

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**1. ALLISON MCGRARY V. CHRISTOPHER MCGRARY**

**22FL0464**

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on February 26, 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 March 20, 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 March 20, 2026, stating that neither party appeared at the CCRC session as scheduled. The court will drop the matter from the calendar without prejudice due to lack of service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO LACK OF SERVICE.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**2. LYDIA MARIE CAREL V. JEROME SILAS**

**22FL0110**

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 473, subdivision (b) on February 25, 2026, to set aside the court's order issued earlier that same day on February 25, 2026, on the grounds that Respondent mistakenly failed to register for the court's new remote appearance platform (implemented February 02, 2026), and therefore, Respondent did not appear at the February 25, 2026, hearing (related to two separate RFOs – one filed by the Respondent on December 01, 2025, and the other filed by the Petitioner on December 12, 2025).

On April 13, 2026, the Respondent filed a declaration with exhibits attached thereto.

On April 20, 2026, the Petitioner filed an objection to Exhibits A through H attached to Respondent's April 13, 2026, declaration on the grounds that the Petitioner was not aware of, or consented to, being recorded. The court sustains the objection and does not consider Exhibits A through H.

The court will vacate its February 25, 2026, order, thereby returning the case to its posture of having a tentative ruling posted February 24, 2026. The court has included the complete text of its February 24, 2026, tentative ruling below.

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 time<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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 #2: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026, FOR ORAL ARGUMENT CONCERNING THE TENTATIVE RULING ORIGINALLY ISSUED BY THIS COURT ON FEBRUARY 24, 2026, A COPY OF WHICH IS INCLUDED ABOVE.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**3. MATTHEW GLAZE V. SHYANNE LECKIE**

**24FL0571**

This matter is before the court for hearing of two competing Requests for Order (RFO), both regarding child custody and visitation.

The first RFO was filed by the Petitioner on March 02, 2026, and included a request for temporary emergency orders, which the court denied. The filing of the Petitioner's RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for March 16, 2026. Proof of service filed March 10, 2026, shows the RFO and CCRC referral (but not the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling) was personally served on the Respondent on March 08, 2026.

The second RFO was filed by the Respondent on March 03, 2026. The court issued the same CCRC referral as it did for Petitioner's RFO, setting a CCRC session for March 16, 2026. Proof of service filed March 09, 2026, shows the RFO and supporting documents (but not the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling) were personally served on the Petitioner on March 05, 2026.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated March 16, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties on March 18, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that date. The court notes that the copy mailed to the Respondent was returned to the court as undeliverable.

Neither party filed a Responsive Declaration to the other party's RFO. The court notes, however, that the competing RFOs are essentially responsive to each other.

Both parties filed a supplemental declaration regarding the CCRC report: the Petitioner filed his on March 23, 2026, and the Respondent filed hers on April 16, 2026. However, neither party filed a proof of service for their respective supplemental declarations. Therefore, the court does not consider either of these filings.

The court finds that the Agreements reached by the parties as contained in the CCRC Report, as well as the Recommendations of the CCRC counsellor, are in the best interests of the parties' child and so adopts them as the orders of the court.

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT FINDS THAT THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT DATED MARCH 16, 2026, ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES' CHILD AND SO ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE FOR 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**4. MONIQUE INSHAW V. FRANCOIS INSHAW**

**23FL0924**

This matter is on calendar for confirmation of trial, which is currently set for April 30, 2026. As for the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on March 04, 2026, the RFO will continue to trail the trial on the domestic violence request.

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M.,  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 FOR CONFIRMATION OF TRIAL.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**5. STEPHAN HAASE V. TAYLOR BROOKE MYATT**

**23FL0933**

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on March 03, 2026, to modify visitation. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for March 20, 2026. Proof of service filed March 04, 2026, shows the RFO and supporting UCCJEA declaration (but not the court's Notice of Tentative Ruling) were electronically served upon the Petitioner that same day.

On March 10, 2026, the court entered the parties' stipulation to continue the CCRC session to March 23, 2026.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated March 30, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties, as well as their attorneys, on April 02, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that same day.

On April 16, 2026, the Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration. Proof of service filed April 16, 2026, shows it was served upon the Respondent that same day via overnight delivery.

On April 22, 2026, the Respondent filed a reply declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Petitioner via mail that same day.

The court finds that the Agreements reached by the parties as contained in the CCRC Report, as well as the Recommendations of the CCRC counsellor, are in the best interests of the parties' child, SH (age 7), and so adopts them as the orders of the court.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE RFO IS GRANTED IN PART. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT DATED MARCH 30, 2026, ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES' CHILD, SH (AGE 7), AND SO ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE FOR 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 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**6. 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, under Family Code section 7822. On February 25, 2026, the court issued an amended citation to appear for April 29, 2026.

On February 27, 2026, the court granted Petitioner's request to serve the amended citation by posting it for 28 continuous days at the South Lake Tahoe Branch of the El Dorado County Superior Court.

Proof of service filed March 30, 2026, shows that the Petitioner properly served the amended citation by posting. Additionally, on March 04, 2026, Petitioner filed proof of service via mail that same day.

The court investigator's report filed December 03, 2025, recommends granting the relief requested. The court notes that the investigator was able to interview the Respondent, who consents to the request but asks for the opportunity to have visits or other contact with the child.

The court grants the petition. Given that the nature of the petition is to terminate parental rights, the court will not order any visitation; however, the court's order does not preclude the Petitioner from allowing the Respondent to have visits.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE PETITIONER'S RFO TO DECLARE THE MINOR FREE FROM PARENTAL CUSTODY AND CONTROL OF THE RESPONDENT IS GRANTED.**

**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.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

**7. YVETTE GREY V. SCOTT LABAR**

**SFL20200150**

On April 06, 2022, the court ordered dissolution of the marriage effective that day. Yet, the matter was set for a Mandatory Settlement Conference on May 09, 2022, and a Trial Setting Conference on May 11, 2022.

Neither party submitted a proposed judgment for the court's signature.

On December 10, 2025, the court dismissed the matter pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310. However, this dismissal was entered in error. Thus, on April 15, 2026, the court issued an ex parte minute order vacating the dismissal and placing the matter on calendar. A copy of the ex parte minute order was mailed to both parties.

To date, there is still no proposed judgment submitted to the court for review and signature. Appearances are required to discuss the status of the case and set any appropriate future hearings.

**TENTATIVE RULING #7: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M.,  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 12  
APRIL 29, 2026  
10:00 a.m.

**1. JEOVANNY GUZMAN PEREZ V. LINDA 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 Orders After Hearing (FOAH).

On January 14, 2026, the court (1) ordered the Respondent to file a Responsive Declaration on or before January 26, 2026; (2) referred the parties to a CCRC session set for February 05, 2026 (to include an interview of the parties' child, CG (age 13)); and (3) placed the matter on calendar for review on April 29, 2026. The court directed the parties to file any supplemental declarations concerning the CCRC report no later than April 22, 2026.

On January 26, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Petitioner via mail that same day according to the proof of service, also filed January 26, 2026.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated February 06, 2026. The court mailed a copy of the CCRC report to both parties that same day per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed February 06, 2026.

The CCRC report indicates the parties were able to reach a full agreement, which has been memorialized in writing and signed by both parties. Neither party filed a supplemental declaration rescinding the agreement. The court finds the parties' agreement to be in the best interests of their child, CG (age 13), and so adopts the agreement as the orders of the court.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE COURT ADOPTS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENT CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 06, 2026, AND SUBSEQUENTLY SIGNED BY BOTH PARTIES, 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.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.**