

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**1. DCSS V. KRISTY ARROYO (OTHER PARTY: ANTHONY HESTER) PFS20180026**

On November 19, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. There is a Proof of Service indicating personal service of the RFO only, none of the other required documents were served. Additionally, the Proof of Service lists the person served as Serina Gomez, not Other Party.

Other Party filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on December 30, 2025. He filed a Declaration on December 31<sup>st</sup> with tribal court summaries included. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore the court cannot consider them.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 19, 2025. A report with recommendations was prepared on January 22, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on January 26, 2026, however the report mailed to Respondent was returned as undeliverable.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to the multiple defects in service and the failed delivery of the CCRC report.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE DEFECTS IN SERVICE AND FAILED DELIVERY OF THE CCRC REPORT.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**2. COLBY BROWN V. AMY PARKKO**

**PFL20180460**

On October 15, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and an order for co-parenting counseling. All required documents were personally served on Petitioner on October 22<sup>nd</sup>.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 17<sup>th</sup> and were able to reach agreements on some, but not all, issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on November 19<sup>th</sup>, it was mailed to the parties on November 20<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 6<sup>th</sup>.

This matter was originally set to be heard on January 22<sup>nd</sup> however it was brought to the court's attention that the parties were close to settling. As such, the court continued the hearing to the present date. There have been no filings since the prior hearing date.

Respondent is requesting an order for the minor to attend counseling and she asks that she be the parent to select the counselor. She has provided a completed FL-341 which she asks the court to adopt as its orders. She also asks that Petitioner be ordered to provide a certificate of completing a co-parenting course within 60 days if he has not completed one since June of 2024. Finally, she asks that all orders be consolidated to the Findings and Orders After Hearing for this hearing.

Petitioner asks the court to adopt the agreements and recommendations with some modifications. His Responsive Declaration provides a discussion of his proposed modifications.

The agreements and recommendations contained in the November 19, 2025 CCRC report are found to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Petitioner's request to have co-parenting counseling only during Respondent's parenting time is denied as are the rest of Petitioner's requested modifications as the court finds the CCRC recommendations and agreements to be in the best interests of the minor as they are stated in the CCRC report.

The request for Petitioner to provide a certificate of completion of a co-parenting course is denied.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE NOVEMBER 19, 2025 CCRC REPORT ARE FOUND TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO HAVE CO-PARENTING COUNSELING ONLY DURING RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME IS DENIED. AS ARE THE REST OF PETITIONER'S REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS AS THE COURT FINDS THE CCRC RECOMMENDATIONS AND AGREEMENTS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AS THEY ARE STATED IN THE CCRC REPORT.**

**THE REQUEST FOR PETITIONER TO PROVIDE A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION OF A CO-PARENTING COURSE IS DENIED.**

**RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**3. JAYMIE CEDENO V. RAFAEL CEDENO**

**22FL0623**

On November 7, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking equalization payment arrears. Petitioner filed a Declaration on January 6, 2026. Both documents were served via mail on January 19, 2026. None of the other required documents were served.

On January 16, 2026, Respondent filed an RFO for spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for these documents.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on January 29, 2026.

Despite the fact that there is no Proof of Service for Respondent's RFO, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 30, 2026 thereby waiving any defect in service. The Responsive Declaration was served on February 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Because Petitioner's RFO includes a request for past due child support and because the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) is a party to this matter, DCSS was required to be served with the moving papers. As such, this matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

Respondent is requesting spousal support be set to \$0.00 as he is currently incarcerated and no longer has an income.

Petitioner's Responsive Declaration only addresses the issue of arrears. She does not oppose spousal support being set to \$0 moving forward.

Respondent is making a post-judgment request for modification of spousal support orders. The court is required to take evidence on, and address the Family Code § 4320 factors when ruling on a post-judgment request for modification of spousal support. The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: PETITIONER'S NOVEMBER 7, 2025 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**4. ISMAEL VAZQUEZ CONTRERAS V. SARAH ALANA KIDD**

**PFL20200408**

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). The RFO was mail-served on January 6, 2026, however it does not appear that the CCRC referral was served.

