

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

1. AMELIA VERDUGO V. ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ

PFL20180504

On February 6, 2025, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on several issues including releasing the minor's MDMI footage for use by the doctor in completing his 730 Evaluation. The court noted that the footage is under the jurisdiction of the District Attorney therefore the court ordered notice to be provided to the District Attorney and the matter to be continued to the present date to allow the District Attorney the opportunity to be heard on the issue.

There have been no filings since the last hearing. Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE 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

March 13, 2025

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

2. ASHLEY CURRY V. PAUL CURRY

24FL0965

On September 16, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for custody and visitation as well as support orders and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were personally served on September 30th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on December 6th.

The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on December 19, 2024, at which time the parties agreed to return to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and continue the matter to the present date. Parties were ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations, and supplemental declarations, no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date. Neither party has done so.

Petitioner brings her RFO seeking the assistance of CCRC to establish a parenting plan for the minor child. She requests guideline child and spousal support and attorney's fees in the amount of \$7,500 pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

Respondent is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody with a 50/50 timeshare. He asks that *pendente lite* spousal support be set at \$218 per month and child support set at \$226 per month. Additionally, he asks that support for overtime be paid within one week of the first day of each month and he agrees to provide Petitioner with copies of his paystubs for the relevant timeframes. Finally, he asks that Petitioner be awarded no more than \$2,000 in attorney's fees and he requests a payment plan in the amount of \$200 per month.

The parties attended CCRC on January 6, 2025, and were able to reach agreements on the issues of custody and visitation. A report with those agreements was prepared on February 28, 2025, it was mailed to the parties the same day. The court finds the agreements contained in the February 28, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors they are therefore hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Regarding the requests for support and attorney's fees, "For all hearings involving child, spousal, or domestic partner support, both parties must complete, file, and serve a current Income and Expense Declaration." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(1); See *also* Cal. Fam. Code §2100. "'Current' means the form has been completed within the past three months providing no facts have changed." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(3). Given that neither party filed

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

updated Income and Expense Declarations and given that the declarations on file with the court for both parties are now out of date (Respondent's is dated December 6, 2024, and Petitioner's is dated September 16, 2024), each party's request for support and attorney's fees is denied.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 28, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS THEY ARE THEREFORE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. GIVEN THAT THE DECLARATIONS ON FILE WITH THE COURT FOR BOTH PARTIES ARE NOW OUT OF DATE (RESPONDENT'S IS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2024, AND PETITIONER'S IS DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2024), EACH PARTY'S REQUEST FOR SUPPORT AND ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

4. CLARA STEWART V. FRANCISCO MARIN

SFL20190229

This matter is before the court for receipt and review of the 3111 Report and to address the issue of whether continued drug testing by Respondent is necessary. A review hearing was set for the present date. Supplemental Declarations were ordered to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed on March 3, 2025. It was electronically served on February 28th. Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Attorney on March 3, 2025.

Respondent is requesting a review hearing be set for late August to allow for the completion of the 3111 evaluation. He asks that Louise Marin be approved as the nonprofessional supervisor and for nonprofessional supervised visits to begin immediately. He asks that supervised visits be increased to 4-hour visits, three days a week with supervised exchanges to be held with a third-party company at Petitioner's expense. Finally, he asks that the order for drug testing be vacated.

Petitioner agrees to a return date in August for the 3111 report. She also agrees that a new exchange supervisor will need to be chosen. She opposes the request for Ms. Marin to act as the nonprofessional supervisor and the request for increased visitation.

Regarding the 3111 evaluation, this matter is continued to August 21, 2025 at 8:30am in Department 5 for receipt and review of the 3111 Report.

The court is ordering Petitioner to choose a new third-party company to monitor the exchanges. Petitioner is to incur the costs thereof.

Respondent's request to increase his visitation is denied. The parties are to continue their agreed upon visitation schedule from January of 2025. Respondent has not established any reason why increased visitation would be in the minor's best interest.

The request for Ms. Marin to act as the nonprofessional supervisor is likewise denied. Respondent was ordered to propose two nonprofessional supervisors. Respondent did so and Petitioner chose one of the two proposed. Respondent then asserted that the chosen individual was not available. Respondent provided a third choice, Ms. Piazza, which Petitioner agreed to. Respondent is now not content with that choice though he was the one who proposed Ms. Piazza in the first place. Ultimately, the parties have complied with

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

the court's order and Ms. Piazza is the chosen supervisor. The court sees no reason to modify its prior order and appoint a different supervisor.

