

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. ALEXANDRA OLMSTEAD V. AUSTIN KUENZI

SFL20140287

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on January 30, 2026, to transfer the case to the state of Nevada (Petitioner's RFO does not identify any specific court in Nevada) on the grounds that both parties presently reside in Nevada. Petitioner concurrently filed a Declaration Under Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) stating that the parties' child has lived with the Respondent in Gardnerville, Nevada, since August 2022.

Proof of service filed February 09, 2026, shows the RFO was served upon the respondent by mail on February 07, 2026. To date, Respondent has filed no opposition.

The court, on its own motion, takes judicial notice of the fact that Gardnerville, Nevada, is located in Douglas County. (Evid. Code, § 452, subd. (h).) Therefore, it would appear that the Petitioner requests to transfer the case to the Ninth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Douglas.

The court intends to grant the RFO; however, appearances are required to confirm that the Ninth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Douglas is the proper court for transfer.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE COURT INTENDS TO GRANT THE RFO.
APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, IN
DEPARTMENT 12 FOR CONFIRMATION THAT THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS IS THE PROPER COURT
FOR TRANSFER.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. BRYCE SHIPLEY V. ELISE SHIPLEY

26FL0160

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on March 03, 2026, to set child custody and visitation. On March 03, 2026, the court issued an order shortening time. The court ordered Petitioner to serve the RFO upon Respondent no later than March 09, 2026; and ordered the Respondent to file and serve a Responsive Declaration no later than March 16, 2026. The court also referred the parties to a CCRC session set for March 19, 2026.

There is no proof of service of the RFO or the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling in the court's file. Nonetheless, on March 16, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Supplemental Declaration. Proof of service filed March 17, 2026, shows that the Responsive Declaration was electronically served upon the Petitioner on March 16, 2026. Proof of service attached to the Supplemental Declaration shows it was electronically served upon the Petitioner on March 17, 2026, which is untimely under the court's March 03, 2026, order shortening time. Therefore, the court does not consider the untimely Supplemental Declaration.

On March 18, 2026, Respondent filed declarations from the following witnesses: (1) Lloyd Steinbrook; (2) Mitchell Shipley; (3) Matthew Howells; and (4) Darlene Shipley. Proof of service filed March 18, 2026, shows that each of these declarations was electronically served upon the Petitioner that same day. The court does not consider any of the aforementioned declarations due to their untimeliness.

The court is in receipt of the CCRC report dated March 23, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties, and electronically served upon both of their attorneys, on March 25, 2026, according to the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, also filed March 25, 2026.

On April 02, 2026, Respondent filed another declaration in opposition to Petitioner's RFO (as opposed to a declaration addressing the contents of the CCRC report). Proof of service attached to the declaration shows it was electronically served upon the Respondent that same day. The court does not consider this declaration due to its untimeliness.

On April 06, 2026, Respondent filed objections to the March 23, 2026, CCRC report. A copy of Respondent's objections were electronically served upon Petitioner that same day according to the attached proof of service.

On April 07, 2026, the court denied a request made by the Respondent to continue the instant hearing.

Having read and considered the CCRC report, the court finds that the agreements and recommendations contained therein are in the best interests of the parties' children and so adopts them as the orders of the court, with two exceptions outlined below.

1. Although the CCRC report recommends joint physical custody of the children utilizing a 2/2 schedule, the court does not find it to be in the best interest of the children for the parties to share equal physical custody at this time. While the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

court commends the Respondent for his commitment to sobriety, as well as his desire to spend more time with the children (in light of his previous statements to the effect of him not wanting to be a parent), the court wants to be confident the Respondent is sincere about these changes by seeing a longer period of demonstrated improvement. As noted in the CCRC report, the Respondent has abstained from alcohol since January 05, 2026. Respondent reported that previously, however, he drank three drinks a night on the weeknights and around 10 drinks a night on the weekends. The court modifies the recommendation in the CCRC report regarding the parenting plan as follows: Respondent shall have custody of the children every weekend except for the third and fifth weekends of each month. Weekend custody shall begin at the end of the school day on Fridays (or 3:00 p.m. on Fridays if school is not in session) and end on Sundays at 5:00 p.m. The parent having weekend custody time shall pick the children up from school on Friday (or the other parent's residence if school is not in session) and return the child to the other parent's residence on Sunday at 5:00 p.m. Additionally, the Respondent shall have custody of the children every Wednesday from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. On these days, the Respondent shall pick the children up from school (or the Petitioner's residence if school is not in session) and return the children to the Petitioner's residence at 6:00 p.m.