Petitioner did not appear at CCRC therefore, a single parent report was prepared without recommendations on December 16, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 23, 2026. It was served on January 20, 2026.

Petitioner states that he was not served with the CCRC referral form. He asks that the matter be re-referred to CCRC.

Petitioner's request is granted. The parties are ordered to attend CCRC on March 18, 2026, at 1:00pm. Hearing on the RFO is continued to May 14, 2026, at 8:30am in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ATTEND CCRC ON MARCH 18, 2026, AT 1:00PM. HEARING ON THE RFO IS CONTINUED TO MAY 14, 2026, AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**5. MICHAEL FLEMMING V. ASHLEY FLEMMING**

**25FL0019**

On November 12, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, orders regarding the sale of community property, access to the community property, and reimbursements to Petitioner. All required documents were served by mail on November 14<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 28, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting an order to sell the former family home and RV. Alternatively he asks that Respondent be ordered to refinance the property and buy out Petitioner's interest. Prior to selling the home, Petitioner asks that he be granted unimpeded access to the former family residence for a period of 6 hours, within 14 days of the court's order, to identify and retrieve his personal property. He further requests permission to conduct a video inventory of the remaining items in the residence. Petitioner is also requesting reimbursement of community expenses he paid with his separate property funds post separation in the amount of \$8,635.80. Finally, Petitioner seeks to expand his parenting time to every Wednesday from 5:00pm to Friday at 5:00pm and alternating Fridays from 5:00pm through Monday at 5:00pm.

Respondent proposes a four-hour window for Petitioner to pick up his personal property. She does not oppose a video inventory but asks that no recording of her personal items or private areas take place. She requests both parties be allowed to have a third party individual present during the videotaping. She agrees to sell the RV with her proposed terms. She further agrees to sell the marital residence pursuant to the conditions set forth in her Responsive Declaration. She asks that the Extra Space Storage Unit be cleared and cancelled within 30 days. She further requests the children's cell phone lines be moved to a more affordable carrier. She asks that Petitioner be ordered to produce statements from the children's cell phones and Chase card statements from January and March 2025 to the present, respectively. She requests both parties be ordered to provide their list of reimbursement claims at least 30 days prior to the March 23, 2026 Mandatory Settlement Conference. Finally, she asks that the current parenting schedule be maintained. She asks for sanctions for having to respond to the request to modify the visitation schedule.

Regarding the sale of the marital residence, the request is granted. Respondent shall provide a list of 3 realtors no later than February 26, 2026. Petitioner to choose one of the three and notify Respondent of his choice no later than March 5, 2026. The parties are

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ordered to place the house up for sale no later than March 19, 2026. The parties are ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home in furtherance of its sale. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional, comply with any recommendations regarding the listing price, and equally split any agreed upon costs that have been suggested by the realtor to make the home available for sale. The parties are ordered to accept any reasonable offer for the purchase of the home if one is received. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner. Net proceeds of the sale are to be placed in the attorney trust account of Respondent's counsel until written agreement of the parties or until court order to release the proceeds.

Pending the sale of the home, the parties are ordered to equally split the costs of the mortgage, property taxes, insurance for the home, HOA fees, utilities, and reasonable maintenance costs.

The parties are ordered to sell the RV forthwith. The court declines to review Respondent's Exhibit D as it constitutes confidential settlement negotiations. The parties are to meet and confer to agree upon a sale price for the RV. Petitioner is to be in charge of selling the RV. Immediately upon doing so, Petitioner shall provide Respondent with documentation of the amount received for the RV. The parties are to equally split the net proceeds from the sale of the RV.

Petitioner's request to access the marital residence to retrieve his personal property is granted. Petitioner shall have a period of six hours, on a date no later than March 5, 2026, to access the marital residence and retrieve his personal property. During that time Petitioner may also take a video inventory of all items within the residence. The parties may each have a third party present, however the parties and their chosen third party individual are ordered not to impede Petitioner's retrieval of his property and videotaping.

The parties are ordered to clear out the Extra Space Storage unit and cancel it no later than March 19, 2026.

The court is reserving jurisdiction over the request for reimbursements until the time of trial. Likewise, the court reserves jurisdiction over Respondent's request to order the move of the children's cell phones to a different carrier.