Finally, regarding the continued drug testing. The court does find good cause to vacate its prior order for Respondent's continued drug testing. This is in light of his negative tests over approximately a year as well as the fact that Petitioner has not reimbursed him for the costs of the negative tests as she was ordered to do. Additionally, with the decreased visitation and the order for supervised visits, the court does not find that continued drug testing furthers the interests of the minor at this time.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO AUGUST 21, 2025 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 FOR RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF THE 3111 REPORT.

THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO CHOOSE A NEW THIRD-PARTY COMPANY TO MONITOR THE EXCHANGES. PETITIONER IS TO INCUR THE COSTS THEREOF.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO INCREASE HIS VISITATION IS DENIED. THE PARTIES ARE TO CONTINUE THEIR AGREED UPON VISITATION SCHEDULE FROM JANUARY OF 2025. THE REQUEST FOR MS. MARIN TO ACT AS THE NONPROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR IS LIKewise DENIED AS MS. PIAZZO HAS ALREADY BEEN CHOSEN AS THE AGREED UPON NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR. THE COURT DOES FIND GOOD CAUSE TO VACATE ITS PRIOR ORDER FOR RESPONDENT'S CONTINUED DRUG TESTING.

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

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

5. EDC DCSS V. CODY MAKOA TURNBULL

23FL1273

On November 20, 2024, Thomas and Donelle Potter (Claimants) filed a Notice of Motion and Declaration for Joinder. The motion was mail served on all required parties on December 5th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Motion for Joinder on January 6, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Claimants are requesting joinder on the basis that they are the maternal grandparents of the minor and they have had primary physical custody of the minor from January 2023 through the present. They request joinder for the purpose of seeking visitation orders.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and given that the grandparents are seeking to make a claim for custody and visitation and given that they have had extensive periods of time where they were the primary caregivers for the minor, the court does find them to be necessary parties to the action. The motion for joinder is granted. The court will sign the Order on Joinder submitted by claimants.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE MOTION FOR JOINDER IS GRANTED. THE COURT WILL SIGN THE ORDER ON JOINDER SUBMITTED BY CLAIMANTS.

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 13, 2025

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

6. ERIK FARAHMAND V. ABIGAIL GAGE

PFL20130874

On December 17, 2024, Petitioner filed an Ex Parte Application and Declaration for Orders and Notice seeking a modification of the parenting plan, an order allowing the minor to switch schools and a court order for sanctions against Respondent. The request was denied on an ex parte basis however the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and the matter was set for hearing on the regular law and motion calendar.

There is no Proof of Service for the ex parte orders, however both parties did appear at CCRC on January 17, 2025, and were able to reach agreements therefore the court finds good cause to reach the matter on the merits. The court has reviewed the agreements of the parties and does find them to be in the best interests of the minor. As such, the agreements contained in the January 17, 2025 CCRC report are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Because the parties agreed not to change the minor's school, the court does not find a change in the visitation schedule is warranted. Therefore, all prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

Regarding the request for sanctions, the request is denied. An award for attorney's fees and sanctions may be made pursuant to Family Code section 271 which states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys." Fam. Code § 271(a). Here, the court does not find Respondent's actions to rise to the level of warranting monetary sanctions. However, Respondent is admonished that continued failure to comply with court orders may result in monetary sanctions or a change in custody orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AND DOES FIND THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. AS SUCH, THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE JANUARY 17, 2025 CCRC REPORT ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IS DENIED. HOWEVER, RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

CONTINUED FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDERS MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS OR A CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

7. JENNIFER DANIELS V. JOSE CARRERO

PFL20170812

On February 19, 2025, the court issued its tentative ruling in this matter. Petitioner requested oral argument, requesting the matter be continued as she had not received the CCRC report timely. However, due to the court's unavailability on February 20th, the hearing was continued to the present date. The court finds Petitioner's oral argument request to continue has been accomplished. The court is reissuing its prior tentative ruling as set forth below.

On November 22, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as various other orders. The RFO was originally filed ex parte, however the ex parte request was denied, the parties were ordered to attend Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a regularly set hearing was scheduled for the present date.

On November 27th, Petitioner also filed an RFO seeking custody and visitation orders. This RFO was also filed ex parte however, it was denied. The court reaffirmed its prior orders, and Respondent was reminded that failure to abide by court orders may result in sanctions and/or contempt orders.

The parties attended CCRC on December 23, 2024. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on February 6, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on February 7th.

Respondent filed a Declaration of Jose Manuel Carrer in Child Custody on February 18th. The court finds this to be late filed therefore it has not been read or considered.

Both parties filed declarations after the court's prior tentative ruling; however, neither party was granted leave to file additional declarations therefore, these declarations have not been considered by the court.

