

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**1. CHELSEA HARRISON V. JOSEPH HARRISON**

**23FL0289**

On November 13, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of property division requests. The RFO and a Blank FL-320 were both served by mail on November 21, 2025. The Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served. Additionally, this is a post-judgment request. As such, the RFO was required to be personally served. See Fam. Code § 215. This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICES.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**2. LUCAS JONATHAN MASLEN HAWES V. ANNA PAGE**

**24FL0868**

On December 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking property orders, bifurcation, and sanctions. He filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on December 18<sup>th</sup> with the exception of the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration in Support of Petitioner's Request for Order on February 25, 2026.

Respondent filed two different Responsive Declarations to Request for Order on February 27<sup>th</sup> along with her Income and Expense Declaration. These documents were served by mail the same date as filing.

Petitioner filed and served his Reply Declaration on March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Respondent filed a third Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 4<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 27<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration therefore it is late filed and cannot be read or considered.

Petitioner is requesting bifurcation and termination of the marital status. He further asks the court to terminate jurisdiction on spousal support and to make property and debt division orders. Finally, he requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Petitioner's request for bifurcation is denied due to failure to file the proper paperwork. While a party may request bifurcation of the issue of marital status, prior to doing so the party must ensure that "[a]ll pension plans that have not been divided by court order that require joinder ..." have been joined. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(d)(1). Additionally, a party seeking bifurcation is to submit a completed FL-315. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(a). Here, Petitioner did not file the requisite FL-315 nor address the issue of any potential pension plans. Accordingly, the request to bifurcate is denied.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Regarding the requests for termination of spousal support, division of property and division of debts, the parties are ordered to appear to select trial and Mandatory Settlement Conference dates on these issues.

The court reserves on Petitioner's request for sanctions until the time of trial.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE REQUEST TO BIFURCATE IS DENIED DUE TO FAILURE TO FILE THE PROPER PAPERWORK.**

**REGARDING THE REQUESTS FOR TERMINATION OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT, DIVISION OF PROPERTY AND DIVISION OF DEBTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES ON THESE ISSUES.**

**THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.**

**PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**4. LLOYD MASON V. THERESA SWAIN**

**25FL0276**

On December 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on December 15<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on February 27<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served her Declaration of Respondent, Theresa Swain on March 2, 2026. While Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration is more than three months old her March declaration affirming that no facts have changed is sufficient to satisfy the currentness requirement for purposes of calculating support.

Respondent is requesting guideline child and spousal support as well as attorney's fees in the amount of \$8,000.

Petitioner asks that Respondent be imputed with full-time income. He further asks the court to deviate downward from guideline child support and to either forego awarding arrears or apply a credit toward arrears given the voluntary payments he has made. Finally, he opposes the request for attorney's fees.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the request is denied. The public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In *Re Marriage of Keech*, 75 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. It "is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party," but rather "parity." *Alan S. v. Sup. Ct.*, 172 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 238,251(2009). In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. "In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party's case adequately." *Id.* at (b).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 2026

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

Here, while there is a disparity in income, the court does not find that Petitioner has the ability to pay both his attorney's fees and those of Respondent. Furthermore, taking into consideration the relative circumstances of each party, Respondent has sufficient equity in the home she owns outright to obtain access to funds to pay for her attorney. For these reasons, the request for attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2030 is denied.

Turning to the issue of support, while it is the obligation of both parties to support their minor children, and spousal support is appropriate where it is necessary to enable the lower earning spouse to maintain the marital standard of living, support may be reduced based on the imputation of income to the lower earning spouse. In re Marriage of Regnery, 214 Cal. App. 3d 1367 (1989). Where the lower earning spouse has the ability and opportunity to work, the amount of income imputed is to be based on that spouse's measurable earning capacity which is determined by (1) the ability of the spouse to earn consistent with the spouse's health, age, education, marketable skills, and employment history; and (2) the opportunity available for employment. In re Marriage of Simpson, 4 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 225 (1992).

Here, the court does find that Respondent has the ability and opportunity to work and earn significantly more than she is currently making. As such, the request to impute her with income commensurate with \$20 per hour full-time work is granted. This amounts to an imputation of \$3,466 per month.

