCRC counsellor was unable to make any recommendations to the court. A copy of the CCRC report was mailed to both parties that same day, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, also filed January 12, 2026.

The court intends to deny the Respondent's RFO and grant the Petitioner's RFO. However, the court does not have specific dates to include in the anticipated order. Appearances are required at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, February 25, 2026, in Department 12, at which time, the court will ask the Petitioner to provide the specific dates to be included in the court's order.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE COURT INTENDS TO DENY THE RESPONDENT'S RFO AND GRANT THE PETITIONER'S RFO. APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12, AT WHICH TIME, THE COURT

¹ The court required service on the Respondent by December 19, 2025, and any Responsive Pleading to be filed by December 24, 2025. The court deferred referring the parties to CCRC until the hearing, which was set for December 31, 2025.

WILL ASK THE PETITIONER TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC DATES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ANTICIPATED ORDER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

5. MATTHEW MCGARRY V. ALLY HOFFMAN

25FL1256

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on December 31, 2025, to set child custody and visitation. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for January 15, 2026. To date, there is no proof of service in the court's file. Additionally, the court is in receipt of a memorandum from the CCRC counsellor, indicating neither party appeared at the CCRC session.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF 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) 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

6. MICHAEL CHARLES LIPKIN V. ILEENE LIPKIN

22FL0794

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on January 06, 2026, requesting (1) a ruling on the Respondent's interests in the marital residence and marital property; and (2) attorney fees and costs. Proof of service attached to the RFO shows the RFO (but not the court's notice of tentative ruling) was electronically served on Petitioner's Counsel on January 06, 2026.

On February 03, 2026, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration. Concurrently-filed proof of service shows the Responsive Declaration was electronically served on Respondent that same day.

With respect to the first request for a judicial determination characterizing certain property as community or separate, this is an ultimate issue for trial. There has been no request for bifurcation. In the absence of bifurcation, the court does not intend to issue intermediate orders on substantive issues. Therefore, the Respondent's request is denied.

With respect to the request for attorney fees, the court notes that Respondent did not file and serve the required Income and Expense Declaration with the RFO. (Cal. Rules Ct., R. 5.360, subd. (a).) Therefore, the request for attorney fees is denied.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE RFO IS DENIED. 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

7. PAUL SEMONIAN V. JENNINA CHIAVETTA

25FL0459

This is a follow-up hearing regarding the Respondent's Request for Order (RFO) filed December 03, 2025, to compel disclosures and request bifurcation. At the hearing on January 14, 2026, the court granted the request to compel disclosures and continued the hearing on the remaining issue of bifurcation. The court ordered the parties to submit supplemental declarations on or before February 11, 2026.

On February 05, 2026, Respondent filed a supplemental declaration, which was served on Petitioner the same day via mail.

The court intends to grant the motion to bifurcate and for entry of a status-only judgment. However, the court will need: (1) a Declaration for Default or Uncontested Dissolution or Legal Separation (Judicial Council form FL-170); or (2) Respondent's appearance at the hearing to provide sworn testimony establishing jurisdictional facts.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT INTENDS TO GRANT THE MOTION TO BIFURCATE AND FOR ENTRY OF A STATUS-ONLY JUDGMENT. THE COURT CONTINUES THE MATTER TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO FILE AND SERVE THE DECLARATION FOR DEFAULT OR UNCONTESTED DISSOLUTION OR LEGAL SEPARATION (JUDICIAL COUNCIL FORM FL-170) ON OR BEFORE MARCH 06, 2026. ALTERNATIVELY, RESPONDENT MAY REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT (PER LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. OUTLINED BELOW) ON THE INSTANT TENTATIVE RULING AND APPEAR AT THE HEARING AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.

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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

8. REGAN R. SINGER V. JOSEPH L. KRIEGER

24FL0165

This action was filed on February 21, 2024. To date, there is no proof of service of summons on the Respondent in the court's file. Under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.420, the court may 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).)

TENTATIVE RULING #8: 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

9. ROSE SHAMAS V. BLAKE ANDREW SHAMAS

23FL0565

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on December 17, 2025, to modify child custody and visitation. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for January 08, 2026. Proof of service filed February 02, 2026, shows the RFO, CCRC referral, and Notice of Tentative Ruling were served upon the Respondent via mail and email on December 18, 2025.

