

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. BRIAN EDWARD SEAHOLM V. VANESSA RUELLYN SEAHOLM

25FL0271

This matter is before the court for hearing of two separate Requests for Orders (RFO).

The first RFO, filed by the Respondent on March 10, 2026, is a request to modify child custody and visitation for the parties' children, SS (age 13) and CS (age 10). This RFO also included a request for temporary emergency orders, which the court denied.

The second RFO, filed by the Petitioner on May 19, 2026, is vaguely worded. It appears to be a one-time request authorizing the paternal grandmother to travel outside the County of El Dorado with the children for Memorial Day Weekend (as opposed to a request for a general lift of the current order that requires pre-authorization for any travel with the parties' children outside the County of El Dorado). This RFO also included a request for temporary emergency orders regarding the Memorial Day Weekend travel, which the court denied.

Respondent's RFO Filed March 10, 2026

A hearing on Respondent's RFO was originally set for April 22, 2026. On that date, the court referred the parties to a CCRC session set for May 07, 2026, continued the hearing to June 24, 2026, and ordered the parties to file any supplemental declarations regarding the CCRC report at least 10 days prior to the continued hearing date.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated May 26, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed May 27, 2026.

On June 04, 2026, the Respondent filed a timely supplemental declaration. Proof of service, also filed June 04, 2026, shows it was electronically served upon the Petitioner that same day.

On June 12, 2026, the Petitioner filed a timely supplemental declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon the Respondent that same day according to the proof of service, also filed June 12, 2026.

The CCRC report recommends seeking a third-party placement for the children. However, the court finds that third-party placement would be far more detrimental for the children. The CCRC report also sets forth the following two alternatives for the court to consider: (1) continuing Respondent's visitation in the form of a step-up plan; and (2) awarding Respondent primary physical custody of the children with non-professionally supervised visitation for the Petitioner.

The Petitioner opposes Respondent having primary physical custody of the children, in part, on the grounds that Respondent has allegedly violated the court's orders by including Mr. Sysock on vacations out of town with the children and otherwise allowing Mr. Sysock to be present during Respondent's visitation with the children. (Brian Seaholm, Supp. Decl., filed June 12, 2026, ¶ 7.) Notably, however, Respondent submitted evidence in her June 04, 2026, supplemental declaration showing that Respondent apparently travelled

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

with the children to Malibu, despite the court specifically denying this request. (Vanessa Seaholm, Supp. Decl., filed June 04, 2026, ¶ 4 & Ex. H.) In light of this evidence, Petitioner's argument opposing custody for Respondent based on Respondent's non-compliance with the court's orders is not well taken. It appears to the court that both parties consider the court's orders as merely advisory — that is simply not the case.

The court will adopt the recommendation of the CCRC counsellor to implement a step-up plan for Respondent's visitation, as follows:

- (1) During the first two weeks of July 2026, Respondent shall have unsupervised visitation with the children using the schedule that is currently in place (three visits per week for up to two hours per visit, with dates and times to be set by the parties based on their schedules and the children's obligations). Mr. Syssock shall not be present at any time during Respondent's visitation.
- (2) During the second two weeks of July 2026, Respondent shall have unsupervised visitation with the children from Friday at 3:00 p.m. to Monday at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Syssock shall not be present at any time during Respondent's visitation.
- (3) During the first two weeks of August 2026, Respondent shall have unsupervised visitation with the children from Friday at 3:00 p.m. to Monday at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Syssock may be present during Respondent's visitation, but only during the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Otherwise, Mr. Syssock shall not be present.
- (4) Beginning the third week of August 2026, the parties shall have week-on, week-off custody of the children. Exchanges shall occur Monday mornings through school, or 8:00 a.m. if there is no school. Mr. Syssock may be present during Respondent's custody time, but again, limited to the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Otherwise, Mr. Syssock shall not be present.
- (5) Beginning October 1, 2026, the parties shall have week-on, week-off custody of the children. Exchanges shall occur Monday mornings through school, or 8:00 a.m. if there is no school. There shall be no restriction regarding Mr. Syssock's presence.

Petitioner's RFO Filed May 19, 2026

The court denies Petitioner's RFO, as phrased, as moot.

TENTATIVE RULING #1:

RESPONDENT'S RFO FILED MARCH 10, 2026: THE RFO IS GRANTED IN PART. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT'S VISITATION SHALL CONTINUE AS SET FORTH IN THE STEP-UP PLAN OUTLINED HEREIN.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

PETITIONER'S RFO FILED MAY 19, 2026: THE RFO IS DENIED AS MOOT.

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
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. CARLOS FRANCISCO MORALES V. KEELY JORENE MORALES 25FL1243

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on May 13, 2026, to modify this court's tentative ruling issued for May 06, 2026, which the court ultimately adopted as the orders of the court.