With granting the request to impute income to Respondent, and the denial of the request for attorney's fees, the court is not inclined to deviate downward from guideline spousal support. As such, that request is denied.

Utilizing the figures as outlined above, the court finds that child support is \$3,609 per month and spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$1,019 per month. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$4,629 per month as and for child support and temporary spousal support, payable on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of December 15, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$13,887 through and including February 15, 2026. However, Petitioner has been paying \$3,098.33 per month voluntarily. This results in a credit of \$9,294.99. Accounting for payments already made, there is a net amount of \$4,592.01 due to be paid. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$191.34 on the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month commencing on April 1, 2026 and continuing

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If any payment is late or missed the entire remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2030 IS DENIED.**

**THE REQUEST TO IMPUTE RESPONDENT WITH INCOME COMMENSURATE WITH \$20 PER HOUR FULL-TIME WORK IS GRANTED. THIS AMOUNTS TO AN IMPUTATION OF \$3,466 PER MONTH.**

**THE COURT IS NOT INCLINED TO DEVIATE DOWNWARD FROM GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT. AS SUCH, THAT REQUEST IS DENIED.**

**UTILIZING THE FIGURES AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$3,609 PER MONTH AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$1,019 PER MONTH. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$4,629 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15<sup>TH</sup> OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF DECEMBER 15, 2025.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$13,887 THROUGH AND INCLUDING FEBRUARY 15, 2026. HOWEVER, PETITIONER HAS BEEN PAYING \$3,098.33 PER MONTH VOLUNTARILY. THIS RESULTS IN A CREDIT OF \$9,294.99. ACCOUNTING FOR PAYMENTS ALREADY MADE, THERE IS A NET AMOUNT OF \$4,592.01 DUE TO BE PAID. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$191.34 ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON APRIL 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE ENTIRE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.**

**PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 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	3	2026			
% time with NCP	20.00 %	0.00 %			14126	14244
Filing status	MFS->	HH/MLA	<b>GUIDELINE</b>	Comb. net spendable		
# exemptions	1 *	4 *	<b>Nets(adjusted)</b>	Percent change	0%	1%
Wages+salary	15282	3466	Father	<b>10172</b>	<b>Father</b>	
Self-employed income	0	0	Mother	3954	Payment cost/benefit	-4534 -4398
Other taxable income	606	0	Total	14126	Net spendable income	5543 5679
TANF+CS received	0	0	<b>Support</b>		Change from guideline	0 136
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of combined spendable	39% 40%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	3609	% of saving over guideline	0% 115%
401(k) employee contrib	602	0	Alameda SS	1019	Total taxes	5082 4361
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	4629	Dep. exemption value	0 0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-		# withholding allowances	0 0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Net wage paycheck	9227 9227
Health insurance	634	0			<b>Mother</b>	
Other medical expense	0	0			Payment cost/benefit	4629 4611
Property tax expense	334	667			Net spendable income	8583 8565
Ded interest expense	1545	0	<b>Proposed</b>		Change from guideline	0 -18
Charitable contributions	0	0	<b>Tactic 9</b>		% of combined spendable	61% 60%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	3926	% of saving over guideline	0% -15%
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	1288	Total taxes	-488 115
Required union dues	0	0	Total	5214	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Mandatory retirement	0	0	Saving	118	# withholding allowances	0 0
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Releases	3	Net wage paycheck	2880 2880
Other GDL deductions	0	0	<i>Released to Father</i>			
Child care expenses	0	0				

Father pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

All children	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
	20 - 80	0	0	0	Father	3609	Father	3609	Father
	20 - 80	0	0	0	Father	673	Father	673	Father
	20 - 80	0	0	0	Father	1058	Father	1058	Father
	20 - 80	0	0	0	Father	1879	Father	1879	Father

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**5. MICHAEL J. OSBORNE V. CORTNEY A. OSBORNE**

**24FL0362**

On December 16, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. He filed an amended RFO on December 22<sup>nd</sup>. The amended RFO was electronically served on December 22<sup>nd</sup> however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served nor was the required blank FL-320. Additionally, he did not serve DCSS who is a party to the action.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 20, 2026. It was served on all parties on February 18<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner's Reply and Declaration in Support of Reply was filed on February 26<sup>th</sup>. It was served only on Respondent.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on January 14, 2026. As they were unable to reach any agreements, a report with recommendations was prepared on February 27, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration to Petitioner's Reply Declaration & CCRC Report on March 5, 2026.

