

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

1. JILL ALIOTO V. JOSEPH ALIOTO

23FL1208

On October 29, 2025, the parties appeared before the court for trial on Petitioner's Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). Ultimately the court denied the request and the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). A review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on November 2nd. A report with recommendations was prepared on February 2, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on February 13th.

Petitioner filed and served an Updating Declaration on February 17th.

Respondent's Reply Declaration to CCRC Report was filed and served on February 19th along with Respondent's Reply Declaration to Petitioner's "Updating Declaration."

Petitioner asks the court to adopt the recommendations of CCRC but with several amendments.

Respondent asks the court not to adopt the CCRC recommendations. Instead, he asks that Petitioner have only supervised visits pending completion of a parenting course. He further asks that Petitioner be ordered to attend a batterer's treatment program and an in-person parenting class. In the event the court is not inclined to order the foregoing, Respondent requests joint legal and physical custody with a 2-2-5 timeshare, daily phone/FaceTime calls at 6:45pm, and exchanges to occur at 5pm. He asks that Petitioner once again be ordered to refrain from making disparaging remarks around the minor and that she be ordered to attend an in-person co-parenting class.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and finds the recommendations contained in the February 11, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor with the following modifications. Section 2.f shall be amended to remove the language "or out-of-state travel." Each party must receive the consent of the other to remove the minor from the country. Out-of-state travel requires notification (not consent) in accordance with the Travel With Children section of the CCRC report. The section titled "Notification of Proposed Move of Child" shall be amended to add the following language – "No residence or work address is needed if a party has an address with the State of California Safe at Home confidential address program." The section regarding phone contact shall be amended to read as follows – "The child is to have daily scheduled phone or video calls with the non-custodial parent at a time reasonably agreed upon by the parties. If the parties are unable to agree on a time then the call shall be held at 6:45pm. Neither party

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

nor any third party may listen to, monitor, discontinue, or in any way interfere with the calls.”

In addition to the above orders, the parties are ordered to allow the minor to continue her participation in soccer, gymnastics, and KidStrong unless the parties agree otherwise. The parties may each choose the religious activities the minor participates in during his or her parenting time.

The parties are admonished to comply with all court orders, including those orders which preclude the parties from making disparaging comments to or around the minor about one another. Failure to comply with court orders may result in sanctions or a change in custody orders.

Finally, Petitioner’s request for alcohol testing is denied as it is outside the scope of the present hearing.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. However, these orders are effective immediately upon the court’s adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE AND FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 11, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. SECTION 2.F SHALL BE AMENDED TO REMOVE THE LANGUAGE “OR OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL.” EACH PARTY MUST RECEIVE THE CONSENT OF THE OTHER TO REMOVE THE MINOR FROM THE COUNTRY. OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL REQUIRES NOTIFICATION (NOT CONSENT) IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TRAVEL WITH CHILDREN SECTION OF THE CCRC REPORT. THE SECTION TITLED “NOTIFICATION OF PROPOSED MOVE OF CHILD” SHALL BE AMENDED TO ADD THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE – “NO RESIDENCE OR WORK ADDRESS IS NEEDED IF A PARTY HAS AN ADDRESS WITH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SAFE AT HOME CONFIDENTIAL ADDRESS PROGRAM.” THE SECTION REGARDING PHONE CONTACT SHALL BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS – “THE CHILD IS TO HAVE DAILY SCHEDULED PHONE OR VIDEO CALLS WITH THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT AT A TIME REASONABLY AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES. IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO AGREE ON A TIME THEN THE CALL SHALL BE HELD AT 6:45PM. NEITHER PARTY NOR ANY THIRD PARTY MAY LISTEN TO, MONITOR, DISCONTINUE, OR IN ANY WAY INTERFERE WITH THE CALLS.”

