

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**1. CARLOS FRANCISCO MORALES V. KEELY JORENE MORALES 25FL1243**

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on January 28, 2026, to transfer the case from the South Lake Tahoe Branch to the Placerville Branch of the El Dorado Superior Court on the grounds that neither party resides in South Lake Tahoe, California. Respondent declares she resides “close to Placerville” and the Petitioner resides in Gardnerville, Nevada. Proof of service, also filed January 28, 2026, shows the RFO was served upon the Petitioner by mail that same day.

On February 17, 2026, the Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration. However, there is no proof of service for said declaration in the court’s file. For this reason, the court does not consider the filing.

Despite there being no opposition that was timely served, the court does not find good cause to transfer the case to Placerville. (El Dorado Super. Ct., Local Ct. R. 2.00.08.D(6) [“Any action or proceeding may, for good cause, be transferred from the South Lake Tahoe Session to the Session at the County Seat, or vice versa, on motion of any party or the Courts.”].) Transferring the case would disadvantage the Petitioner to the same degree as it would benefit the Respondent. Therefore, the request is denied.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: 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  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**2. HERVE GOGUELY V. SYLVIE GOGUELY**

**24FL0466**

This matter is before the court for a Trial Setting Conference. The parties are ordered to appear to select a trial date, and potentially a new Mandatory Settlement Conference date (the parties previously participated in a Mandatory Settlement Conference on February 26, 2026).

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO SELECT A TRIAL DATE, AND POTENTIALLY A NEW MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATE.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**3. JARED ALLAN COLLINS V. STEFANI KERN**

**SFL20180059**

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on January 27, 2026, to modify child custody and visitation. Respondent also requests the court to order the Petitioner not to interfere with the Respondent's parenting time (i.e., scheduling extracurricular activities for the parties' children during the Respondent's scheduled visitation). Proof of service filed February 02, 2026, shows the RFO was personally served upon the Petitioner on February 01, 2026.

On February 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration. There is no proof of service for this declaration. Therefore, the court does not consider it. On February 26, 2026, the Petitioner filed an Amended Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Respondent by mail that same day, according to the proof of service filed February 27, 2026. The court notes, however, that service of the amended declaration is untimely. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1005, subd. (b) [requiring opposition papers to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing].) Therefore, the court does not consider the Petitioner's amended declaration, either.

The custody and visitation order the Respondent seeks to modify was based upon the parties' stipulation at the last CCRC session on September 12, 2025 (the corresponding CCRC report was issued that same day). Generally, the court does not issue a new CCRC referral on a contested custody or visitation matter where a CCRC report has been issued within the past six months. (El Dorado Super. Ct., Local Ct. R. 8.10.01.) In this case, the instant RFO was filed roughly four-and-a-half months after the most recent CCRC session on September 12, 2025. Therefore, the court did not issue a new CCRC referral at the time Respondent filed the instant RFO.

The hearing date on the Respondent's RFO is one day shy of six months since the last CCRC report. Given the fact that the Petitioner opposes the RFO (the court merely notes the fact that the Petitioner opposes the RFO, not the substance of his opposition, for the reasons explained above), the court finds it appropriate to issue a new CCRC referral. The court orders the parties to participate in CCRC on Friday, March 27, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. and sets the matter for review on Wednesday, May 13, 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 on or before May 08, 2026.

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.

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT ORDERS THE PARTIES TO PARTICIPATE IN CCRC ON FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 2026, AT 1:00 P.M. AND SETS THE MATTER FOR REVIEW ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 OF THE COURT. ANY**

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS MUST BE FILED AND SERVED ON OR BEFORE MAY 08, 2026. 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.**

**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  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**4. KERRY BROWN V. MARC BROWN**

**22FL0838**

This matter is before the court for review following the orders entered after hearing on January 21, 2026. The court ordered the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations on or before March 04, 2026.

On March 03, 2026, the Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration, which was served upon the Respondent via mail on March 02, 2026, according to the proof of service, also filed March 02, 2026.

Ruth E. Jacobsen, MSW, LCSW (the reunification therapist) also submitted a letter to the court dated February 20, 2026. Attached to Ms. Jacobsen's letter is a declaration from the parties' child, BB (age 15). There is no proof of service of Ms. Jacobsen's letter on either party. However, the Petitioner's supplemental declaration acknowledges receipt of Ms. Jacobsen's February 20, 2026, letter, and further indicates that Ms. Jacobsen emailed a copy of her letter to both parties. (See K. Brown Supp. Decl., filed Mar. 03, 2026, ¶ 4.)

The Respondent did not submit any supplemental declaration.

Based upon the declaration of BB attached to Ms. Jacobsen's letter, the court discontinues reunification services. Respondent's visitation shall be at the request of BB and shall be facilitated by the parties.

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE COURT DISCONTINUES REUNIFICATION SERVICES. RESPONDENT'S VISITATION SHALL BE AT THE REQUEST OF THE PARTIES' CHILD, BB (AGE 15), AND SHALL BE FACILITATED BY THE PARTIES.**

**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  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**5. MAE CABRISTANTE V. CHAD CABRISTANTE, SR.**

**SFL20200161**

This matter is before the court for a five-year dismissal hearing under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310, which provides, “An action shall be brought to trial within five years after the action is commenced against the defendant.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.310.) The action was filed on November 13, 2020.

The five-year dismissal hearing was originally set for December 03, 2025. On December 02, 2025, the court issued a tentative ruling dismissing the action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310. Both parties appeared at the December 03, 2025, hearing. The Petitioner expressed her desire to proceed with divorce. The court referred the parties to the Family Law Facilitator for assistance with preparing the necessary documents for judgment of dissolution and indicated that if no appearances and/or judgment of dissolution was submitted to the court, the court would dismiss the petition for dissolution without prejudice at the next scheduled hearing.

Since December 03, 2025, there have been no new filings. Therefore, the court intends to dismiss the action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 583.310, THE COURT DISMISSES THE ACTION 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  
MARCH 11, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**6. MICHAEL CORBITT, SR. V. CORRIN THOMPSON**

**SFL20210046**

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on January 07, 2026, 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 26, 2026. To date, there is no proof of service of the RFO in the court's file. Additionally, the court received a memorandum from the CCRC counsellor dated January 26, 2026, stating that neither party appeared for the scheduled CCRC appointment.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: 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  
MARCH 11, 2026  
10:00 a.m.

**7. DAINY BONILLA SIERRA V. JULIAN BERMEO OSORIO**

**26FL0085**

This matter is before the court on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on January 30, 2026, requesting that the court make a determination that the Respondent is the biological father of the Petitioner's minor children, JLBB (age 4), and FBB (age 2). Proof of Service of Summons filed February 20, 2026, shows that (in addition to the service of summons) the instant RFO and Declaration under Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) were personally served upon the Respondent on February 12, 2026.

To date, the Respondent has filed no opposition. Having reviewed and considered the Petitioner's RFO and UCCJEA Declaration, the court intends to grant the RFO, finding that the Respondent is the biological father of JLBB and FBB. Such finding will allow the court to issue custody orders in this matter.

**TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE RFO IS GRANTED. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE RESPONDENT IS THE BIOLOGICAL FATHER OF THE PETITIONER'S MINOR CHILDREN, JLBB (AGE 4), AND FBB (AGE 2).**

**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.**