Regarding the visitation schedule, it is the policy of the state to ensure that children have frequent and continuing contact with both parents. Fam. Code §3020. The "frequent

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

and continuing contact” policy gives way only where the court deems such contact to be adverse to the best interests of the child. *Id.* After reviewing the filings of the parties, the court does find it to be in the best interests of the children to increase their time with Petitioner regardless of the prior stipulation of the parties. As such, commencing immediately, Petitioner shall have parenting time every Wednesday from 5:00pm through Friday at 5:00pm and alternating Fridays from 5:00pm through Monday at 5:00pm. Respondent shall have the children during all other times.

The request for sanctions is denied as Respondent has not provided argument to support her request or an amount requested.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: REGARDING THE SALE OF THE MARITAL RESIDENCE, THE REQUEST IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT SHALL PROVIDE A LIST OF 3 REALTORS NO LATER THAN FEBRUARY 26, 2026. PETITIONER TO CHOOSE ONE OF THE THREE AND NOTIFY RESPONDENT OF HIS CHOICE NO LATER THAN MARCH 5, 2026. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOUSE UP FOR SALE NO LATER THAN MARCH 19, 2026. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL, COMPLY WITH ANY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE LISTING PRICE, AND EQUALLY SPLIT ANY AGREED UPON COSTS THAT HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED BY THE REALTOR TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE ARE TO BE PLACED IN THE ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT OF RESPONDENT’S COUNSEL UNTIL WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR UNTIL COURT ORDER TO RELEASE THE PROCEEDS.**

**PENDING THE SALE OF THE HOME, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE COSTS OF THE MORTGAGE, PROPERTY TAXES, INSURANCE FOR THE HOME, HOA FEES, UTILITIES, AND REASONABLE MAINTENANCE COSTS.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO SELL THE RV FORTHWITH. THE COURT DECLINES TO REVIEW RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT D AS IT CONSTITUTES CONFIDENTIAL**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER TO AGREE UPON A SALE PRICE FOR THE RV. PETITIONER IS TO BE IN CHARGE OF SELLING THE RV. IMMEDIATELY UPON DOING SO, PETITIONER SHALL PROVIDE RESPONDENT WITH DOCUMENTATION OF THE AMOUNT RECEIVED FOR THE RV. THE PARTIES ARE TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE NET PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE RV.**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO ACCESS THE MARITAL RESIDENCE TO RETRIEVE HIS PERSONAL PROPERTY IS GRANTED. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE A PERIOD OF SIX HOURS, ON A DATE NO LATER THAN MARCH 5, 2026, TO ACCESS THE MARITAL RESIDENCE AND RETRIEVE HIS PERSONAL PROPERTY. DURING THAT TIME PETITIONER MAY ALSO TAKE VIDEO INVENTORY OF ALL ITEMS WITHIN THE RESIDENCE. THE PARTIES MAY EACH HAVE A THIRD PARTY PRESENT, HOWEVER THE PARTIES AND THEIR CHOSEN THIRD PARTY INDIVIDUAL ARE ORDERED NOT TO IMPEDE PETITIONER'S RETRIEVAL OF HIS PROPERTY AND VIDEOTAPING.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO CLEAR OUT THE EXTRA SPACE STORAGE UNIT AND CANCEL IT NO LATER THAN MARCH 19, 2026.**

**THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION OVER THE REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENTS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. LIKewise, THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO ORDER THE MOVE OF THE CHILDREN'S CELL PHONES TO A DIFFERENT CARRIER.**

**REGARDING THE VISITATION SCHEDULE, COMMENCING IMMEDIATELY, PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME EVERY WEDNESDAY FROM 5:00PM THROUGH FRIDAY AT 5:00PM AND ALTERNATING FRIDAYS FROM 5:00PM THROUGH MONDAY AT 5:00PM. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE THE CHILDREN DURING ALL OTHER TIMES.**

**THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS DENIED AS RESPONDENT HAS NOT PROVIDED ARGUMENT TO SUPPORT HER REQUEST OR AN AMOUNT REQUESTED.**

**PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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***

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**6. KELLY HESKETT V. JACOB HESKETT**

**25FL0732**

On November 19, 2025, Counsel for Petitioner filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. This matter was originally filed as part of a request for an order shortening time. As such, Petitioner filed her opposition on November 19<sup>th</sup>. The request for an order shortening time was denied and the matter was set to be heard on the present date. Petitioner was served with the motion and all other documents on December 11, 2025. There is no Proof of Service indicating service of Respondent.

