LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 12
OCTOBER 28, 2026
8:30 a.m.

1. ANY BEATRIZ AVILA ARCE V. EDWIN A. GARCIA 24FL0990

This action was filed on September 20, 2024. To date, there is no proof of service on the Respondent in the court's file.[1] 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).)

This two-year dismissal hearing was originally set for September 30, 2026. However, the court, on its own motion, continued the hearing to October 28, 2026, to ensure Petitioner's counsel of record, Karla Hugo (Mulholland) was served notice of the hearing at her address listed on the California State Bar's website.

There being no proof of service in the court's file, the court dismisses the action without prejudice pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 582.420.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: 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.

[1] On December 24, 2024, the court granted Petitioner's request to serve the petition by posting and subsequent mailing to Respondent's last known address.

2. APRIL HERRERA V. DANIEL HERRERA 25FL0477

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on July 08, 2026, to modify visitation for the parties' three children, LH (age 18), BH (age 15), and JH (age 14), and sell certain personal property belonging to Respondent. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for September 14, 2026.

An amended proof of service filed July 15, 2026,[2] shows that the RFO, CCRC referral, and notice of the court's tentative ruling system were all served upon Respondent, who is currently incarcerated, on July 13, 2026, via mail.

The court is in receipt of a memorandum from the CCRC counsellor dated September 14, 2026, stating that neither party appeared at CCRC as scheduled.

On October 16, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration. To date, however, there is no proof of service for the Responsive Declaration in the court's file. Therefore, the court does not consider it.

The parties' oldest child, LH (DOB: 4/22/2008), is over the age of 18. Therefore, the court no longer has jurisdiction over custody and visitation of LH, and with respect to this child only, the court denies Petitioner's RFO to modify visitation. LH shall decide what contact, if any, he has with Respondent. The court grants Petitioner's RFO with respect to visitation of the two younger children, BH and JH. Respondent shall have no visitation with BH or JH until further order of the court.

The court also grants Petitioner's RFO with respect to sale of Respondent's personal property provided that Petitioner retains all proceeds therefrom, along with records of sale to include: photographs of items sold, documentation of the listing and advertising thereof, buyer's contact information, terms of sale, and any other sale documents.

With respect to Petitioner's request for unequal division of the community property home, the court will defer on this issue to the time of trial on the underlying petition for dissolution.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE RFO IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. THE RFO IS DENIED WITH RESPECT TO VISITATION OF LH (AGE 18) BECAUSE HE HAS REACHED THE AGE OF MAJORITY, AND THUS, THE COURT NO LONGER HAS JURISDICTION OVER CUSTODY AND VISITATION OF LH. THE RFO IS GRANTED WITH RESPECT TO VISITATION OF BH AND JH; RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE NO VISITATION WITH BH OR JH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT. THE COURT AUTHORIZES PETITIONER TO SELL RESPONDENT'S PERSONAL PROPERTY IN PETITIONER'S POSSESSION PROVIDED THAT PETITIONER RETAINS ALL PROCEEDS THEREFROM, ALONG WITH RECORDS OF SALE TO INCLUDE: PHOTOGRAPHS OF ITEMS SOLD,

[2] It appears that Petitioner submitted the same amended proof of service on September 02, 2026.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE LISTING AND ADVERTISING THEREOF, BUYER'S CONTACT INFORMATION, TERMS OF SALE, AND ANY OTHER SALE DOCUMENTS. THE COURT DEFERS ON THE ISSUE OF UNEQUAL DIVISION OF THE COMMUNITY PROPERTY HOME UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL ON THE UNDERLYING PETITION FOR MARITAL DISSOLUTION.

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.

3. ARTHUR SCOTT AMOROSO V. DANIELLE DOLAN SFL20190051

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on October 05, 2026, to modify visitation, enforce the counseling requirement, and appoint minor's counsel for the parties' child, SD (age 8). To date, there is no proof of service of the RFO in the court's file and no Responsive Declaration submitted by the Petitioner.

Due to the lack of service, matter is dropped from the calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE, MATTER IS DROPPED FROM THE CALENDAR.

4. BRIAN EDWARD SEAHOLM V. VANESSA RUELLYN SEAHOLM 25FL0271

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on September 08, 2026, 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).[3]

The hearing was originally set for October 21, 2026, at which time, both parties appeared before the court. The court, on its own motion, continued the matter to October 28, 2026, and ordered the parties to submit any reply or supplemental declarations no later than October 23, 2026. The court indicated it would review Respondent's October 07, 2026, filing, which had not been timely served prior to the October 21, 2026, hearing.

On October 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration as well as a Response to Objections of Vanessa Seaholm, copies of which were both electronically served upon Respondent that same day per the proof of service filed October 26, 2026.