2. The court modifies the right of first option of childcare to apply when either parent requires childcare for four hours or more (the CCRC report recommends that the right of first option apply when either parent requires childcare for two hours or more).

TENTATIVE RULING #2: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12. THE COURT'S TENTATIVE RULING IS TO GRANT THE RFO IN PART AND DENY THE RFO IN PART. REFER TO FULL TEXT. BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE COURT'S NOTICE OF TENTATIVE RULING IN THE COURT'S FILE, THE COURT WILL NOT LIMIT THE PARTIES' ABILITY TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENT UNDER LOCAL COURT RULE 8.05.07 (GENERALLY REQUIRING A TIMELY ORAL ARGUMENT REQUEST, AS WELL AS NOTICE UPON THE OTHER PARTY, ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. HOLLY A. AVILA V. DONALD F. HOPKINS, III

23FL0439

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on February 06, 2026, to modify child custody and visitation. The RFO also includes a request for temporary emergency orders pending the hearing, which the court denied. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for February 26, 2026.

To date, there is no proof of service of the RFO in the court's file. Additionally, the court is in receipt of a memorandum from the CCRC counsellor indicating that neither party appeared for the CCRC session as scheduled. The court drops the matter from the calendar without prejudice due to the lack of service.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO THE 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
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. LESLIE EDMONDS V. JEFFREY EDMONDS

23FL1077

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on February 02, 2026, to (1) set child custody and visitation; (2) grant the Petitioner exclusive temporary use, possession, and control of the real property located at 2949 Springwood Drive in South Lake Tahoe, California; (3) award attorney's fees and costs (both need-based under Family Code section 2030, and as sanctions under Family Code section 271 based on Respondent allegedly breaching his fiduciary duty under the automatic temporary restraining order in the summons (ATROS) by draining the parties' joint account); (4) require Respondent to return approximately \$239,000.00 he allegedly removed from the parties' Commonwealth Financial account; (5) require the parties to file tax returns; (6) list the real property located at 114 Keyt Way in Cotati, California, for immediate sale; and (7) require Respondent to reimburse Petitioner for post-separation expenses.

Petitioner concurrently filed a current Income and Expense Declaration (I&E), and supporting declarations from herself and her attorney. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for February 19, 2026. Proof of service filed February 03, 2026, shows the RFO and supporting documents (but not the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling) were electronically served upon the Respondent that same day.

On February 13, 2026, the court found good cause to grant Respondent's request to continue the CCRC hearing. The court continued the CCRC session to March 05, 2026, and ordered the Respondent to serve notice of the same on Petitioner no later than February 17, 2026. There is no proof of service in the court's file for the continued CCRC date. However, as noted below, both parties attended the re-scheduled CCRC session. Thus, the court deems Petitioner to have waived any defect in service.

On March 02, 2026, the Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration in support of her RFO, a copy of which was served upon the Respondent that same day, according to the proof of service, also filed March 02, 2026.

On March 04, 2026, the Respondent filed a declaration (not a responsive declaration to the RFO) in advance of the CCRC appointment. Respondent's declaration was electronically served upon the Petitioner on March 02, 2026, according to the proof of service filed March 04, 2026.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated March 23, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties and electronically served upon both parties' attorneys of record, on March 25, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, also filed March 25, 2026.

On March 25, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Petitioner's RFO. Proof of service filed that same day shows the Responsive Declaration was electronically served on March 25, 2026.

On April 03, 2026, Petitioner filed another supplemental declaration, which was electronically served upon the Respondent that same day, according to the proof of service filed April 03, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

On April 14, 2026, the parties submitted a stipulation regarding child custody and visitation, which the court has approved, thereby resolving the custody and visitation issues presented by the RFO.

