

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 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 September 04, 2026, seeks limited property control orders regarding the marital residence for the purpose of listing, marketing, and selling the property. The second RFO, filed by the Petitioner on September 08, 2026, seeks to modify child custody and visitation, as well as an order prohibiting Alex Sysock from being around the parties' children, SS (age 12) and CS (age 10).¹ Petitioner's RFO also included a request for temporary emergency orders, which the court denied.

Respondent's RFO Filed September 04, 2026

Proof of service filed September 10, 2026, shows that the Respondent, herself, electronically served the RFO upon Petitioner's attorney that same day. Generally, service must be completed by a third party to the litigation.

On October 09, 2026, Petitioner filed a timely Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 09, 2026. Based on the filing of the Responsive Declaration, the court deems Petitioner to have waived any defect in service of Respondent's RFO.

On October 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Reply Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Petitioner that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 13, 2026.

The court denies Respondent's request for exclusive possession of the marital residence. The court accepts Respondent's representation that the loan balance becomes due in total on December 01, 2027. (Reply, ¶ 4 & Ex. E.) Both parties agree that the home needs to be sold. Switching out possession between the parties while they should be getting the home on the market is not efficient. It would also be disruptive for the children. The court grants Petitioner's request for affirmative relief in his Responsive Declaration, that he keep possession of the marital residence on the conditions that he is obligated to continue making timely mortgage payments and prepare the home for sale. The court approves of the selection of Kimberly Williams as the listing agent. Both parties shall

¹ On June 24, 2026, the court ordered a step-up plan for Respondent's visitation, which included the following orders regarding Mr. Sysock's presence around the parties' children during Respondent's visitation: (1) during the month of July 2026, Mr. Sysock shall not be present at any time during Respondent's visitation; (2) during the first two weeks of August 2026, Mr. Sysock may be present during Respondent's visitation, but only during the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (otherwise, Mr. Sysock shall not be present); and (3) beginning October 01, 2026, there shall be no restriction regarding Mr. Sysock's presence.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

comply with any and all reasonable requests of the listing agent to prepare the home for sale. Additionally, both parties shall cooperate in removing their personal items by September 01, 2027. Although the total loan balance does not become due until December 01, 2027, the court orders that the home shall be listed for sale as soon as reasonably practical.

Petitioner's RFO Filed September 08, 2026

Proof of service filed September 11, 2026, shows that the RFO was electronically served upon Respondent that same day.

On October 07, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Petitioner on October 13, 2026, per the proof of service filed that date. However, this is untimely service. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1005, subd. (b) (requiring opposition papers to be filed and served at least nine court days before the hearing).) Therefore, the court does not consider it.

Petitioner filed no Reply Declaration.

Appearances are required for oral argument on Petitioner's RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #1:

RESPONDENT'S RFO FILED SEPTEMBER 04, 2026: THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S RFO. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF IN HIS RESPONSIVE DECLARATION THAT HE KEEP POSSESSION OF THE MARITAL RESIDENCE ON THE CONDITIONS THAT HE IS OBLIGATED TO CONTINUE MAKING TIMELY MORTGAGE PAYMENTS AND PREPARE THE HOME FOR SALE. THE COURT APPROVES OF THE SELECTION OF KIMBERLY WILLIAMS AS THE LISTING AGENT. BOTH PARTIES SHALL COMPLY WITH ANY AND ALL REASONABLE REQUESTS OF THE LISTING AGENT TO PREPARE THE HOME FOR SALE. ADDITIONALLY, BOTH PARTIES SHALL COOPERATE IN REMOVING THEIR PERSONAL ITEMS BY SEPTEMBER 01, 2027. ALTHOUGH THE TOTAL LOAN BALANCE DOES NOT BECOME DUE UNTIL DECEMBER 01, 2027, THE COURT ORDERS THAT THE HOME SHALL BE LISTED FOR SALE AS SOON AS REASONABLY PRACTICAL.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

**THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL.RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL
RULE 8.05.07.**

**PETITIONER'S RFO FILED SEPTEMBER 08, 2026: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED
AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2026, FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON
PETITIONER'S RFO.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

2. BRYCE SHIPLEY V. ELISE SHIPLEY

26FL0160

This matter is before the court for review of the court's July 1, 2026, child support and spousal support orders.² During the July 1 hearing, the court referred the parties to a CCRC session set for July 13, 2026.