After reviewing the filings of the parties as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the February 6, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor they are therefore hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 6, 2025 CCRC REPORT ARE FOUND TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

THEREFORE ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

8. JING HAN V. LIEN HAN

PFL20160529

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on May 3, 2024. The matter has been continued several times to perfect service. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on October 2, 2024.

Respondent filed a Motion to Discharge or Demurrer on December 5, 2024. Petitioner was served on December 16, 2024. Respondent also filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting Discharge or Demurrer. The RFO was served on Petitioner on December 16, 2024.

Petitioner filed an RFO on September 24, 2024, requesting a modification of child custody and other orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on October 23, 2024, and a review hearing on January 2, 2024. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served on October 24, 2024, by mail with address verification.

Neither party appeared at the CCRC appointment.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on December 5, 2024, objecting to the court making any orders until the contempt proceedings are resolved. Petitioner was mail served on December 3, 2024.

On January 2, 2025, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO and OSC at which time the parties agreed to be re-referred to CCRC after the conclusion of the contempt proceedings. The May 3rd OSC and the September 24th RFO were continued to the present date to join with the demurrer/discharge hearing.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on March 3, 2025. The court finds these documents to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposing 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 28, 2025, the last day for filing Petitioner’s opposition papers therefore these documents have not been read or considered by the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

OSC and Demurrer/Discharge

The OSC alleges 14 counts of contempt. Respondent requests the discharge of the OSC or, alternatively, Respondent demurs to the OSC. The basis of Respondent's motion is outlined in further detail below.

Discharge of a cause of action is permitted pursuant to Penal Code § 1385 which states, in pertinent part, "[t]he judge or magistrate may...in furtherance of justice, order an action to be dismissed. The reasons for the dismissal shall be stated orally on the record...A dismissal shall not be made for any cause that would be ground of demurrer to the accusatory pleading." Pen. Code § 1385(a).

A demurrer raises only issues of law, not fact, regarding the form and content of the pleadings of the opposing party. Cal. Civ. Pro. §§ 422.10 and 589. It is not the function of the demurrer to challenge the truthfulness of the complaint, instead, for the purposes of testing the sufficiency of the cause of action, the demurrer admits the truth of all material facts in the pleading but not contentions, deductions or conclusions of fact or law. Aubry v. Tri-City Hosp. Dist., 2 Cal. 4th 962, 966-967 (1992); Serrano v. Priest, 5 Cal. 3d 584 (1971); Adelman v. Associated Int'l Ins. Co., 90 Cal. App. 4th 352, 359 (2001).

When a demurrer is sustained but "...the defect raised by ...[the] demurrer is reasonably capable of cure, 'leave to amend is routinely and liberally granted to give the plaintiff a chance to cure the defect in question.'" Price v. Dames & Moore, 92 Cal.App.4th 355, 360 (2001); Grieves v. Superior Court, 157 Cal.App.3d 159, 168 (1984). In fact, it is generally an abuse of discretion to deny leave to amend, because the drastic step of denial of the opportunity to correct the curable defect effectively terminates the pleader's action. Vaccaro v. Kaiman, *supra*, at p. 768." CLD Const., Inc. v. City of San Ramon, 120 Cal.App.4th 1141, 1146-1147 (2004). Leave to amend may be granted "even though no request to amend [the] pleading was made." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 472(a); Eghtesad v. State Farm Gen. Ins. Co., 51 Cal. App. 5th 406 (2020).

Count 1: Respondent argues this count fails to state a prima facie case of contempt because it fails to allege willful disobedience by Respondent and the order is too vague, ambiguous and uncertain. The demurrer to this count is sustained, with leave to amend. While the orders cited in the count do not address using the minor to send messages between the parties, the court did preclude the parties from doing so and therefore, taking such actions would be in violation of the court's order. See FOAH Aug. 22, 2023, No Use of

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

Children as Messengers. However, Respondent is correct in that the count does not allege willful misconduct by Respondent herself. It simply states that the minor informed Petitioner of the change in weekends, without alleging anything further on the part of Respondent.

Count 2: Respondent argues this count fails to allege willful disobedience on the part of Respondent and the order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain. The demurrer to this count is overruled. “To determine whether a cause of action is stated, the appropriate question is whether, upon a consideration of all the facts alleged, it appears that the plaintiff is entitled to *any judicial relief* against the defendant, notwithstanding that the facts may not be clearly stated, or may be intermingled with a statement of other facts irrelevant to the cause of action shown, or although the plaintiff may demand relief to which he is not entitled under the facts alleged.” (emphasis added) Elliot v. City of Pacific Grove, 54 Cal. App. 3d 53, 56. Here, while the phrasing of the count may not be explicit, it states in no uncertain terms that Respondent refers to Petitioner as “that guy.” The minor has now begun to do the same. It is clear that the allegation here is that Respondent continues to refer to Petitioner as “that guy” in front of, or within earshot of, the minor, which would potentially be a violation of the respect guidelines therefore the demurrer to this count is overruled.