Also on February 02, 2026, the Petitioner filed a subpoena duces tecum directed to the Lake Tahoe Unified School District requiring the production of entire school records for the parties' child, GS (age 5); Petitioner also filed and served the required Notice to Consumer or Employee (Judicial Council form SUBP-025), directed to Respondent.

On February 04, 2026, the Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration. Proof of service filed February 04, 2026, states the Responsive Declaration was personally served upon February 04, 2026; however, the proof of service does not indicate the person who was served.

The court is in receipt of the CCRC report dated February 05, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties, and Petitioner's attorney, on February 06, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that day.

On February 10, 2026, the Respondent filed a supplemental declaration, which was electronically served on Petitioner's attorney that same day, according to the proof of service, also filed February 10, 2026.

The court has read and considered the above-referenced documents. The court agrees with the assessment of the CCRC counsellor that it is concerning that the parties have not resolved their conflicts such as to be able to manage coparenting issues on their own. Similarly, the court agrees that there is no basis for a modification of the existing parenting plan requested by either parent.

However, the court finds no evidence in the CCRC report or in either party's declarations that would justify putting their child GS (age 5) in therapy. It, also, was not requested by either parent.

The court finds that the Agreements of the parties and the Recommendations of the CCRC counsellor set forth in the CCRC Report of February 05, 2026, excepting the Recommendation that the parties refer GS to therapy, are in GS's best interests and therefore adopts them as the orders of the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE COURT FINDS THAT THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CCRC COUNSELLOR SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT OF FEBRUARY 05, 2026, EXCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PARTIES REFER THEIR CHILD, GS, TO THERAPY, ARE IN GS'S BEST INTEREST AND THEREFORE ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

10. SAVANNA ARNETT V. GAVIN NISHIHIRA

25FL1181

This matter is before the court on two separate Requests for Orders (RFO), one filed by the Respondent on January 29, 2026, and the other filed by the Petitioner on February 05, 2026.

Respondent's RFO Filed January 29, 2026

Respondent's RFO requests the court to modify child custody and visitation; it also includes a request for Temporary Emergency Orders. On January 29, 2026, the court issued an order shortening time, ordering the Respondent to serve the RFO on the Petitioner on or before February 04, 2026; and the Petitioner to file and serve her Responsive Declaration on or before February 11, 2026. The court also granted Temporary Emergency Orders prohibiting either party from removing the minor children from the state of California pending the hearing set for February 18, 2026; and ordering that the Petitioner shall have the children attend the school they were attending as of the start of this year, 2026.

Proof of service filed February 02, 2026, shows the RFO and Temporary Emergency Orders (but not the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling) were served upon Petitioner via mail.

Petitioner's RFO Filed February 05, 2026

Petitioner's RFO requests the court to: (1) set aside the temporary emergency orders issued January 29, 2026; (2) strike Respondent's RFO and supporting declaration, both filed January 29, 2026; (3) admonish Respondent and his attorney for filing confidential Child Protective Service (CPS) reports in violation of Penal Code 11167.5; and (4) impose sanctions under Family Code section 271. The RFO also included a request for Temporary Emergency Orders.

On February 05, 2026, the court granted Temporary Emergency Orders as follows: (1) Respondent's RFO and Declaration shall be placed in the confidential portion of the court's file; (2) the court reserves jurisdiction over Petitioner's request that Respondent's RFO and Declaration be stricken, Petitioner's request that Respondent and his attorney be admonished for filing a confidential CPS report with the court, and Family Code section 271 sanctions.

On February 06, 2026, Respondent filed an "Opposition to Request for Ex Parte Orders." Proof of service filed February 06, 2026, shows said opposition was electronically served upon Petitioner's attorney that same day.

///

///

CCRC Referral and Temporary Emergency Orders

The court has read and considered the above referenced documents. The court orders the parties to participate in CCRC on Friday, March 05, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., and sets the matter for review on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 8:30 a.m. in Department 12 of the court. The court will issue a new Tentative Ruling by 2:00 p.m. the day prior to the new hearing date. Any supplemental declarations must be served and filed at least 10 days prior to the new hearing date. The parties are directed to submit the required CCRC questionnaire (Local Form F-17a, which can be downloaded from the court's website or obtained from the Clerk's Office) at least five days prior to the CCRC session.