The purpose of setting this review hearing was to see if, following the CCRC session, any changes were made to the custody orders that would result in an adjustment to the child support and spousal support orders entered July 01, 2026. However, the intended CCRC session did not occur as scheduled. In this tentative ruling, the court will make updated visitation orders based on the information currently before the court. The court will also set a further review hearing to address applicable adjustments to the support orders.

On September 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration and memorandum of points and authorities, copies of which were served upon Respondent via mail that same day per the proof of service, also filed September 21, 2026.

On September 24, 2026, Respondent filed "Elise Shipley's Response to September 9, 2026 CCRC Report," which includes a separate declaration made by Respondent's attorney. Proof of service attached to the filing shows it was electronically served upon Petitioner on September 24, 2026.

On October 08, 2026, Respondent filed "Respondent Elise Shipley's Declaration in Opposition to Motion to Modify Custody and Visitation," a copy of which was electronically served upon Petitioner³ per the proof of service attached to the declaration.

Since the July 01, 2026, hearing, neither party has submitted a new Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner's declaration demonstrates to the court that, if any substance abuse issue existed with Petitioner, it has resolved.

² The instant review hearing was originally set for August 19, 2026. However, on July 13, 2026, the court continued the review hearing to October 21, 2026, as a result of the parties' CCRC appointment being continued from July 13, 2026, to September 09, 2026. The court notes, however, that Respondent failed to appear for CCRC on September 09, 2026.

³ The proof of service indicates the declaration was emailed to kmonck@sherlockanderson.com. The court notes that, on September 30, 2026, Petitioner filed "Notice of Change of Handling Attorney Within Firm," which indicates that the attorney handling Petitioner's case had changed within the law firm (Sherlock // Anderson, PC) from Kaitlyn D. Monck to Jason R. Sherlock. The notice requested that Mr. Sherlock be replaced as counsel of record and that Ms. Monck be removed from the court's service list for this case only. The notice did not identify any new or different email address to use for electronic service of process.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

The court adopts the recommendation of the CCRC counsellor for an equal parenting plan, but modifies the exact schedule proposed in the CCRC report issued March 23, 2026. Instead of the proposed schedule identified in the CCRC report, the court orders a week-on, week-off schedule. Exchanges shall occur on Mondays at school drop-off (or 8:00 a.m. if there is no school). The non-custodial parent for the week shall have visitation on Wednesdays beginning at 3:00 p.m. until Friday after school (or 3:00 p.m. if there is no school on Friday). The custodial parent for the week shall have custody of the children over the weekend.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE COURT ORDERS A WEEK-ON, WEEK-OFF PARENTING SCHEDULE. EXCHANGES SHALL OCCUR ON MONDAYS AT SCHOOL DROP-OFF (OR 8:00 A.M. IF THERE IS NO SCHOOL). THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT FOR THE WEEK SHALL HAVE VISITATION ON WEDNESDAYS BEGINNING AT 3:00 P.M. UNTIL FRIDAY AFTER SCHOOL (OR 3:00 P.M. IF THERE IS NO SCHOOL ON FRIDAY). THE CUSTODIAL PARENT FOR THE WEEK SHALL HAVE CUSTODY OF THE CHILDREN OVER THE WEEKEND. THE COURT SETS A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING FOR 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12. THE COURT DIRECTS THE PARTIES TO FILE AND SERVE CURRENT INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS, AS WELL AS ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS CONCERNING CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT, NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 13, 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 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
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

3. ERNESTO MAZAR KINDELAN V. KARI GILSON

24FL0826

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on September 23, 2026, to transfer the parties' minor children, OG (age 7) and MG (age 6), from their current school to attend Sierra House Elementary School, where Respondent is employed. The RFO also included a request for order shortening time, which the court granted. The court ordered Respondent to serve the RFO upon Petitioner no later than September 28, 2026, and ordered Petitioner to file and serve a Responsive Declaration no later than October 09, 2026.