Because both parties attended CCRC, the court finds good cause to proceed with the RFO despite Petitioner's failure to serve DCSS who is a party to the action.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal custody and sole physical custody of the minor.

Respondent opposes the request and asks the court to confirm the current 2-2-3 schedule and confirm the court's orders from July 11, 2024. She further requests Petitioner be ordered to purchase a device for the minor to use while in his care and set nightly calls between the minor and Respondent.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the February 27, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 27, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

**RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**6. KIRSTEN REIMAN V. SCOTT REIMAN**

**25FL0453**

On January 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The matter was originally filed as an ex parte request which was granted in part and the parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment. All required documents were served on January 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was prepared without recommendations.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Nevertheless, Petitioner filed and served a Reply Declaration on March 2, 2026.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the orders that were made ex parte on January 23, 2026 to be in the best interests of the minor Helena. Respondent shall have no overnights with the minor. The parties are to continue practicing the 2-2-3 schedule, however Respondent's time with Helena shall be from after school (3:00pm if no school) until 8:00pm on Respondent's visitation days. Respondent shall ensure the minor has access to a phone and he shall not supervise her calls. The minor shall remain in counseling services and the minor and Respondent are to participate in conjoint counseling at a frequency and duration as recommended by the conjoint counselor.

Petitioner's request that the minor may not be compelled to attend parenting time is granted. The minor may choose not to attend the visits with Respondent. However, the minor may not choose to skip conjoint counseling visits with Respondent.

Petitioner's request to allow the minor's individual therapist on her own to discontinue conjoint therapy is also denied. The conjoint therapist, as the individual conducting the conjoint visits, will be in a position to provide valuable input as to the progress of the conjoint counseling. As such, the conjoint counselor and the minor's individual counselor may discuss the minor's progress and the parties are ordered to sign whatever releases may be necessary to make that happen. If both counselors agree that continued conjoint therapy is not in the best interests of the minor then conjoint visits shall be discontinued until such time as the counselors feel that resuming the conjoint visits would be beneficial to the minor.

The court is once again appointing Minor's Counsel. The clerk is directed to refer this matter to the Minor's Counsel Layla Cordero if one has not yet been appointed.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES FIND THE ORDERS THAT WERE MADE EX PARTE ON JANUARY 23, 2026 ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR HELENA. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE NO OVERNIGHTS WITH THE MINOR. THE PARTIES ARE TO CONTINUE PRACTICING THE 2-2-3 SCHEDULE, HOWEVER RESPONDENT'S TIME WITH HELENA SHALL BE FROM AFTER SCHOOL (3:00PM IF NO SCHOOL) UNTIL 8:00PM ON RESPONDENT'S VISITATION DAYS. RESPONDENT SHALL ENSURE THE MINOR HAS ACCESS TO A PHONE AND HE SHALL NOT SUPERVISE HER CALLS. THE MINOR SHALL REMAIN IN COUNSELING SERVICES AND THE MINOR AND RESPONDENT ARE TO PARTICIPATE IN CONJOINT COUNSELING AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONJOINT COUNSELOR.**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST THAT THE MINOR MAY NOT BE COMPELLED TO ATTEND PARENTING TIME IS GRANTED. THE MINOR MAY CHOOSE NOT TO ATTEND THE VISITS WITH RESPONDENT. HOWEVER, THE MINOR MAY NOT CHOOSE TO SKIP CONJOINT COUNSELING VISITS WITH RESPONDENT.**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO ALLOW THE MINOR'S INDIVIDUAL THERAPIST TO DISCONTINUE CONJOINT THERAPY IS ALSO DENIED. THE CONJOINT COUNSELOR AND THE MINOR'S INDIVIDUAL COUNSELOR MAY DISCUSS THE MINOR'S PROGRESS AND THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO SIGN WHATEVER RELEASES MAY BE NECESSARY TO MAKE THAT HAPPEN. IF BOTH COUNSELORS AGREE THAT CONTINUED CONJOINT THERAPY IS NOT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR THEN CONJOINT VISITS SHALL BE DISCONTINUED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COUNSELORS FEEL THAT RESUMING THE CONJOINT VISITS WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO THE MINOR.**