The parties' declarations are largely comprised of hearsay statements from the parties' children, which the court does not consider. In the CCRC report issued May 26, 2026, the CCRC counsellor had recommended that the court appoint minors' counsel for the parties' children. The court did not adopt this recommendation at the time, in part because the court wanted to avoid having the parties incur additional costs.

At this time, however, the court finds it in the best interests of the minors to have appointed counsel represent their interests and provide an independent voice for the children to the court. Therefore, the court exercises its authority under Family Code section 3150, subdivision (a) and appoints Kelly Bentley, Esq. to represent the parties' children. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the minors' attorney in coordinating access to her clients. The parties are also ordered to equally share the cost of Counsel for their children without prejudice to reallocation at the time of hearing.

The court notes a hearing is currently set on Respondent's RFO (filed September 28, 2026) for November 18, 2026. However, the court anticipates that minors' counsel will need additional time to familiarize themselves with the case and prepare. Therefore, the court, on its own motion and in the interest of judicial economy, advances the November 18, 2026, hearing to October 28, 2026, at which time, the court intends to

---

[3] 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.

continue the hearing on both matters (Petitioner's RFO filed September 08, 2026, and Respondent's RFO filed September 28, 2026) to a date in which all parties are available.

Pending the continued hearing date, the court will issue interim visitation orders as follows: the parties shall have a week on, week off schedule with the parties' children. 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).

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE COURT EXERCISES ITS AUTHORITY UNDER FAMILY CODE SECTION 3150, SUBDIVISION (a) AND APPOINTS KELLY BENTLEY, ESQ. TO REPRESENT THE PARTIES' CHILDREN, SS (AGE 12) AND CS (AGE 10). THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE MINORS' ATTORNEY IN COORDINATING ACCESS TO HER CLIENTS. THE PARTIES ARE ALSO ORDERED TO EQUALLY SHARE THE COST OF COUNSEL FOR THEIR CHILDREN WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO REALLOCATION AT THE TIME OF HEARING.

THE COURT ADVANCES THE NOVEMBER 18, 2026, HEARING ON RESPONDENT'S RFO (FILED SEPTEMBER 18, 2026) TO 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2026.

APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12, AT WHICH TIME, THE COURT INTENDS TO CONTINUE THE HEARING ON BOTH MATTERS (PETITIONER'S RFO FILED SEPTEMBER 08, 2026, AND RESPONDENT'S RFO FILED SEPTEMBER 18, 2026) TO A DATE IN WHICH ALL PARTIES ARE AVAILABLE.

PENDING THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE, THE COURT INTENDS TO ISSUE THE FOLLOWING INTERIM ORDERS: THE PARTIES SHALL HAVE A WEEK ON, WEEK OFF SCHEDULE WITH THE PARTIES' CHILDREN. 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).

5. MEGHAN WOLFF V. JOHNNYJOE SMITH 24FL1083

This action was filed on October 16, 2024. To date, there is no proof of service on the 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 April 23, 2026, the court mailed notice of this two-year dismissal hearing to Petitioner at her address on file.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: 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.

6. SARAH DODGE V. KONAUGHER BANNISTER 25FL0353

This matter is before the court for hearing of two separate Requests for Order (RFO), both filed by the Petitioner.

The first RFO, filed August 13, 2026, requests modification of child custody and visitation, as well as the following orders: (1) that Respondent shall not leave the parties' children unsupervised in the care of Brandi Bannister or Nicole Hayes Pelfrey; (2) that Respondent submit to a substance abuse assessment, as well as a mental health assessment, and participate in counseling; (3) that Respondent shall be ordered to take a parenting class; (4) that the court terminate the right of first refusal as to Petitioner's parenting time; (5) that the parties' children shall be enrolled in counseling; and (6) authorization for Petitioner to obtain a passport for both of the parties' children.

The second RFO, filed August 27, 2026, requests permission to travel to Carson, Douglas, and Washoe Counties, all located within the State of Nevada, for the purpose of recreational activities and medical treatment.

Petitioner's RFO Filed August 13, 2026

Petitioner's RFO filed August 13, 2026, included a request for temporary emergency orders, which the court granted on August 14, 2026, in the Amended Temporary Emergency Orders (Judicial Council form FL-305), wherein the court ordered: (1) Respondent shall have visitation Sundays from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in South Lake Tahoe, California in a public place; (2) neither Nicole Pelfrey nor Brandi Bannister shall be present during Respondent's visitation; and (3) Respondent shall tell Petitioner where he will be so Petitioner can assure compliance with the court orders.