This matter is continued to March 26, 2026, at 8:30am in Department 5 (30 days). Counsel for Petitioner is ordered to serve Respondent with the requisite documents.

On September 18, 2025, Petitioner filed an Ex Parte Application and Declaration for Orders requesting the court confirm its jurisdiction and an accounting and deposit of settlement proceeds. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 18<sup>th</sup>. The requests were denied ex parte, Petitioner filed an RFO renewing her requests and the matter was set to join the hearing on Respondent's RFO.

On October 21<sup>st</sup>, Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration in Opposition of Petitioner's Request for Order Filed 9/18/25. It was served on October 20<sup>th</sup>.

The matter was originally set to be heard on November 6, 2025, however due to a pending dispute regarding jurisdiction, the issue of the settlement proceeds was continued to the present date to allow Respondent sufficient time to brief the issue if jurisdiction was found to be proper.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration since the prior hearing date.

Petitioner is requesting an accounting of the settlement proceeds from Respondent's wrongful termination suit. She further requests the settlement funds be deposited into a trust account pending the court's characterization of the property.

Petitioner's request is granted. Respondent is ordered to provide Petitioner with an accounting (with supporting documentation) of the settlement proceeds from his wrongful termination suit, case number 23CV010108, no later than March 5, 2026. Respondent is further ordered to deposit all such proceeds into an attorney trust account with his attorney.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS CONTINUED TO MARCH 26, 2026, AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 (30 DAYS). COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO SERVE RESPONDENT WITH THE REQUISITE DOCUMENTS.**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST REGARDING THE SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH AN ACCOUNTING (WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION) OF THE SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS FROM HIS WRONGFUL TERMINATION SUIT, CASE NUMBER 23CV010108, NO LATER THAN MARCH 5, 2026. RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ORDERED TO DEPOSIT ALL SUCH PROCEEDS INTO AN ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT WITH HIS ATTORNEY.**

**PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**8. KIMBERLY JOHNSON V. JEFFREY JOHNSON**

**PFL20120645**

On September 9, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. This matter was originally set to be heard on December 4, 2025, however due to Respondent's evasion of service, the court granted Petitioner's request for substituted service and continued the matter to the present date.

The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) however only Petitioner appeared therefore CCRC could not make recommendations.

All required documents were mail served on December 17<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent has not opposed the RFO.

According to Petitioner's filing, the minor turned 18 on February 2, 2026. Given that the minor has reached the age of majority the court finds the issues of custody and visitation to be moot.

This matter is dropped from calendar as the issues raised in the RFO are now moot.

**TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE RFO ARE NOW 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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**9. REGINA MCNAUGHTON V. JOHN MCNAUGHTON**

**25FL0337**

On November 12, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and property control orders. She filed a Declaration of Kristine S. Cummings and an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently with the RFO. All required documents were served the same day as filing.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on December 5<sup>th</sup> however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore it cannot be considered.

On December 10, 2025, Respondent filed and served an RFO seeking several property orders and an order to release the joinder of the 401k.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 2, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on February 3<sup>rd</sup>. She filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and an Income and Expense Declaration on February 4<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served his Reply Declaration on February 13<sup>th</sup>. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all reply papers are to be filed at least five court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made February 10<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing the reply therefore it is late filed and has not been read or considered by the court.

Petitioner is requesting modification of the current temporary spousal support order to reflect guideline temporary support payable to Petitioner in light of her new health insurance expense and Respondent's reduced health insurance expense. She further requests an order for \$5,000 in need-based attorney's fees and an order prohibiting Respondent from making changes to the marital residence.