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE ORDERS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ALLOW THE MINOR TO CONTINUE HER PARTICIPATION IN SOCCER, GYMNASTICS, AND KIDSTRONG UNLESS THE PARTIES AGREE OTHERWISE. THE PARTIES MAY EACH CHOOSE THE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES THE MINOR PARTICIPATES IN DURING HIS OR HER PARENTING TIME.

THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED TO COMPLY WITH ALL COURT ORDERS, INCLUDING THOSE ORDERS WHICH PRECLUDE THE PARTIES FROM MAKING DISPARAGING COMMENTS TO OR AROUND THE MINOR ABOUT ONE ANOTHER. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDERS MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS OR A CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS.

FINALLY, PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ALCOHOL TESTING IS DENIED AS IT IS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PRESENT HEARING.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. HOWEVER, THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. OMAR ATEBAR V. MINA ATEBAR

PFL20140638

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and child support. His Income and Expense Declaration was filed on November 14th. Both documents were served by mail on December 12th however this is a post-judgment request and as such service is required to be personal pursuant to Family Code § 215.

On December 29th Petitioner filed another RFO also seeking custody and visitation orders. This time the RFO was filed on an ex parte basis. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set to join the hearing on the already pending RFO.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on January 13th. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Respondent filed and served a Declaration on January 16th.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on February 13th, thereby waiving any defect in service of the original RFO.

The parties attended CCRC on January 13th and a report with recommendations was prepared on February 19th. It was mailed to the parties on February 20th.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor. He requests child support with a wage assignment and backpay due to Respondent's failure to pay support over the past year and a half.

Respondent opposes Petitioner's request and instead asks that she be awarded sole legal and sole physical custody.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the recommendations contained in the February 19, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined in the attached Xspouse report, the court finds that child support is \$903 per month. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$903 per month as and for child support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. According to the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

parties, Respondent has had sole custody of the minor since December of 2025. As such, this order is effective as of December 1, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$2,709 through and including February 1, 2026. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$112.88 on the 15th of each month commencing on March 15, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If any payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. However, these orders are effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 19, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$903 PER MONTH. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$903 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. ACCORDING TO THE PARTIES, RESPONDENT HAS HAD SOLE CUSTODY OF THE MINOR SINCE DECEMBER OF 2025. AS SUCH, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF DECEMBER 1, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,709 THROUGH AND INCLUDING FEBRUARY 1, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$112.88 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON MARCH 15, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. HOWEVER, THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN ORDER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 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.

| Fixed Shares | Father | Mother | Monthly figures | Cash Flow | Guideline | Proposed |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| #of children | 0 | 1 | 2026 | | | |
| % time with NCP | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | | | 3998 | 4223 |
| Filing status | HH/MLA | HH/MLA | GUIDELINE | Comb. net spendable | 0% | 6% |
| # exemptions | 1 * | 2 * | Nets(adjusted) | Percent change | | |
| Wages+salary | 4750 | 0 | Father | 3998 | Father | |
| Self-employed income | 0 | 0 | Mother | 0 | Payment cost/benefit | -903 -751 |
| Other taxable income | 0 | 0 | Total | 3998 | Net spendable income | 3095 3247 |
| TANF+CS received | 0 | 0 | Support | | Change from guideline | 0 152 |
| Other nontaxable income | 0 | 0 | Addons | 0 | % of combined spendable | 77% 77% |
| New spouse income | 0 | 0 | Guideln CS | 903 | % of saving over guideline | 0% 67% |
| 401(k) employee contrib | 0 | 0 | Alameda SS | 0 | Total taxes | 752 527 |
| Adjustments to income | 0 | 0 | Total | 903 | Dep. exemption value | 0 0 |
| SS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | - | | # withholding allowances | 0 0 |
| CS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | Settings changed | | Net wage paycheck | 3868 3868 |
| Health insurance | 0 | 0 | | | Mother | |
| Other medical expense | 0 | 0 | | | Payment cost/benefit | 903 976 |
| Property tax expense | 0 | 0 | | | Net spendable income | 903 976 |
| Ded interest expense | 0 | 0 | Proposed | | Change from guideline | 0 73 |
| Charitable contributions | 0 | 0 | Tactic 9 | | % of combined spendable | 23% 23% |
| Misc tax deductions | 0 | 0 | CS | 976 | % of saving over guideline | 0% 33% |
| Qual bus income ded | 0 | 0 | SS | 0 | Total taxes | 0 0 |
| Required union dues | 0 | 0 | Total | 976 | Dep. exemption value | 0 0 |
| Mandatory retirement | 0 | 0 | Saving | 225 | # withholding allowances | 0 0 |
| Hardship deduction | 0 * | 0 * | Releases | 1 | Net wage paycheck | 0 0 |
| Other GDL deductions | 0 | 0 | <i>Released to Father</i> | | | |
| Child care expenses | 0 | 0 | | | | |