On August 27, 2026, the court issued the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders (Judicial Council form FL-305). With respect to child custody and visitation, the only change to the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders is that there is no prohibition against Brandi Bannister being present during Respondent's visitation.[4]

The filing of Petitioner's RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for September 01, 2026.

Proof of service filed August 27, 2026, states the following documents were personally served upon Respondent on August 17, 2026: "Temporary Emergency (Ex Parte) Orders Child Custody, Visitation (Parenting Time) Other/Referral to Child Custody recommending Counseling/Request for Order, Appearance Information and Order

[4] The Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders issued August 27, 2026, also authorized Petitioner to take the parties' children to Washoe County, Douglas County, and Carson City, Nevada for medical, dental, and other appointments, including speech therapy and soccer practices and games. The court notes that this temporary emergency order is related to Petitioner's RFO filed August 27, 2026.

thereon/Notice of Hearing." It is unclear to the court, however, which specific documents were served upon Respondent, as there were multiple temporary emergency orders issued, and a separate RFO filed by the Petitioner on August 27, 2026.

Proof of service filed October 16, 2026, appears to show that Petitioner served a copy of the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders upon Respondent via mail on September 11, 2026. Said proof of service indicates the following documents were served: "Temporary Order re: out of State travel re: medical etc." The only temporary order that addressed out-of-state travel is the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders.

On August 14, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration. To date, there is no proof of service in the court's file for the Responsive Declaration.

Nonetheless, on August 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration, which substantively responds to Respondent's Responsive Declaration. Proof of service, also filed August 17, 2026, shows it was electronically served on Respondent that same day.[5] Based on the filing of Petitioner's Reply Declaration, the court deems Petitioner to have waived any defect in service of Respondent's Responsive Declaration.

The court is in receipt of a "One Parent" CCRC report dated September 01, 2026, which indicates that Petitioner failed to appear at CCRC as scheduled.

On September 14, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request to Reschedule Hearing Involving Temporary Emergency Orders, which Respondent opposed, and the court denied on September 21, 2026. The court ordered Petitioner to serve said order on Respondent via mail or email no later than September 21, 2026. Proof of service filed October 16, 2026, shows Petitioner served a copy of the court order on Respondent via mail on September 21, 2026.

On October 08, 2026, Respondent submitted a supporting declaration of Nicole Hayes, a copy of which was served upon Petitioner via mail that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 08, 2026.

On October 15, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration (Judicial Council form FL-320), as well as a personal declaration (on pleading paper), copies of which were served upon Petitioner via mail that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 15, 2026.

On October 16, 2026, Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent on October 15, 2026.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

[5] Petitioner's proof of service, however, shows that she, herself, performed the service. Generally, service must be completed by a third party to the litigation.

Petitioner's RFO Filed August 27, 2026

On August 27, 2026, the court issued the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders (Judicial Council form FL-305). With respect to the request for relief in Petitioner's RFO filed August 27, 2026, the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders authorized Petitioner to take the parties' children to Washoe County, Douglas County, and Carson City, Nevada for medical, dental, and other appointments, including speech therapy and soccer practices and games.

Proof of service filed August 27, 2026, states the following documents were personally served upon Respondent on August 17, 2026: "Temporary Emergency (Ex Parte) Orders Child Custody, Visitation (Parenting Time) Other/Referral to Child Custody recommending Counseling/Request for Order, Appearance Information and Order thereon/Notice of Hearing." It is unclear to the court, however, which specific documents were served upon Respondent, as there were multiple temporary emergency orders issued, and a separate RFO filed by the Petitioner on August 14, 2026.

Proof of service filed October 16, 2026, appears to show that Petitioner served a copy of the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders upon Respondent via mail on September 11, 2026. Said proof of service indicates the following documents were served: "Temporary Order re: out of State travel re: medical etc." The only temporary order that addressed out-of-state travel is the Second Amended Temporary Emergency Orders.

To date, Respondent has filed no Responsive Declaration to Petitioner's RFO regarding out-of-state travel.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12, AT WHICH TIME, THE COURT INTENDS TO RE-REFER THE PARTIES TO CCRC AND ISSUE INTERIM VISITATION ORDERS PENDING THE RETURN HEARING DATE.

7. TAMERA TERRILL V. JOSHUA PIERSON SFL20100296

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on September 14, 2026, to enforce joint legal custody orders and order Petitioner to complete a full neurodiverse assessment for the parties child, KT-P (age 16). Proof of service filed October 05, 2026, shows the RFO was served upon Petitioner via mail that same day.

To date, Petitioner has filed no Responsive Declaration.

The court denies the RFO as currently phrased.