**THE COURT IS ONCE AGAIN APPOINTING MINOR'S COUNSEL. THE CLERK IS DIRECTED TO REFER THIS MATTER TO THE MINOR'S COUNSEL LAYLA CORDERO IF ONE HAS NOT YET BEEN APPOINTED.**

**PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**7. MANDALYN RICHARDS V. JUSTIN RICHARDS**

**25FL0311**

On December 15, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to set aside the court's child support orders and to have new orders made. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Numerous documents were served on December 15<sup>th</sup> however the Notice of Tentative Ruling and the blank FL-320 were not served. The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), who is a party to the matter, was not served.

The Declaration of Attorney Layla Cordero Re: Respondent's Request for Order was filed and served on January 12, 2026.

Despite the fact that they were not served with the moving papers, DCSS filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 21, 2026 thereby waiving any potential defect in service.

On February 9<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed a declaration in response to the declaration of Ms. Cordero. It was served only on Petitioner, not on DCSS.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 3<sup>rd</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 27<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing Petitioner's Responsive Declaration therefore this document is late filed and the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration on March 3<sup>rd</sup>. It was served on Respondent only on March 3<sup>rd</sup>. DCSS was not served.

Respondent requests the default judgment be set aside pursuant to Civil Procedure § 473(b). After reviewing the filing, no default has been taken. Accordingly, the request is denied.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 2026

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT IS DENIED AS NO DEFAULT JUDGMENT HAS BEEN ENTERED. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**8. MONIQUE ROYAL V. GREGORY J. ROYAL**

**23FL0191**

On December 8, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 9, 2026. However, the RFO and the CCRC referral were not served until January 9<sup>th</sup>.

The RFO and other requisite documents were mail served, however, this is a post-judgment request for modification of custody orders. As such, it was required to be personally served or, if served by mail, Respondent was required to complete and file a Declaration Regarding Address Verification – Post Judgment Request to Modify a Child Custody, Visitation, or Child Support Order, which she has not done. See Fam. Code § 215.

Petitioner did not appear at CCRC and she has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**9. ANTHONY TATUM V. PETRINA TATUM**

**23FL1230**

On December 4, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders.

On December 5, 2025, Petitioner also filed an RFO seeking custody and visitation orders. His RFO was filed on an ex parte basis. The court granted his request in part by suspending Respondent's therapeutic visits with the minor. The court reserved on all other requests until the hearing on the regular law and motion calendar. All required documents were electronically served on December 5<sup>th</sup> and served by mail on December 10<sup>th</sup>.

The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 9, 2026. Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC therefore a single parent report without recommendations was prepared on February 5, 2025.

Minor's Counsel filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 26<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO and the CCRC referral were both timely and properly served on Respondent. She had notice of the pending requests and the CCRC appointment and chose not to appear at CCRC nor file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat her failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

On February 27<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed an Objection to Respondent's Request for Order and Request to Strike Pleading for Noncompliance with CCP § 1005. Petitioner objects to the RFO on the basis that it was not timely served. He states he was served with the moving papers at 11:13pm on February 23, 2025.

Petitioner's objection is sustained. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all moving papers are to be filed and served at least sixteen 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 18<sup>th</sup> the last day to timely serve the RFO therefore

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent's RFO filed on December 4, 2025 is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

Petitioner is requesting the suspension of Respondent's therapeutically supervised visits with the minor. He further requests Respondent be ordered to enroll in, attend, and fully engage in parenting coaching sessions with a licensed, skilled, and experienced mental health professional, either Joel Walton, MFT, or Josh Collver, LCSW. He also asks that Respondent be ordered to complete and engage in anger management, therapy and any additional services as the court deems necessary. Prior to resuming visits, Petitioner requests proof of Respondent's enrollment in, and/or completion of, the foregoing. He requests a review hearing to address Respondent's compliance with these orders.