To date, there is no proof of service of the instant RFO in the court's file. Due to the lack of service, the court drops the matter from the calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF SERVICE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. NICOLE COOLEY V. IAN COOLEY

23FL0862

This matter is before the court for a review hearing, as set by the court on February 11, 2026, regarding a possible shift to a week-on, week-off schedule. The court ordered the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations on or before June 14, 2026.

On June 10, 2026, the Petitioner filed a timely supplemental declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Respondent via mail that same day according to the proof of service, also filed June 10, 2026. Petitioner opposes modifying parenting to a week-on, week-off schedule at this time. She would like to setup additional holiday scheduling and prepare for the next school year.

On June 15, 2026, Respondent filed an untimely supplemental declaration. Therefore, the court does not consider it.

The court finds good cause to re-refer the parties to CCRC to address the aforementioned issues. The court orders the parties to participate in CCRC on Friday, July 24, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. and sets the matter for review on Wednesday, September 02, 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 in response to the new CCRC report must be filed and served on or before August 26, 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, JULY 24, 2026, AT 9:00 A.M. AND SETS THE MATTER FOR REVIEW ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 02, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT 12 OF THE COURT. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE NEW CCRC REPORT MUST BE FILED AND SERVED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 26, 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. SAVANNA ARNETT GAVIN NISHIHARA

25FL1181

This matter is before the court on four separate issues: (1) an Order to Show Cause (OSC) regarding contempt, issued April 20, 2026; (2) a Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on May 11, 2026, for move-away orders; (3) a motion, filed by the Respondent on June 02, 2026, to set aside and/or vacate default judgment; and (4) an RFO filed by the Respondent on June 03, 2026, to set aside and/or vacate the default judgment (entered December 02, 2025), as well as the Findings and Orders after Hearing (issued November 26, 2025), modify child custody and visitation, and award attorney fees and costs.

OSC Re: Contempt Issued April 20, 2026

The OSC alleges Respondent failed to comply with this court's support orders. Arraignment on the OSC was originally set for June 03, 2026. On June 02, 2026, the court issued a tentative ruling indicating that service was untimely. At the hearing on June 03, 2026, however, Respondent's attorney waived time for service. Proof of service filed later on June 03, 2026, shows Respondent was electronically served that same day.

Appearances are required for arraignment, entry of plea, determination of representation (i.e., whether Respondent is requesting a public defender), and setting of trial.

RFO Filed by Petitioner May 11, 2026

Proof of service filed May 18, 2026, shows the RFO was electronically served upon Respondent that same day.

Petitioner's RFO includes a request for temporary orders authorizing her to temporarily reside with the children in the state of Arizona pending the hearing. The court denies Petitioner's request for temporary orders.

On June 02, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration. To date, there is no proof of service for this Responsive Declaration in the court's file.

On June 11, 2026, Respondent filed a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to Petitioner's RFO. Proof of service attached to the brief shows it was electronically served upon Petitioner on June 11, 2026.

The Petitioner's RFO will require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing regarding the *LaMusga*¹ move-away factors. Appearances are required to participate in the selection of an evidentiary hearing date.

¹ *In re Marriage of LaMusga* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1072.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

Motion to Set Aside Filed by Respondent June 02, 2026

Respondent filed his motion using Local Form C-35. Respondent did not use Judicial Council form FL-300, as required under California Rule of Court 5.92, subdivision (a)(1) (“a notice of motion or order to show cause must be filed on *Request for Order* (form FL-300) ...”). Due to the procedural defect, the court will drop this matter from the calendar.

RFO Filed by Respondent June 03, 2026

The court, on its own motion, continues the matter to 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 01, 2026, in Department 12. The court apologizes to the parties for any inconvenience.

TENTATIVE RULING #4:

OSC RE: CONTEMPT ISSUED APRIL 20, 2026: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 FOR ARRAIGNMENT, ENTRY OF PLEA, DETERMINATION OF REPRESENTATION, AND SETTING OF TRIAL.

RFO FILED BY PETITIONER MAY 11, 2026: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SELECTION OF AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING DATE.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE FILED BY RESPONDENT JUNE 02, 2026: DUE TO THE PROCEDURAL DEFECT, MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR.

RFO FILED BY RESPONDENT JUNE 03, 2026: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, CONTINUES THE MATTER TO WEDNESDAY, JULY 01, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M., IN DEPARTMENT 12.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
JUNE 24, 2026
8:30 a.m.

5. TAYLOR SANDERS V. MAXWELL BREJC

26FL0318

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on May 11, 2026, requesting spousal support. The RFO also included a request for order shortening time, which the court denied. To date, there is no proof of service of the RFO upon the Respondent in the court's file. Respondent filed no Responsive Declaration.

Due to the lack of service, the court drops the matter from the calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE, THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM THE CALENDAR.