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

| | Timeshare | cce(F) | cce(M) | Addons | Payor | Basic CS | Payor | Pres CS | Payor |
|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|
| All children | 0 - 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Father | 903 | Father | 903 | Father |
| | 0 - 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Father | 903 | Father | 903 | Father |

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. CURTIS CHRISTENSEN V. GINA CHRISTENSEN

PFL20170845

On November 24, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, attorney's fees and sanctions. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration and Attorney Amanda D. Yasbek's Declaration concurrently with the RFO. All required documents were served by mail on December 8, 2025.

Minor's Counsel filed and served her statement on February 11, 2026.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 29, 2025. A report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on February 11, 2026, however it is of note that the date on the CCRC report is December 11, 2026. This is believed to be a typo.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on February 13, 2026. 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 11th the last day for filing, therefore the Responsive Declaration is late and cannot be considered by the court.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration was filed on February 19, 2026 along with Petitioner's Reply Declaration and an Objection to Respondent's Responsive Declaration. Petitioner filed an Amended Supplemental Declaration the same day.

Respondent filed and served a Declaration on February 20th.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. MICKEY DEMARTINI V. JESSICA SIMMONS

24FL1219

On November 20, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking clarification of the court's July 3rd order. He filed another RFO on January 2, 2026 seeking to set aside the July 3rd order.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 9, 2026.

On February 17th, Petitioner filed Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration in Support of Request for Clarification and Motion to Set Aside.

Petitioner requests clarification as to the grounds for dismissal of the Petition. He further requests the court set aside its order of dismissal pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b).

Respondent opposes the motion arguing that Section 473(b) does not support setting aside the order under the given circumstances.

"The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 473(b). The burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for relief. *Austin v. L.A. Unified School Dist.*, 244 Cal. App. 4th 918 (2016). The moving party is tasked with not only establishing grounds for relief, but establishing that the error was *excusable* on the part of the moving party. *Austin* at 929; *See also* *Huh v. Wang*, 158 Cal. App. 4th 1406, 1419 (2007).

Here, Petitioner is arguing excusable neglect on the basis that he does not have a valid driver's license, relied on his mother to transport him to court, but was unaware that his mother needed to drop the children off at school. The court does not find this to fall within the purview of Section 473(b). In order to set aside the order, the neglect must be *excusable*; Petitioner's failure to obtain proper transportation is not excusable neglect. Furthermore, the court granted the dismissal of the Petition on the merits based on the arguments set forth by Respondent's counsel. As such, the motion to set aside the July 3, 2025 order is denied.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. However, these orders are effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JULY 3, 2025 ORDER IS DENIED. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. HOWEVER, THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. MACKENZIE GLYNN V. ELIZABETH GLYNN

24FL1238

On November 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel Respondent's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure and sanctions. She filed her Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of her RFO. All required documents were mail served on November 19, 2025.

Respondent filed her Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and her Income and Expense Declaration on November 18th.

Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). "...[T]he court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney's fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Given that Respondent has served her Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure the court finds the motion to compel moot and therefore the court declines to rule on it. That said, the request for monetary sanctions is granted in the amount of \$500. While the court recognizes that Petitioner incurred more than that in fees and costs associated with Respondent's non-compliance, however after reviewing Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration the court finds that anything more than that would constitute a significant financial burden on Respondent and would therefore be unjust. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner's attorney \$500 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 2107(c). This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$25 commencing on March 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 20 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. However, these orders are effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: GIVEN THAT RESPONDENT HAS SERVED HER PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE THE COURT FINDS THE MOTION TO COMPEL MOOT AND THEREFORE THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON IT. THAT SAID, THE REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IS GRANTED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$500. THE COURT FINDS THAT ANYTHING MORE THAN THAT WOULD CONSTITUTE A SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL BURDEN ON RESPONDENT AND WOULD THEREFORE BE UNJUST. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY \$500 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2107(C). THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$25 COMMENCING ON MARCH 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 20 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. HOWEVER, THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026

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

7. DANA M. LOUIS V. TRACI L. LOUIS

24FL0026

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 24, 2025 requesting sanctions and orders regarding the execution of escrow documents. Petitioner objected to the RFO as it was untimely served. On August 28th, Respondent's attorney appeared and requested a continuance on behalf of all parties. The request was granted and the matter was continued. On November 20th the parties requested another continuance. The request was granted and the matter was continued to the present date.

Respondent requests an order directing Petitioner to sign the Interspousal Transfer Deed forthwith. Should she fail to do so by June 18, 2025, Respondent asks that the clerk be appointed as elisor to sign on behalf of Petitioner. She states that the documents must be signed no later than June 20th. Respondent further requests sanctions in the amount of \$3,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271 and an additional \$15,000 in alleged actual damages caused by Petitioner's failure to sign the escrow documents.

Petitioner opposes the RFO arguing that the issue was already ruled on at the June 17, 2025 hearing. She states that Respondent has already purchased the subject home and the court reserved on each party's request for sanctions. Petitioner now seeks an additional \$3,500 in sanctions.

The court finds the issue of the Interspousal Transfer Deed to be moot. The court has already reserved on each party's request for sanctions. The court is reserving on Petitioner's request for additional sanctions until the time of trial.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. However, these orders are effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE ISSUE REGARDING THE INTERSPOUSAL TRANSFER DEED IS FOUND TO BE MOOT AND THEREFORE THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON IT. THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE ON EACH PARTY'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS AND ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. HOWEVER, THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN ORDER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. MEGAN A PIERCE V. TYLER L PIERCE

25FL0574

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 19, 2025 seeking a vocational evaluation of Petitioner. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on October 24th.

On September 25th, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on an RFO that had been previously filed by Petitioner. At that time, the parties reached agreements on a variety of issues, including an agreement for Petitioner to undergo a vocational evaluation.

The parties attended hearing on the pending RFOs on November 20th at which time the court ruled on the request for attorney's fees and continued the issues of imputation of income and support to the present date to allow for receipt and review of the vocational evaluation. The parties were ordered to file supplemental declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 29, 2026. It was served on February 5th.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration, a Supplemental Declaration and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on February 13th.

Respondent filed his Reply Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on February 18th. Both documents were served on February 17th.

Petitioner filed an Objection to Respondent's Reply Declaration and Request to Strike Pleading on February 20th. She argues that the pleading exceeds the mandatory 5-page limit and seeks to submit the vocational evaluation which is improper hearsay evidence.

The objection is sustained in part. Petitioner is correct that the Reply Declaration is not compliant with the page limit set by California Rule of Court 5.111(a). As such, the court has only read and considered the first five pages of the document. Regarding the objection to the vocational evaluation, the objection is sustained.

This matter is continued to Monday, April 13th at 8:30am in Department 10 to be heard on the Department of Child Support Services calendar.