Respondent does not oppose the request regarding changes to the marital residence. He asks the court to deny the remainder of Petitioner's requests however, he too is requesting a modification of the temporary spousal support order as he states he cannot afford to pay the current order. Respondent further requests an order allowing him to sell

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

the 2017 Honda CRV and split the proceeds equally. For this reason, he is also requesting release of the Gartner 401(k) joinder; Alternatively, he requests immediate equal division and disbursement of the 401(k) balance. Finally, he asks that the court order Petitioner to retrieve her personal property from the marital residence as soon as possible or that he be allowed to sell the items.

Petitioner opposes the request regarding retrieval of her property unless, and until, the marital residence is sold. She further opposes the release of joinder of the Gartner 401(k). She states the 2017 Honda has already been sold but requests the sale of the 2023 Hyundai Palisade and the proceeds to be equally divided.

The parties are ordered to appear on all issues.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON ALL ISSUES.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**10. TAMARA MOORE V. STEVEN BUTRICK, JR.**

**24FL0458**

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, as well as attorney's fees and child support. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 12, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO, the Income and Expense Declaration, or the CCRC referral and neither party appeared at CCRC.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service and the failure of Respondent, the moving party, to appear at CCRC.

**TENTATIVE RULING #10: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AND THE FAILURE OF RESPONDENT, THE MOVING PARTY, TO APPEAR AT CCRC.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**11. ERIN ANNE WATSON V. ADAM LEE WATSON**

**24FL0010**

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, an order to sell the marital residence, and an order to compel disclosures. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 11, 2025. The RFO and Income and Expense Declaration were both mail-served on November 12<sup>th</sup>. None of the other required documents were served.

Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration on December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. Respondent did not appear though it was set at his request. A single parent report without recommendations was prepared on December 11, 2025.

Given that Respondent failed to appear at CCRC, the parties stipulated to be re-referred. The stipulation, the RFO, and all other required documents were served on Petitioner on December 24<sup>th</sup>.

Both parties attended the reset CCRC appointment on January 23, 2026. They were able to reach agreements on issues of custody and visitation. A report containing those agreements was prepared on January 23, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on January 26, 2026.

Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 6, 2026. It was served on February 5<sup>th</sup>. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, “[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made February 4<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing therefore the Responsive Declaration is late filed and cannot be considered by the court.

Respondent requests the court set a regular parenting plan. He further requests an order to sell the community residence as Petitioner has failed to make payments on the mortgage and Respondent cannot afford to cure any future non-payment. He asks that the home be listed for sale within 30 days of the date of the order. He proposes Keith Wenger of Imperial Real Estate and Mortgage to list the home. Prior to the sale of the home,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent asks that he be allowed to access the home to inventory personal property and then set a subsequent date to allow him to pick up any personal property. Finally, he requests an order directing Petitioner to serve her Preliminary Declaration of Disclosures within 14 days.

Regarding the request for custody and visitation orders, the court has reviewed the agreements of the parties and finds them to be in the best interests of the minor, Jack. As such, the court is adopting the agreements contained in the January 23, 2026 CCRC report as the orders of the court.

Turning to the request to sell the marital residence, the request is granted. It is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court's authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to "[a]t any time during the proceeding...order the liquidation of community or quasi-community assets so as to avoid unreasonable market or investment risks..." Cal. Fam. Code § 2108.

Here, the court is concerned with the inability of the parties to keep current on the mortgage payments. As such, the parties are ordered to place the house up for sale with Keith Wenger of Imperial Real Estate and Mortgage no later than March 19, 2026. The parties are ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home in furtherance of its sale. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional to make the home available for showings and to communicate with the real estate professional as needed. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner.

Prior to the sale of the home, Respondent shall have access to the home to inventory the personal property. The parties are to meet and confer to agree upon a date and time for him to do so. Once he has done so, the parties are to select another date and time for Respondent to have access to the home to retrieve his personal property prior to the sale of the home.