The court grants the RFO insofar as the Petitioner requests control of the real property located at 2949 Springwood Drive in South Lake Tahoe, California. The evidence shows that the Petitioner has been in exclusive possession of said property for over two years and thus, granting the request will maintain the status quo.

The court defers the other property-related requests, as well as the request for sanctions based on the alleged breach of fiduciary duty, to the time of trial, as it is not proper to decide such issues in a “piece-meal” fashion. The court notes that the petition for dissolution has been pending since October 31, 2023.

Lastly, the court continues the hearing on the request for need-based attorney fees to April 29, 2026, because there is no current I&E submitted by the Respondent. The Respondent is ordered to file and serve his I&E on or before April 22, 2026, so the court can make its determination regarding need-based attorney fees.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE RFO IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART (REFER TO FULL TEXT). ADDITIONALLY, THE HEARING ON THE PORTION OF THE RFO RELATED TO NEED-BASED ATTORNEY FEES IS CONTINUED TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12. THE RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE A CURRENT INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION NO LATER THAN APRIL 22, 2026. BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE COURT’S NOTICE OF TENTATIVE RULING IN THE COURT’S FILE, THE COURT WILL NOT LIMIT THE PARTIES’ ABILITY TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENT UNDER LOCAL COURT RULE 8.05.07 (GENERALLY REQUIRING A TIMELY ORAL ARGUMENT REQUEST, AS WELL AS NOTICE UPON THE OTHER PARTY, ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED).

APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

5. MICHELLE PIMLEY V. DENNIS PIMLEY

25FL0925

This matter is before the court for a trial setting conference requested by the Petitioner on March 10, 2026, as well as a Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on March 23, 2026, regarding the sale of the marital home and division of community property funds in the parties' Wells Fargo account ending in 5399.

Trial Setting Conference

The issues to be addressed at trial are property division, spousal support, *Epstein*¹ credits, and *Watts*² charges. The parties are ordered to appear to participate in the selection of Mandatory Settlement Conference and trial dates.

RFO

The RFO has been made moot by a stipulation and order signed by the court on April 14, 2026. Therefore, the matter is dropped from the calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #5:

TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SELECTION OF MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

REQUEST FOR ORDER: THE RFO IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR AS MOOT.

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

² *In re Marriage of Watts* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 366.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

6. MONIQUE INSHAW V. FRANCOIS INSHAW

23FL0924

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent, Francois Inshaw (“Respondent”), on March 04, 2026,³ to (1) require the parties’ child, PI (age 8,) to receive vaccines required to attend school in California; (2) authorize Respondent to retrieve his belongings from the parties’ marital homes; (3) require Petitioner Monique Inshaw (“Petitioner”) to return community funds she allegedly removed before and immediately after separation; and (4) set a CCRC session as soon as possible. The RFO also included a request for an order shortening time.

On March 06, 2026, Petitioner’s attorney filed a declaration in opposition to Respondent’s request for an order shortening time. A copy of this declaration was electronically served that same day according to the proof of service, also filed March 06, 2026. Ultimately, the court denied the Respondent’s request to shorten time.

Two separate proofs of service, both filed March 17, 2026, show that the Respondent’s RFO, as well as the court’s Notice of Tentative Ruling, were electronically served upon Petitioner on March 09, 2026.

On March 30, 2026, the Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent on March 28, 2026, according to the proof of service filed March 30, 2026.

Also on March 30, 2026, the Respondent filed a reply brief. Proof of service attached to the reply brief shows it was electronically served upon the Petitioner on March 29, 2026.

On April 08, 2026, Respondent filed a separate reply declaration, which was electronically served on Petitioner that same day according to the attached proof of service.

The issues raised in the instant RFO are not decisions the court will make while the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) remains pending. The TRO was originally issued on September 13, 2023. Since then, the TRO has been continued by agreement of the parties on representation that the dispute would be resolved. Currently, a contested hearing on the matter is set for April 30, 2026; and trial confirmation is set for April 29, 2026. The issues in the instant RFO shall therefore trail the TRO hearings.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE RFO SHALL TRAIL THE TRO HEARINGS, WHICH ARE CURRENTLY SET FOR TRIAL CONFIRMATION AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12; AND SET FOR A CONTESTED HEARING AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.