Minor's Counsel also asks that all visits and communication between the minor and Respondent be suspended. She asks that credible, professional documentation be submitted to the court prior to the court considering resuming visits.

When making orders regarding custody or visitation the court is to consider (1) the state's policy to ensure the child has frequent and continuing contact with both parents after a separation and (2) the health, welfare, and safety of the child. Cal. Fam. Code § 3020. Where these two factors are in conflict, the health, welfare, and safety of the child trumps the policy regarding parental contact. *Id.* at (c).

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find it to be in the best interests of the minor to suspend the visits between her and Respondent. Respondent is ordered to enroll in, attend, and fully engage in parenting coaching sessions with a licensed, skilled, and experienced mental health professional, either Joel Walton, MFT, or Josh Collver, LCSW. She is further ordered to complete and engage in anger management and individual therapy. Respondent is ordered to provide Petitioner, his attorney, and Minor's Counsel with written documentation of her compliance with this order.

The court is not setting a review hearing at this time. Upon compliance with the above orders or some other grounds that would effectively change the best interests of the minor, a new RFO may be filed.

All orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: RESPONDENT'S RFO FILED DECEMBER 4, 2025 IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

**AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES FIND IT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR TO SUSPEND THE VISITS BETWEEN HER AND RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO ENROLL IN, ATTEND, AND FULLY ENGAGE IN PARENTING COACHING SESSIONS WITH A LICENSED, SKILLED, AND EXPERIENCED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL, EITHER JOEL WALTON, MFT, OR JOSH COLLVER, LCSW. SHE IS FURTHER ORDERED TO COMPLETE AND ENGAGE IN ANGER MANAGEMENT AND INDIVIDUAL THERAPY. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER, HIS ATTORNEY, AND MINOR'S COUNSEL WITH WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION OF HER COMPLIANCE WITH THIS ORDER.**

**ALL ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

**THE COURT IS NOT SETTING A REVIEW HEARING AT THIS TIME. UPON COMPLIANCE WITH THE ABOVE ORDERS OR SOME OTHER GROUNDS THAT WOULD EFFECTIVELY CHANGE THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR, A NEW RFO MAY BE FILED.**

**PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**10. GEORGIA WANLAND V. DONALD WANLAND**

**PFL20190812**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 16, 2026, seeking an order compelling Petitioner's discovery responses. The matter was originally set to be heard April 2, 2026. On January 27, 2026, Respondent filed an ex parte application to have the matter heard sooner, as the parties' trial is scheduled for April 1<sup>ST</sup>. The court denied the request as Respondent had failed to file the necessary mandatory forms. Respondent filed a second ex parte application on January 30<sup>th</sup>, again requesting an earlier hearing date. The court granted the request to advance the hearing to March 5, 2026. The parties once again requested the matter be continued and the continuance was granted.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served. Respondent filed a Proof of Service on February 23, 2026, showing Petitioner was served with "Notice of Hearing on March 5, 2026 @1:30 PM, Dept. 5". It is unclear to the court what document this is referring to. Regardless, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with the RFO and all other required documents. As such, the matter is dropped from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #10: 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**11. BALI DINES V. JACOB DINES**

**25FL0867**

On December 11, 2025, the court granted Petitioner's request to appoint a Receiver to assess the business. A review hearing was set for January 29, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the court signed the order appointing the Receiver.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on January 8, 2026, requesting the review hearing be continued 45 days. Respondent was served by mail on January 8, 2026.

In its tentative ruling the court set the review hearing for April 9<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner and her counsel appeared at the review hearing on January 29, 2026, and requested an earlier review hearing date. The court granted the request and set the review hearing for March 12, 2026.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on February 9, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the court denied the request for orders on an ex parte basis. Petitioner filed the Request for Order (RFO) making the same requests as set forth in her ex parte application on February 10, 2026. Respondent was mail served on February 10, 2026.