Finally, the request for an order compelling Petitioner's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosures is granted. Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel the disclosure. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

In accordance with Family Code § 2107, Petitioner is ordered to serve her full and complete Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure no later than March 5, 2026.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AND FINDS THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR, JACK. AS SUCH, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE JANUARY 23, 2026 CCRC REPORT AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOUSE UP FOR SALE WITH KEITH WENGER OF IMPERIAL REAL ESTATE AND MORTGAGE NO LATER THAN MARCH 19, 2026. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER.**

**PRIOR TO THE SALE OF THE HOME, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE ACCESS TO THE HOME TO INVENTORY THE PERSONAL PROPERTY. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER TO AGREE UPON A DATE AND TIME FOR HIM TO DO SO. ONCE HE HAS DONE SO, THE PARTIES ARE TO SELECT ANOTHER DATE AND TIME FOR RESPONDENT TO HAVE ACCESS TO THE HOME TO RETRIEVE HIS PERSONAL PROPERTY PRIOR TO THE SALE OF THE HOME.**

**PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO SERVE HER FULL AND COMPLETE PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE NO LATER THAN MARCH 5, 2026.**

**RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12. BRYAN CHAIX V. KRISTINA NEIDIGER**

**PFL20200265**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 16, 2025, seeking orders from the court to enter the judgment pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure 664.6 and reimbursement for overpayment of support. Respondent was served electronically on December 23, 2025. The court notes the Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 2, 2026. It was served electronically on February 2<sup>nd</sup>. Respondent consents in part to Petitioner's request and objects in part to the requests.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on February 6, 2026. It was served electronically on the same day.

The court finds there has not been a meeting of the minds of the parties as to the terms of the judgment. As such, the court is not entering the judgment pursuant to 664.6, as it appears there has not been an agreement between the parties.

The court orders the parties to appear.

**TENTATIVE RULING #12: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**13. EMILY CORVALAN V. SEBASTIAN ANDRADE**

**25FL1128**

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on November 18, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 22, 2025 and a review hearing on February 19, 2026. Proof of Service shows the Petition, Summons, and RFO were personally served on Respondent on December 8, 2025. It does not appear Respondent was served with the referral to CCRC or the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and fully participated. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 5, 2026, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Response and Declaration on February 13, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for either document. As such, the court cannot consider them. Further, these documents are late filed. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, “[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made February 4<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

The court finds good cause to proceed on the merits as Respondent fully participated in the CCRC appointment and is aware of the requested orders. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the February 5<sup>th</sup> CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED ON THE MERITS, AS RESPONDENT FULLY PARTICIPATED IN THE CCRC APPOINTMENT AND IS AWARE OF THE REQUESTED ORDERS. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 5<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON**

**23FL0077**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 26, 2026, seeking health insurance decision making rights as well as reassignment of the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) counselor. Respondent and Minors' Counsel were served electronically on November 26, 2025. However, they were not served with a blank FL-320.

Neither Respondent nor Minors' Counsel has filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS 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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**15. PARKER MILLS V. VIOLET ROBERTS**

**25FL0423**

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on May 7, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day.

On May 27, 2025, Petitioner was permitted to accomplish service of the Summons through the Mountain Democrat. Petitioner filed a Proof of Service showing the Petition and Summons were published in accordance with the order, on June 20, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 21, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 15, 2025, and a review hearing on February 19, 2026.

Petitioner again requested to serve Respondent via publication on December 19, 2025. The court granted the order on December 23, 2025. Petitioner filed a Proof of Publication on February 10, 2026. It shows the dates of publication as January 14, 21<sup>st</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup>, and February 4<sup>th</sup>. The court finds this to be untimely.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on January 15, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on January 16<sup>th</sup>.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**16. MILENA ROBBINS V. RYAN ROBBINS**

**PFL20140570**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 17, 2025. Seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 18, 2025, and a review hearing on February 19, 2026. Proof of Service shows the RFO was mail served on “January 16” via mail service. The Proof of Service is defective on multiple grounds. First, it does not state a year that the service was effectuated. Second, it is signed by Respondent, which is not permissible. Additionally, it states that an Address Verification Form, which is required pursuant to Family Code section 215, was filed, however, upon review of the court file, there is no such document.