The first request, to "enforce joint legal custody orders," is a request to "[o]rder Petitioner to comply with timely medical updates to Respondent including but not limited to mental health and prescription medication updates." As such, it is a request that the court find that the Petitioner is not complying with the existing orders, as opposed to a request to change or modify existing orders. Therefore, the request may be better suited for a contempt proceeding.

With respect to the neurodiverse assessment, the court will order Petitioner to take all steps necessary for completion of the neurodiverse assessment by Dr. Mary Jo Coiro by November 20, 2026. However, the court declines to grant any further relief requested in the RFO. The court would entertain a subsequent motion asking for sole legal custody, if that is what Petitioner seeks.

The court defers on the issue of costs of the neurodiverse assessment. As phrased, the RFO does not properly notify the Petitioner that an affirmative request is being made regarding costs. Petitioner merely states in his supporting declaration that he pre-paid $1,250 for the assessment and is "asking [Petitioner] to pay half." (Pierson Decl., ¶ 6.)

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE RFO IS DENIED AS PHRASED. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO TAKE ALL STEPS NECESSARY FOR COMPLETION OF THE NUERODIVERSE ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTIES' CHILD, KT-P (AGE 16) BY DR. MARY JO COIRO BY NOVEMBER 20, 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.

8. TYLER JACKSON V. DEBORAH PUMARINO SFL20150111

This matter is before the court for a review hearing on the issue of child custody, as originally set by the court on July 22, 2026.[6] The court ordered the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations no later than October 14, 2026.

On October 14, 2026, Petitioner filed a timely supplemental declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Respondent that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 14, 2026.

On October 15, 2026, Respondent filed a supplemental declaration, a copy of which was electronically served upon Petitioner that same day per the proof of service, also filed October 15, 2026. The court will consider Respondent's untimely declaration in light of the filing of Petitioner's October 21, 2026, declaration, wherein Petitioner addressed the substance of Respondent's October 15 filing, because it shows that Petitioner received actual notice of the October 15 filing. The court does not consider Petitioner's October 21, 2026, filing for any other purpose, as the court did not invite any further declarations.

Based on the court's review of the previous submissions in this matter, as well as the supplemental declarations filed October 14 and 15, 2026, respectively, the court finds the following visitation orders to be in the children's best interests: With the exception of the third and fifth weekends of each month, Respondent shall have visitation with the parties' children each weekend beginning Friday after school (or 3:00 p.m. if there is no school) until Monday morning return to school (or 8:00 a.m. if there is no school (i.e., summer vacation).) If, however, there is a school holiday on the Monday following Respondent's weekend visitation, then Respondent's weekend visitation shall be extended until Tuesday morning return to school.

The court, on its own motion, sets a further review hearing for June 23, 2027. The court orders the parties to file and serve any supplemental declarations for the court's consideration no later than June 14, 2027. Pending the June 23, 2027, hearing, Respondent shall not consume alcoholic beverages within 12 hours before or during his visitation; additionally, Respondent shall continue to provide breathalyzer tests through his Ignition Interlock Device as previously ordered. Any existing orders not modified by these orders shall remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE THIRD AND FIFTH WEEKENDS OF EACH MONTH, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE VISITATION WITH THE PARTIES' CHILDREN EACH WEEKEND BEGINNING FRIDAY AFTER SCHOOL (OR 3:00 P.M. IF THERE IS NO SCHOOL) UNTIL MONDAY MORNING RETURN TO

[6] The review hearing was originally set for October 21, 2026. However, due to the court's calendaring error, the court, on its own motion, continued the review hearing to October 28, 2026.

SCHOOL (OR 8:00 A.M. IF THERE IS NO SCHOOL (I.E., DURING SUMMER VACATION).) IF, HOWEVER, THERE IS A SCHOOL HOLIDAY ON THE MONDAY FOLLOWING RESPONDENT'S WEEKEND VISITATION, THEN RESPONDENT'S WEEKEND VISITATION SHALL BE EXTENDED UNTIL TUESDAY MORNING RETURN TO SCHOOL.

THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, SETS A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING FOR 8:30 A.M., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2027, IN DEPARTMENT 12. THE COURT ORDERS THE PARTIES TO FILE AND SERVE ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS FOR THE COURT'S CONSIDERATION NO LATER THAN JUNE 14, 2027. PENDING THE JUNE 23, 2027, HEARING RESPONDENT SHALL NOT CONSUME ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES WITHIN 12 HOURS BEFORE OR DURING HIS VISITATION; ADDITIONALLY, RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE BREATHALYZER TESTS THROUGH HIS IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE AS PREVIOUSLY ORDERED. ANY EXISTING ORDERS NOT MODIFIED BY THESE ORDERS SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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.