The court reserves jurisdiction to modify child and spousal support back to July 15, 2025.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO MONDAY, APRIL 13TH AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 10 TO BE HEARD ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES CALENDAR.

THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO MODIFY CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT BACK TO JULY 15, 2025.

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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. LISA PURVES V. SCOTT PURVES

PFL20010383

On November 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking division of the pension plan. Given that this is a post-judgment request, the RFO and all other required documents were personally served on December 26th, however, the Proof of Service states that service was on December 26, 2026, not December 26, 2025. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

With the defective Proof of Service and the fact that Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration waiving any potential defect, the court is continuing this matter. Petitioner is ordered to file a corrected Proof of Service prior to the next hearing date.

This matter is continued to Thursday, May 21st at 8:30am in Department 5. Any Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY MAY 21ST AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO FILE A CORRECTED PROOF OF SERVICE. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE.

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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. SCOTT RONNINGEN V. ANGELINA RONNINGEN

23FL0127

On November 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking sanctions and further sentencing for Petitioner's noncompliance with court orders. The RFO was served by mail on January 13, 2026. It appears the Notice of Posting Tentative Ruling was not served with the RFO. Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Respondent is seeking the following: (1) Petitioner to be found in noncompliance with his sentence issued at the March 12, 2025 hearing; (2) Petitioner to be found in violation of his probation; (3) further sentencing; and (4) Family Code § 271 sanctions. Of note, Respondent seems to be referencing Petitioner as "Respondent" in her moving papers.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. JUSTIN SIMARRO V. YAJAIRA SIMARRO

PFL20200099

On November 6, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for Petitioner to pay credit card debts.

On November 17th, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC).

Respondent filed another RFO on January 16, 2026.

On February 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Proof of Service indicating service of an “FL300, ex parte” and an “FL300.” There are currently three RFOs pending before the court and the Proof of Service does not specify which one was served. Additionally, the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, nor was a blank Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Without a properly completed Proof of Service the matter cannot be heard. The November 6, 2025 RFO and the January 16, 2026 RFO are both dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

According to the Proof of Service, the “FL410” was personally served on Petitioner. The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment on the OSC.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE NOVEMBER 6, 2025 RFO AND THE JANUARY 16, 2026 RFO ARE BOTH DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT ON THE OSC.

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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. JENNIFER WEISSENSEE V. DAVID KRUEGER

22FLL0584

On December 19, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were served on December 23rd, however there was no Notice of Tentative Ruling served.

Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 13, 2026, it was served on February 12th.

On February 20th, Respondent filed an Objection to Petitioner's Response and Reply. However, the parties filed a Stipulation Re: CCRC and Child Visitation and Order on February 23rd wherein Respondent waived his objection and the parties stipulated to be re-referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC).

The parties are ordered to attend CCRC on Thursday, March 26th at 9:00am. A review hearing is set for Thursday, May 21st at 8:30am in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ATTEND CCRC ON THURSDAY, MARCH 26TH AT 9:00AM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, MAY 21ST AT 8:30AM. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED 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 26, 2026

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

13. COUNTY OF EL DORADO V. DOMINIC INGRAM (OTHER PARENT: HOLLY FROST)

24FL0957

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 10, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 2, 2026, and a review hearing on February 26, 2026. Other Parent was mail served on December 18, 2025. It appears Other Parent was also personally served on December 18th; however, the Proof of Service appears to be incomplete. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served. Respondent is seeking joint legal and physical custody with parenting time every other weekend during the school year and a week on/week off schedule during the summer. Respondent is also seeking phone calls/Facetime contact during the week. Respondent has proposed a holiday schedule as well.

Both parties and the minor appeared at the CCRC appointment. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 11, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 11, 2026. Respondent was served electronically and by mail on February 11th. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served. Other Parent objects to the requested orders. Other Parent has proposed a 20-week step-up plan as well as a holiday schedule and other requests regarding vacation time.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed on the merits, despite the lack of proper service to Petitioner. The court finds the recommendations set forth in the February 11th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect.