Both parties appeared for CCRC and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 5, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on February 6<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed a Declaration on January 16, 2026. Respondent filed an additional two Declarations on January 22, 2026. All three Declarations were served by mail on January 30, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on February 4, 2026. It was served via mail the same day. Petitioner does not raise the issues of the defects in service in her Responsive Declaration; therefore, the court deems them to be waived. Petitioner objects to the requested orders. Petitioner seeks orders which are beyond the scope of the RFO, specifically that Respondent be deemed a vexatious litigant.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court does not find the recommendations as to the parenting plan to be in the best interest of the minor. The court is maintaining the current parenting plan of week on/week off. The court is adopting the remainder of the recommendations as set forth. The court denies Petitioner’s request to declare Respondent a vexatious litigant as it is beyond the scope of the RFO.

All prior orders not in conflict with the current orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE PARENTING PLAN TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT IS MAINTAINING THE CURRENT PARENTING PLAN OF WEEK ON/WEEK OFF. THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE REMAINDER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. THE**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO DECLARE RESPONDENT A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT AS IT IS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**17. TIFFANY SCHNEIDER V. NATHAN SCHNEIDER**

**PFL20210326**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 1, 2026, seeking child custody orders as well as “new orders to establish child support”. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 24, 2025, and a review hearing on February 19, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent or the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) were properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared for the CCRC appointment. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on January 22, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on January 26, 2026.

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for orders on January 15, 2026, requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor. The court denied the request on an ex parte basis; however, the court did direct the minor to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor. Petitioner did not file a subsequent RFO.

Petitioner filed another ex parte request for emergency custody orders on January 29, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 2, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document. The court again denied Petitioner’s ex parte requests and confirmed the previously set review hearing.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on January 16, 2026. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service correlated to this document. Therefore, it has not been considered by the court.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed with the custody and parenting plan portion of the RFO only. The court drops the request to establish new child support orders as it was not properly served.

As to child custody and the parenting plan, the court finds the recommendations as set forth in the January 22, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor, with the exception of the timing on when the orders shall commence. The recommendation is to wait until the end of the academic year to change the primary residence of the minor. The court does not find this to be in the best interest of the minor. The court finds under the present circumstances it is in the best interest of the minor to effectuate the change in primary placement at this time. The court orders that Petitioner shall have primary custody effective February 19, 2026, and Respondent shall have parenting time the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup>

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

weekend of the month. The court finds Respondent's 4<sup>th</sup> weekend of February to begin on Friday February 27<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner is to immediately enroll the minor in the local school district where she resides. The court adopts the remainder of the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THE CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN PORTION OF THE RFO ONLY. THE COURT DROPS THE REQUEST TO ESTABLISH NEW CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS AS IT WAS NOT PROPERLY SERVED.**

**AS TO CHILD CUSTODY AND THE PARENTING PLAN, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JANUARY 22, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE TIMING ON WHEN THE ORDERS SHALL COMMENCE. THE RECOMMENDATION IS TO WAIT UNTIL THE END OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR TO CHANGE THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE OF THE MINOR. THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THIS TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT FINDS UNDER THE PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES IT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR TO EFFECTUATE THE CHANGE IN PRIMARY PLACEMENT AT THIS TIME. THE COURT ORDERS THAT PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PRIMARY CUSTODY EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 19, 2026 AND RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME THE 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2<sup>ND</sup>, AND 4<sup>TH</sup> WEEKEND OF THE MONTH. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT'S 4<sup>TH</sup> WEEKEND OF FEBRUARY TO BEGIN ON FRIDAY FEBRUARY 27<sup>TH</sup>. PETITIONER IS TO IMMEDIATELY ENROLL THE MINOR IN THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT WHERE SHE RESIDES. THE COURT ADOPTS THE REMAINDER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.**

**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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**18. TODD STANLEY V. HANNAH COLE**

**24FL0221**

On December 29, 2025, at the conclusion of trial on the issues of § 3044 and a move away request, the court found that Petitioner had not overcome the 3044 presumption and Respondent was granted her request to relocate with the minor. The court noted the automatic 30-day stay on move-away orders and made several orders to be completed prior to the move away. A review hearing was set for January 29, 2026. The review hearing is to ensure all conditions have been met prior to relocating the minor.