Separate proofs of service, both filed October 19, 2026, show that the RFO was served upon Petitioner via mail and email on September 28, 2026.

On October 09, 2026, Petitioner filed a timely Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 09, 2026. Respondent states he is not necessarily opposed to the requested transfer in the future but he is opposed to the requested transfer occurring during the 2026–2027 school year.

The court will grant Respondent's RFO with one caveat: the transfer shall not occur until the next break in the school year, whether that be a holiday break, or the end of a school term (e.g., a quarter, a semester, etc.); if there is no such defined break in the children's school schedule, then the transfer shall occur at the beginning of a new school week (i.e., Monday), at least one week following the court's order. The court finds that, because the children — who are currently ages 6 and 7 — are in an early stage of their education, a change in schools will not have as dramatic an effect as it would have if the children were in higher school level grades. Moreover, delaying the transfer of schools would likely result in the children gaining stronger bonds with their current classmates and thus, waiting to transfer schools would end up being harder on the children.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S RFO TO TRANSFER BOTH CHILDREN TO SIERRA HOUSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. SUCH TRANSFER SHALL NOT OCCUR UNTIL THE NEXT BREAK IN THE SCHOOL YEAR, WHETHER THAT BE A HOLIDAY BREAK OR THE END OF A SCHOOL TERM (E.G., A QUARTER, A SEMESTER, ETC.). IF THERE IS NO SUCH DEFINED BREAK IN THE CHILDREN'S SCHOOL SCHEDULE, THEN THE TRANSFER SHALL OCCUR AT THE BEGINNING OF A NEW SCHOOL WEEK (I.E., MONDAY), AT LEAST ONE WEEK FOLLOWING THE COURT'S ORDER.

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
OCTOBER 21, 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

4. JADE CHILD V. BRET PAULIN

24FL0164

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on September 04, 2026, to modify the extra-curricular activities of the parties' children, SC (age 8) and JC (age 6).

To date, there is no proof of service for the RFO in the court's file. Nonetheless, on October 08, 2026, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Respondent via mail on October 06, 2026, per the proof of service filed October 08, 2026. Based on the filing of the Responsive Declaration, the court deems Petitioner to have waived any defect in service.

On October 09, 2026, Respondent filed a Reply Declaration. However, there is no proof of service for this filing, either. Therefore, the court does not consider it.

The court denies Respondent's RFO. Each parent may enroll the children in activities, but the court is not willing to order the other parent to be responsible for transporting the children to practices, games, etc., given the great distance that the children would have to travel. Additionally, the court finds that at ages 8 and almost 7, the children are too young to place such a high priority on their sports and other extra-curricular activities. Perhaps the issue can be reconsidered when the children are older (i.e., middle school).

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S RFO.

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
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

5. JASMINE CHAVARRI V. JORGE CHAVARRI

25FL1054

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on September 17, 2026, to set child custody and visitation, child support and spousal support, issue an order authorizing the Petitioner to have exclusive control of the marital residence, and award need-based attorney fees and costs (\$15,505.00). On September 16, 2026, Petitioner filed a current Income and Expense Declaration (I&E), as well as an ex parte application to shorten time for the instant hearing, which the court granted. On September 17, 2026, the court set the instant hearing for October 21, 2026, and referred the parties to a CCRC session set for October 06, 2026. Separate proofs of service, both filed September 17, 2026, show that the RFO and supporting papers (including the CCRC referral) were served upon Respondent via mail and email that same day.

The court is in receipt of a “One Parent” CCRC report dated October 06, 2026, which indicates that Respondent failed to appear for the CCRC session as scheduled for which reason, the CCRC counsellor was unable to make any recommendations to the court.

To date, Respondent has filed no Responsive Declaration and has not otherwise appeared in the case as described in California Rule of Court 5.62.