The court is directing Respondent to prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. These orders are effective immediately and are not conditioned upon the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED ON THE MERITS, DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE TO PETITIONER. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 11TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE COURT IS DIRECTING RESPONDENT TO PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED UPON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. DAVID BELL V. MEGAN GUERRERO

24FL0556

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on November 13, 2025. The court denied the ex parte application on November 17, 2025. The parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on December 9, 2025, with a review hearing scheduled for January 8, 2026. On November 17th Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and parenting plan orders, as well as a finding that Family Code section 3044 has been rebutted. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on November 25, 2025.

Both parties attended the CCRC appointment on December 9, 2025. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on December 31, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Parties appeared for the hearing on January 8, 2026. The court inquired of the parties as to the status of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order Request by Respondent in San Joaquin County as well as the pending criminal charges against Petitioner in San Joaquin County. The court made parenting plan orders and set a review hearing for February 26, 2026. The court directed parties to file and serve Supplemental Declarations at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 10, 2026. It was mail served the same day. Respondent asserts the current parenting plan is working well and requests additional parenting time. Respondent seeks clarification as to communication between the parties.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on February 13, 2026. The court deems this to be a Supplemental Declaration. Petitioner seeks an immediate termination of overnight parenting time with Respondent.

Both parties have included in their Supplemental Declarations that the pending matters in San Joaquin County have been continued and are likely to be continued again.

The court finds the current orders remain in the minor's best interest and maintains the current orders. As to communication between the parties, the court maintains the current orders in this case. This court does not have the authority to modify the court orders from the San Joaquin County cases. Any modification or clarification of those orders must be sought in San Joaquin County. The court finds it is necessary to set a further review

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

hearing to determine the outcomes of the matters currently pending in San Joaquin County. The court sets a review hearing for Thursday, May 26th at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. This order is effective immediately and not conditioned on the formal written order.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST AND MAINTAINS THE CURRENT ORDERS. AS TO COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THE COURT MAINTAINS THE CURRENT ORDERS IN THIS CASE. THIS COURT DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO MODIFY THE COURT ORDERS FROM THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CASES. ANY MODIFICATION OR CLARIFICATION OF THOSE ORDERS MUST BE SOUGHT IN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY. THE COURT FINDS IT IS NECESSARY TO SET A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING TO DETERMINE THE OUTCOMES OF THE MATTERS CURRENTLY PENDING IN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY. THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING FOR THURSDAY MAY 26TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY AND NOT CONDITIONED ON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026

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

16. JUSTIN HALLOCK V. DEBRA HALLOCK

PFL20200781

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking enforcement of current orders, as well as attorney's fees and sanctions on December 3, 2025. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. There is no Proof of Service showing these documents were properly served.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on February 5, 2026. Proof of Service shows all parties were served electronically and by mail on February 5th. Respondent objects to all hearsay statements and documents in Petitioner's pleading. Respondent objects to Petitioner's requested orders, including the request for attorney's fees. Respondent seeks attorney's fees and sanctions.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on February 13, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner and Respondent were served on February 12th. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services, who is a party to the case, has been properly served.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on February 13, 2026. Proof of Service shows all parties were served on February 12th.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. MEGAN HAMAN V. JUSTIN HAMAN

25FL1156

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 1, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 21, 2025 and a review hearing on February 26, 2026. Respondent was personally served on December 18, 2025.

Petitioner subsequently filed a request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). The request for a temporary DVRO was granted in part on December 12, 2025. That matter is currently pending trial in Department 8 on March 10, 2026.

Respondent filed multiple Responsive Declarations, including on December 30, 2025, January 16, 2026, and two on January 20, 2026. The court is unclear as to which Responsive Declaration was served on January 16, 2026, as the Proof of Service does not state the filed date of the Responsive Declaration. Likewise, the Proof of Service filed on January 20, 2026, does not state which Responsive Declaration was served. As such, the court cannot determine which Responsive Declaration has been properly served, and therefore, has not considered any of the Responsive Declarations.