The court notes a default judgment was entered on March 9, 2026. The judgment appears to address the need for the review hearing. It is unclear whether the judgment resolves all remaining issues raised in the RFO. As such, parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #11: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12. BRANDON MAHBKE V. HALEY CALDWELL**

**PFL20130891**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 7, 2026, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had participated within the prior six months. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #12: 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**13. CHRISTY NEUWORTH V. CORY NEUWORTH**

**25FL1179**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 12, 2026. Petitioner is seeking enforcement of the terms of the parties' judgement. Respondent was personally served on January 18, 2026. Petitioner seeks reimbursement for the monthly costs of Ollie Health per the provisions of the judgement. Petitioner seeks a total reimbursement of \$384.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 14, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on March 3, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the provisions of the parties' judgement include a provision to pay for Ollie Heath. The court grants the request for Respondent to pay Petitioner for Ollie Heath in the amount of \$384. Respondent shall pay Petitioner \$384 in one lump sum on or before April 1, 2026. The court finds that all provisions of the judgment remain in full force and effect. Failure to comply with the terms of the judgement may result in sanctions and/or a contempt citation.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. These orders are effective immediately upon the adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned on the formal written order.

**TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST FOR RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER FOR OLLIE HEATH IN THE AMOUNT OF \$384. RESPONDENT SHALL PAY PETITIONER \$384 IN ONE LUMP SUM ON OR BEFORE APRIL 1, 2026. THE COURT FINDS THAT ALL PROVISIONS OF THE JUDGMENT REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THE JUDGEMENT MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS AND/OR A CONTEMPT CITATION.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 2026

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

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. AMANDA PARKER V. DAKOTA HENDERSON**

**25FL1120**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 17, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 14, 2026 and a review hearing on March 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with only the FL-300 and the FL-311, not the CCRC referral form.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared for 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 17, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 2, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 3, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document and it is late filed, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The court finds good cause to proceed with the RFO despite the defects in service, as Respondent appeared for and fully participated in CCRC. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the February 27, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth as its orders.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. These orders are effective immediately upon the adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned on the formal written order.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THE RFO DESPITE THE DEFECTS IN SERVICE, AS RESPONDENT APPEARED FOR AND FULLY PARTICIPATED IN CCRC. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 27, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH AS ITS ORDERS.**

**PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 12, 2026

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

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**15. CHELSEY ROMERO V. ROBERT ROMERO**

**PFL20190274**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 6, 2025, requesting to augment the current orders. Petitioner was mail served on November 6<sup>th</sup>. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), who is a party to the case, was properly served. Additionally, this is a post-judgment request for modification and as such compliance with Family Code section 215 is required.

Respondent appeared at the hearing on January 15, 2026 and requested the matter be continued to allow time for proper service. The court granted the request to continue and set the matter for a further hearing on March 12, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Upon review of the court file, Respondent has not filed any further Proof of Service.

Neither Petitioner nor DCSS have filed a Responsive Declaration.

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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**16. KELLY SOUZA KROEKER V. BRYAN KROEKER**

**25FL0129**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 31, 2025, seeking child support as well as an order for the sale of the former marital home. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was mail served on January 2, 2026. Petitioner is seeking guideline child support as well as sale of the home with the agreed upon real estate agent.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on February 18, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court cannot consider them.

As to the sale of the former marital residence, 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 parties had previously agreed to the sale of the home; therefore, the parties are ordered to list the home for sale with Hollie Hallauer with Five Star Service Real Estate, Inc.

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 real estate professional is authorized to determine the listing price for the home. 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 divided equally between the parties upon the close of escrow.

The parties are ordered to appear on the issue of child support.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing. These orders are effective immediately upon the adoption of the tentative ruling and are not conditioned on the formal written order.