Because Respondent has not yet appeared in the case as described in California Rule of Court 5.62, Petitioner’s RFO must be served in the manner specified for the service of a summons in Code of Civil Procedure section 415.10 through 415.95, including personal service. (Cal. R. Ct. 5.92, subd. (f)(1)(B).) Under these circumstances, service of the RFO via mail and email is not valid. Therefore, the court must deny the RFO without prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: DUE TO THE LACK OF VALID SERVICE UNDER CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 5.92, SUBDIVISION (f)(1)(B), THE RFO IS DENIED 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
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

6. JEFFREY O'NEIL V. MELISSA PEREIRA

SFL20170221

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on July 08, 2026, to modify custody and visitation for the parties' minor child, JP (age 10), who is represented in this matter by minor's counsel (Kelly Bentley). The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for September 09, 2026.

On October 05, 2026, Petitioner filed a proof of service showing electronic service upon Respondent, but not until October 02, 2026, over a month after the CCRC appointment. This is untimely service. Further, there is no proof of service of the RFO upon minor's counsel.

The court is in receipt of a "One Parent" CCRC report issued September 09, 2026, which indicates that Respondent did not appear at CCRC as scheduled.

To date, no Responsive Declarations have been filed. Due to the defective service, the court drops the matter from the calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: DUE TO THE DEFECTIVE SERVICE, MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

7. JENNIFER SAMIS V. COLIN MAXWELL BLAINE

25FL0623

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on September 08, 2026, to modify child custody and visitation. The filing of the RFO did not prompt the court to refer the parties to CCRC because a CCRC session was already scheduled for September 09, 2026 (the court made said CCRC referral on May 06, 2026; the court also set a return hearing for November 18, 2026).

Proof of service filed September 10, 2026, shows the RFO was served upon Petitioner via mail that same day.

The court is in receipt of a “One Parent” CCRC report, indicating that the Petitioner failed to appear for the CCRC session as scheduled, for which reason, the CCRC counsellor was unable to make any recommendations to the court.

On October 09, 2026, Petitioner filed a timely Responsive Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent on October 08, 2026, per the proof of service attached to the Responsive Declaration.

On October 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Reply Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Petitioner per the proof of service, also filed October 13, 2026. The court notes, however, that the proof of service shows Respondent served the Reply Declaration, himself. Generally, service must be completed by a third party.

The court, on its own motion and in the interest of justice, continues the instant hearing to November 18, 2026, to coincide with the hearing already set for that date. All existing orders shall remain in effect. The court directs the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations no later than November 9, 2026.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, CONTINUES THE INSTANT HEARING TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2026, TO COINCIDE WITH THE HEARING ALREADY SET FOR THAT DATE. ALL EXISTING ORDERS SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT. THE COURT DIRECTS THE PARTIES TO FILE AND SERVE ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN NOVEMBER 9, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

8. JUAN ANTONIO MOLINA V. ZARETH ROJAS

24FL1064

This action was filed on October 10, 2024. To date, there is no proof of service of summons on the Respondent in the court's file. Under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.420, the court may 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 April 17, 2026, the court mailed Petitioner notice of this two-year dismissal hearing.

Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 583.420, the court dismisses the action without prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: 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
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

9. MATTHEW MCGARRY V. ALLY HOFFMAN

25FL1256

TENTATIVE RULING #9: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12 FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON THE TENTATIVE RULING ISSUED BY THIS COURT ON OCTOBER 13, 2026, REGARDING INTERIM CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS PENDING THE DECEMBER 30, 2026, HEARING. THE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUEST WAS SUBMITTED BY THE RESPONDENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 21, 2026
8:30 a.m.

10. PAUL SIMON COTTER V. NINA SCHLOEMERKEMPER

26FL0690

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on September 10, 2026, to dismiss the entire action based on the grounds that a dissolution action is already pending between the parties in Scotland. Proof of service filed October 14, 2026, shows that the RFO was personally served upon Petitioner on September 28, 2026.

To date, Petitioner has filed no Responsive Declaration.

As a matter of comity, the court exercises its discretion to stay the proceedings in the instant case pending the outcome of the Scotland action. (*In re Marriage of Gray* (1988) 204 Cal.App.3d 1239.)

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE RFO IS DENIED. HOWEVER, AS A MATTER OF COMITY, THE COURT EXERCISES ITS DISCRETION TO STAY THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE INSTANT CASE PENDING FURTHER APPLICATION OR RESOLUTION OF THE SCOTLAND ACTION.

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.