³ On March 06, 2026, Respondent requested the court to file the instant RFO under seal after being alerted by Petitioner’s counsel that excerpts of a Child Protective Services (CPS) report, attached to the RFO, are not to be made publicly available in court filings. The court granted Respondent’s request in an ex parte minute order issued March 06, 2026. Accordingly, the RFO filed March 04, 2026, is marked “confidential” in the court’s file.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

7. SAVANNA ARNETT V. GAVIN NISHIHIRA

25FL1181

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

A hearing was originally set for February 25, 2026. On that date, the court referred the parties to a CCRC session set for March 05, 2026,⁴ and continued the hearing to April 15, 2026. Pending the April 15 hearing, the following orders remain in full force and effect: (1) the Temporary Emergency Orders issued by this court on January 29, 2026 (Respondent's RFO); (2) the Temporary Emergency Orders issued by this court on February 05, 2026 (Petitioner's RFO); and (3) the 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.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated March 12, 2026, a copy of which was emailed to both Respondent and Petitioner's attorney that same day per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, also filed March 12, 2026.

The court notes that neither party submitted any supplemental declaration concerning the CCRC report.

The court finds that the agreements and recommendations contained in the CCRC report are in the best interests of the parties' children and so adopts them as the orders of the court with the following exceptions:

1. The CCRC report recommends that the children shall not be removed from El Dorado County. However, this is problematic because the Petitioner currently lives in Sacramento County. Therefore, the court modifies this recommendation in the CCRC report to state the children shall not be removed from El Dorado County or Sacramento County without written permission of the other parent or court order.
2. Although not expressly identified in the "Recommendations" section of the CCRC report, the body of the CCRC report recommends that the court appoint minor's counsel for each of the parties' two minor children. However, the court declines to do so for two reasons. First, the parenting classes and co-parenting counseling that the parties have agreed to participate in should alleviate the need for minor's counsel. Additionally, appointing minor's counsel would put additional financial stress on the parties, who are already struggling to meet their financial needs and the needs of the children.

⁴ The CCRC session was later re-scheduled to March 10, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MODIFICATIONS OUTLINED HEREIN, THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT DATED MARCH 12, 2026, TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES' CHILDREN AND SO 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
APRIL 15, 2026
8:30 a.m.

8. 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). On February 25, 2026, the court re-referred the parties to a CCRC session set for February 26, 2026, for the CCRC counsellor to interview ES. The court ordered the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations on or before April 08, 2026.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated April 01, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties, as well as Respondent's attorney, on April 02, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed April 02, 2026.

Neither party filed a timely supplemental declaration concerning the CCRC report.

The court finds the CCRC report and recommendations contained therein to be in the best interests of ES and therefore will adopt the recommendations as the orders of the court with the following exception: the Respondent shall have unsupervised visits with ES every Thursday after school (or 3:00 p.m. if school is not in session) until 8:00 p.m. Respondent shall pick up ES from school (or the Petitioner's residence at 3:00 p.m. if school is not in session) and return ES to the Petitioner's residence at 8:00 p.m.

The court also sets a review hearing at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 12, 2026, in Department 12 to determine whether any changes should be made heading into the following school year. The parties shall file and serve supplemental declarations at least 10 days prior to the review hearing (no later than July 31, 2026).

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CCRC REPORT DATED APRIL 01, 2026, AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION: RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE VISITATION WITH THE PARTIES' CHILD, ES, EVERY THURSDAY BEGINNING AFTER SCHOOL (OR 3:00 P.M. IF SCHOOL IS NOT IN SESSION) UNTIL 8:00 P.M. THE RESPONDENT SHALL PICK UP ES FROM SCHOOL (OR PETITIONER'S RESIDENCE AT 3:00 P.M. IF SCHOOL IS NOT IN SESSION) AND RETURN ES TO PETITIONER'S RESIDENCE AT 8:00 P.M.

THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO DETERMINE WHETHER ANY CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE HEADING INTO THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL YEAR. THE PARTIES SHALL FILE AND SERVE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING (NO LATER THAN JULY 31, 2026).

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 12

APRIL 15, 2026

8:30 a.m.

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.