

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
AUGUST 19, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. JEFFREY STEVEN VANHEE V. ASHLEY NICHOLE VANHEE

25FL0526

This matter is on calendar for an oral ruling.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES MAY, BUT ARE NOT REQUIRED, TO APPEAR FOR THE COURT'S ORAL RULING. REMOTE APPEARANCES ARE AUTHORIZED, ASSUMING THAT THE REQUIRED PAPERWORK IS IN THE COURT'S FILE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
AUGUST 19, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. LAUREN RUSSELL V. MATTHEW CADENA

SFL20210110

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 August 06, 2021.

On August 05, 2026, the court issued an ex parte minute order continuing the five-year dismissal hearing to August 19, 2026, in Department 12. A copy of the court’s minute order was mailed to both parties’ addresses on file.

The court finds, however, that this is insufficient notice because it only provided the parties’ 10 court days’ notice. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1005, subd. (b).) Therefore, the court, on its own motion, and in the interest of justice, continues the matter once more to September 23, 2026, and directs the court clerk to serve notice of the continued hearing upon the parties.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, CONTINUES THE FIVE-YEAR DISMISSAL HEARING TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 AND DIRECTS THE COURT CLERK TO SERVE NOTICE OF THE CONTINUED HEARING UPON BOTH PARTIES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
AUGUST 19, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. MATTHEW GLAZE V. SHYANNE LECKIE

24FL0571

This matter is on calendar for an oral ruling.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES MAY, BUT ARE NOT REQUIRED, TO APPEAR FOR THE COURT'S ORAL RULING. REMOTE APPEARANCES ARE AUTHORIZED, ASSUMING THAT THE REQUIRED PAPERWORK IS IN THE COURT'S FILE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
AUGUST 19, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. MICHAEL JOHN SKOCZEN V. AMANDA RHODES

24FL0806

This action was filed on August 06, 2024. To date, there is no proof of service of summons on Respondent in the court's file. Code of Civil Procedure section 583.420 authorizes the court to 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).)

On February 23, 2026, the court mailed the Petitioner notice of this two-year dismissal hearing.

Due to the lack of service, the court intends to dismiss the action without prejudice at the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 583.420, 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
AUGUST 19, 2026
10:00 a.m.

1. TOMAS PULIDO V. ARACELI VIVAS SANDOVAL

22FL0418

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on May 26, 2026, to modify custody and visitation. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for July 10, 2026.

To date, there is no proof of service of the RFO in the court's file. Additionally, the court is in receipt of "One Parent" report from the CCRC counsellor dated July 10, 2026, which states that Petitioner did not appear at the CCRC session. Petitioner filed no response to the RFO.

Due to the lack of service, the court denies the RFO without prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE, THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR ORDER 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.