Pending the new hearing, the Temporary Emergency Orders issued January 29, 2026 (Respondent's RFO), and February 05, 2026 (Petitioner's RFO), shall remain in full force and effect as will the previous orders issued on December 02, 2025, by the Superior Court of California, in and for Nevada County, except as modified by the two Emergency orders entered by this court.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT ORDERS THE PARTIES TO PARTICIPATE IN CCRC ON MARCH 05, 2026, AT 1:00 P.M. AND SETS THE MATTER FOR REVIEW ON APRIL 15, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT 12 OF THE COURT. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS MUST BE SERVED AND FILED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEW HEARING DATE. THE PARTIES ARE DIRECTED TO SUBMIT THE REQUIRED CCRC QUESTIONNAIRE (LOCAL FORM F-17a, WHICH CAN BE DOWNLOADED FROM THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR OBTAINED FROM THE CLERK'S OFFICE) AT LEAST FIVE DAYS PRIOR TO THE CCRC SESSION. PENDING THE NEW HEARING, THE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ORDERS ISSUED JANUARY 29, 2026 (RESPONDENT'S RFO), AND FEBRUARY 05, 2026 (PETITIONER'S RFO), SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT AS WILL THE PREVIOUS ORDERS ISSUED ON DECEMBER 02, 2025, BY THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, IN AND FOR NEVADA COUNTY, EXCEPT AS MODIFIED BY THE TWO EMERGENCY ORDERS ENTERED BY THIS COURT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

11. STEPHANIE CHAVEZ V. EDUARDO ALBERTO TORRES OCHOA 25FL0929

This matter is before the court on the petition to declare minor free from parental custody and control of the Respondent, filed by the Petitioner on September 05, 2025. That same day, the court issued a Citation to Appear. To date, there is no proof of service of said citation upon the Respondent. Therefore, the court is unable to grant the requested relief at this time.

Petitioner's appearance is required at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, February 25, 2026, in Department 12, at which time, the court intends to set a continued hearing date and issue a new Citation to Appear. The court notes that, should the Petitioner require assistance with serving the new Citation, the Petitioner may consult with an attorney and/or the Family Law Facilitator.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE PETITIONER'S APPEARANCE IS REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
8:30 a.m.

12. TINA WALLICK V. MICHAEL SHOTT

SFL20110036

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on December 15, 2025, to modify child custody and visitation of the parties' child, ES (age 15). This prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for January 05, 2026. Proof of service filed December 23, 2025, shows the RFO, CCRC Referral, and Notice of Tentative Ruling were personally served upon the Respondent on December 20, 2025.

To date, the Respondent has filed no Responsive Declaration.

The court is in receipt of the CCRC report dated January 05, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties that same day per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, also filed January 05, 2026.

The CCRC counsellor states in their report it would be beneficial to interview the child in order to provide additional insight into the circumstances presented, and provide the child a fair opportunity to have her voice heard directly by the court so that her preference can be taken into considerations and appropriate recommendations be made.

The court hereby sets a new CCRC appointment for the CCRC counsellor to interview ES on Thursday, February 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. The parent having physical custody of the child on that date shall be responsible for transporting the child to the CCRC appointment.

The court hereby continues the hearing to April 15, 2026. The parties are ordered to file and serve any supplemental declarations on or before April 08, 2026.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT SETS A NEW CCRC APPOINTMENT FOR FEBRUARY 26, 2026, AT 1:00 P.M. FOR THE CCRC COUNSELLOR TO INTERVIEW THE PARTIES' CHILD, ES. THE PARENT HAVING PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE CHILD ON THAT DATE SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TRANSPORTING THE CHILD TO THE CCRC APPOINTMENT. THE COURT HEREBY CONTINUES THE HEARING ON THE RFO TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ON OR BEFORE APRIL 08, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
FEBRUARY 25, 2026
10:00 a.m.

13. YESENIA HERNANDEZ V. JESUS PLATERO SOSA

SFL20110044

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on January 14, 2026, to unilaterally obtain a passport for the parties' child, AP (age 17), without the signature and/or appearance of the Respondent.

There is no proof of service for the RFO in the court's file. However, on February 10, 2026, the Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, consenting to the Petitioner's RFO. Proof of service, also filed February 10, 2026, shows the Responsive Declaration was served upon the Petitioner that same day by mail.

Based upon the Respondent's non-opposition, the RFO will be granted. The Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders after Hearing (FOAH) for the court's review and signature. The court notes that the Petitioner may seek assistance preparing the FOAH from the Family Law Facilitator.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT INTENDS TO GRANT THE RFO. THE PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH) FOR THE COURT'S REVIEW AND SIGNATURE.

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.