**TENTATIVE RULING #16: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**THE COURT ORDERS THE PARTIES TO LIST THE HOME FOR SALE WITH HOLLIE HALLAUER WITH FIVE STAR SERVICE REAL ESTATE, INC. 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 REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL IS AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE THE LISTING PRICE FOR THE HOME. 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 DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE PARTIES UPON THE CLOSE OF ESCROW.**

**PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING. THESE ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**17. CELESTE SPINA V. ANTHONY CATALANO**

**24FL0448**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 9, 2026, seeking a motion to compel declarations of disclosure, or further responses to declarations of disclosure pursuant to Family Code section 2100-2107. Respondent was mail served on January 9, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Declaration regarding attorney's fees on February 24, 2026. Petitioner was electronically and mail served the same day. Respondent opposes the request, as he has served Petitioner with his preliminary and final declaration of disclosure. Respondent asserts this is a motion to compel further discovery, which is time barred.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on March 4, 2026. Respondent was served on March 5, 2026.

Generally speaking, discovery is to be completed on the 30<sup>th</sup> day prior to the trial date, and discovery motions are to be heard on or before the 15<sup>th</sup> day "before the date *initially set for trial...*" Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2024.020(a)(emphasis added). A continuance or postponement of the trial date by itself, does not automatically reopen discovery proceedings Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2024.020(b). These cut off dates are applicable to a motion to compel further responses brought pursuant to Family Code § 2107(b). However, while the discovery cutoff dates generally do apply, courts have recognized the disclosure obligations in family law cases are different than ordinary discovery. In family law matters, "...each party has a *continuing duty* to immediately, fully, and accurately update and augment..." his or her disclosures with all material information. Fam. Code § 2100(c). Failure to do so is a violation of that party's fiduciary duty and may subject that party to sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 1101.

Here, the discovery cut off dates are calculated based on the initial trial date in December of 2025. The request to continue by itself did not reopen discovery and there is no request to reopen discovery before the court therefore the motion to compel further responses is denied as untimely. Nevertheless, while the court is not granting the motion to compel further responses based on the discovery cut-off dates under the Civil Discovery Act, Respondent and is strongly admonished to comply with his fiduciary duty to Petitioner; a duty which extends beyond the traditional cut off dates. Failure to do so may result in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 1101.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH), however, this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

**TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES IS DENIED AS UNTIMELY. NEVERTHELESS, WHILE THE COURT IS NOT GRANTING THE MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES BASED ON THE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DATES UNDER THE CIVIL DISCOVERY ACT, RESPONDENT IS STRONGLY ADMONISHED TO COMPLY WITH HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY TO PETITIONER; A DUTY WHICH EXTENDS BEYOND THE TRADITIONAL CUT OFF DATES. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 1101.**

**RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

**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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**18. HOLLIE WALLACE V. JASON WALLACE**

**24FL1139**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 18, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as orders regarding the division of property. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 15, 2026 and a review hearing on March 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on December 24, 2025. However, the Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served a blank FL-320 form.

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

Petitioner filed a Declaration on January 22, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court has not considered it.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**19. CHALLYN WILLIAMS V. MARK WILLIAMS**

**PFL20210389**

On January 7, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking final decision making authority on the minor's school as well as medical decisions regarding vaccinations. Respondent was personally served on January 8, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 26, 2026. It was mail served on Petitioner on the same day. Respondent is opposed to the request.

While this request does not specify that there is a request to modify legal custody, the court finds that is in fact what Petitioner is requesting. As such, the court finds it appropriate to refer the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) to see if parties are able to reach any agreements and, if they are unable to do so, then for the court to obtain recommendations from the counselor. On the court's own motion, the court refers the parties to CCRC with an appointment on Monday April 6<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM with Michaela Murphy and continued the review hearing to Thursday June 4<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Any Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #19: ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION THE COURT REFERS THE PARTIES TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON MONDAY APRIL 6<sup>TH</sup> AT 9:00 AM WITH MICHAELA MURPHY AND CONTINUED THE REVIEW HEARING TO THURSDAY JUNE 4<sup>TH</sup> AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5.**

**ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. 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  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
March 12, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**20. BREEANNA WINN V. JORDAN LUEBBERS**

**25FL1207**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 24, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 15, 2026 and a review hearing on March 12, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Neither party appeared for the CCRC appointment.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to Petitioner's failure to properly serve Respondent, as well as Petitioner's failure to appear at CCRC which was set at her request.

**TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT, AS WELL AS PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC WHICH WAS SET AT HER REQUEST.**

**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.**