Respondent filed two more Declarations on February 11, 2026. Proof of Service shows these were mail served on February 4, 2026.

Respondent filed three additional Declarations on February 11, 2026, two are third-party declarations. Proof of Service shows these were mail served on February 9, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on February 19, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner requests the court adopt the CCRC report recommendations along with the parties' agreements for a temporary modification due to the minor's basketball schedule. Petitioner requests the court deny Respondent's request for sole custody of the minors, and delegation of parenting time to non-parties.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations along with the parties' agreements as set forth in Petitioner's Reply Declaration as its orders.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing. These orders are effective immediately and are not conditioned on the formal written order.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALONG WITH THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AS SET FORTH IN PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION AS ITS ORDERS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY AND ARE NOT CONDITIONED ON THE FORMAL WRITTEN 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) 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. RUSSELL MILLS V. BETHANY MILLS

PFL20190783

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 9, 2025, seeking a change in the current child support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was personally served on December 9, 2025. However, Petitioner was not served all the required documents.

Parties submitted a stipulation regarding child support, which the court adopted as its order, on February 17, 2026. The court finds the stipulation renders the RFO moot. As such, the RFO is dropped from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS MOOT. 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. ANASTASIA SIROCHMAN V. JUSTIN SCHWARTZ

23FL0660

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 3, 2025, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders, following the court's denial of her ex parte application for the same orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 31, 2025, and a review hearing on February 26, 2026. Proof of Service shows substituted personal service of some, but not all the required documents. There is no Proof of Service showing mail service as is required by Code of Civil Procedure section 415.20(b).

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on February 11, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on the same day.

Respondent has not 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 #20: 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 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. NADIA STAMOS V. PETER DONALD STAMOS

25FL0604

On September 9, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, child support, attorney's fees, and an order to sell the marital residence. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were electronically served on September 16th, though she did not serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling. An additional Income and Expense Declaration was filed on September 12th and served on the 16th.

On September 23rd, Petitioner filed a Stipulation and Order to Sell Real Property and Other.

Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 21st, it was served on September 19th. Respondent has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

Parties appeared for the hearing on December 4, 2025, at which time the court resolved the issues of child and spousal support. The court set a review hearing for February 26, 2026, to address the issues of the sale of the home and the tax debt. The court invited parties to file briefs on the issue of the tax debt and directed that briefs were due at least 10 day prior to the hearing.

Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on February 19, 2026. It was served on February 20, 2026.

Respondent filed an Order Shortening Time (OST) along with an RFO to modify child and spousal support on February 19, 2026. The court granted the OST and set the RFO for a hearing to join the previously set review hearing on February 26th. Respondent was directed to serve Petitioner by February 20th. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served electronically on February 20th. The OST granted Petitioner until February 24th to file and serve a Responsive Declaration.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Neither party has filed a brief or a Supplemental Declaration regarding the review hearing.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

February 26, 2026

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

22. DANIL TARASOV V. YEKATERINA TARASOV

PFL20210520

This matter is before the court on Respondent's request for bifurcation. The Request for Order (RFO) was filed on September 5, 2025.

Parties appeared for the originally set hearing on December 4, 2025. The court continued the matter to allow service to be perfected.

Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on December 4, 2025.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
February 26, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

23. PAIGE WRIGHT V. MICHAEL WRIGHT

24FL1202

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders on November 24, 2025. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 2, 2026 and a review hearing on February 26, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

On January 2, 2026, the parties were informed that the CCRC appointment was rescheduled to January 8, 2026.

Neither party appeared at the CCRC appointment.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as Petitioner's failure to appear at the CCRC appointment.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT THE CCRC APPOINTMENT.

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.