The Declaration of Respondent, Re Updates for Compliance With Orders Prior to Relocation was filed and served on January 26<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration for Hearing was filed on January 27<sup>th</sup> though it was served on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

Parties appeared for the hearing on January 29, 2026. The court found the conditions precedent to the move-away had not yet been met. The court made further orders regarding conjoint counseling between the minors and Petitioner as well as orders regarding individual counseling for the minors. The court received input from Minor's Counsel as well. As the conditions had not been met, the court extended the stay and set a further review hearing for February 19, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Respondent filed a Declaration regarding an update for the move away request on February 13, 2026. It was served on February 13<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 13, 2026. It was served the same day.

Petitioner filed a further Supplemental Declaration and Memorandum of Points and Authorities on February 18, 2026. It was served electronically on February 17<sup>th</sup>. The court finds this to be late filed and therefore has not considered it.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #18: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**19. LENDY WEST V. JASON WEST**

**PFL20160662**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 25, 2025, seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were personally served on September 8<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on September 29<sup>th</sup>. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore, a report with recommendations was prepared on November 6, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on November 7<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent's Objection to the Child Custody Recommending Counselor's Report was filed on November 18<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner asks that Respondent have parenting time every other weekend from Friday after school until Sunday at 8:00pm. She also requests a variety of other orders as stated in her FL-311.

Respondent opposes the request. He asks the court to issue sanctions and enforce dispute resolution requirements per the Final Parenting Plan of the parties. He asks the court to correct the jurisdictional and procedural defects. He further requests temporary sole physical custody of the minor until co-parenting counseling is scheduled and he requests sole physical custody of the minor if Petitioner relocates out of El Dorado County. He requests sole legal custody for purposes of the minor's health and educational decisions. He asks that the parties negotiate a holiday and vacation schedule at mediation. He further asks the court to disregard the entirety of the CCRC report and order a "full" child custody evaluation at Petitioner's expense.

Parties appeared for the hearing on November 20, 2025. The court expressed its concern with the minor's nine absences from school and cautioned that the Individual Education Plan accommodations should not be abused. The court ordered both parties to ensure the minor's regular attendance at school. The court adopted its tentative ruling and set a review hearing to assess the minor's school attendance. The court directed Supplemental Declarations were to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Respondent filed a Request for a Statement of Declaration on January 26, 2026. Petitioner was electronically served the same day.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
February 19, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent filed two documents entitled “Statement of Fact Regarding the Child’s Individual Education Plan” and “Statement of Facts Regarding Child’s Clinical Diagnosis” on February 3, 2026. Respondent also filed a Request for Judicial Notice of certain education codes. Petitioner was served the same day. The court finds these documents do not address the issues currently before the court.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 4, 2026. Petitioner was served the same day. The court finds this document does not address the issues currently before the court.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 9, 2026. It was served the same day. In her declaration, Petitioner requests the court deny Respondent’s request for a Statement of Decision as improper. Reject Respondent’s Revocation of Signature, as untimely. Issue sanctions against Respondent for frivolous and harassing filings, as well as any other relief the court deems appropriate.

The court denies Respondent’s request for a Statement of Decision. The hearing on February 19, 2026, is a law and motion matter and does not meet the requirements for the court to issue a Statement of Decision.

The court finds the current orders remain in the best interest of the minor. All current orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. ALL CURRENT ORDERS 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) 621-6725 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, 1247 (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 5

February 19, 2026

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**20. ERIC WEXELMAN V. JAMAICA WEXELMAN**

**24FL0838**

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders, regarding the proceeds from the sale of the former marital residence on February 5, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the court denied the request on an ex parte basis but granted an Order Shortening Time. The court directed Respondent to serve Petitioner by February 6<sup>th</sup> and for Petitioner to file a Responsive Declaration by no later than February 13, 2026. Respondent filed the Request for Order (RFO) on February 6, 2026, with the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows electronic service on February 6, 2026. However, the service did not include a blank FL-320.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on February 13, 2026. Although it is marked "Late Filed" it was filed in accordance with the Order Shortening Time granted by the court. Respondent was served with the Responsive Declaration by mail and electronically on February 12, 2026.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 13, 2026. The court deems this to be a Reply Declaration. It was served electronically on February 12<sup>th</sup>.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #20: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**