Counts 3, 4, 5: These counts allege Respondent’s failure to make the children available for phone calls with Petitioner. Respondent argues the order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain and does not provide any mandatory direction to Respondent. The court does not agree. The order is to “make the children available for phone contact nightly at 7:30.” The court further ordered that “[n]o party or any other third party may listen to, monitor, or interfere with the calls.” FOAH Aug. 22, 2023, Phone Contact § 4. Where Petitioner is calling and Citee specifically hangs up on Petitioner (as alleged in Counts 3 and 5) without giving the phone to the children, she has not made the children available for phone contact with Petitioner and she has affirmatively interfered with the call. Likewise, where Citee affirmatively orders the children not to answer the call (as alleged in Count 4), she is interfering with Petitioner’s ability to have a phone call with the children. Taking the facts as alleged in the OSC to be true, Petitioner would potentially be entitled to relief therefore the demurrer to these counts is overruled.

Count 6: Respondent demurs to this count on the basis that the order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain as there is no mandatory direction regarding the exchange time, location, or date. The demurrer to this count is granted with leave to

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

amend. Specifically, the count alleges that Respondent refused to allow for the exchange of the children at 9:00 am. The court's order does not specify an exchange time. Instead, it states only that one parent will have Monday and Tuesday, the other will have Wednesday and Thursday, the weekends will rotate. The order also states that "[n]otice shall be required twenty-four (24) hours in advance for any requested deviation from the time scheduled for pickup or delivery of the children." MSA Dec. 16, 2019 § 3.1.6. It is unclear from the pleading if the parties had previously agreed to a scheduled exchange time of 9:00 am therefore, as worded, the count does not entitle Petitioner to relief. The demurrer is sustained with leave to amend.

Count 7: This count alleges Respondent violated the court's order by informing the minor that he could change Petitioner's vacation's plans to attend soccer practice instead. Respondent argues that the court's order was vague, ambiguous, and uncertain. She also argues that the count fails to plead Respondent's willful violation. The orders in question state specifically "[n]either parent shall discuss custody issues with the children" and "[n]either parent shall ask the children to carry messages between them." Taking the allegations of count 7 as true, Respondent had a discussion with the minor about his ability to change Petitioner's vacation plans. In other words, Respondent had a discussion with the minor regarding Petitioner's allotted physical custody time. Admittedly, it is unclear how this may have constituted a violation of the order regarding using the minor to carry messages, nonetheless the demurrer is to be overruled if the allegations of the complaint are sufficient to state a cause of action under any legal theory. Brousseau v. Jarrett, 73 Cal. App. 3d 864 (1977); see also Nguyen v. Scott, 206 Cal. App. 3d 725 (1988). Accordingly, the demurrer to this count is overruled.

Count 8: This count is discharged pursuant to Penal Code § 1385 which vests the power to discharge any count of contempt in the interests of justice. This alleges actions taken against the paternal grandmother, not Petitioner. Additionally, the court finds no basis in which the alleged conduct is a violation of Petitioner's right to privacy as ordered by the court.

Count 9: The demurrer to this count is overruled. This count alleges Respondent told the children that the paternal grandmother feeds the children poison. The court's order states in no uncertain terms that "[n]either parent shall make disparaging remarks about extended family, relatives, friends, or significant others in the children's presence or within earshot. As such, the demurrer is overruled.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

Count 10: This count is discharged pursuant to Penal Code § 1385 which vests the power to discharge any count of contempt in the interests of justice. This count alleges that the weekly letters written by the minor are addressed to Respondent only. Taking the allegations as alleged as true, the court does not find that this is necessarily a violation of court orders.

Count 11: This count alleges Respondent intentionally withheld information regarding the minor's basketball schedule to exclude Petitioner and his family from attending. Respondent objects on the basis that the order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain and on the basis that Petitioner has failed to establish that the order requires her to share the minor's basketball schedule. The language included in the OSC cites a violation of Section 3.1 of the 2019 Orders which states, in pertinent part, "[e]ach parent is permitted to attend [extracurricular] activities, whether or not it is during the parent's time with the child." The order does not require Respondent to disclose the schedule to Petitioner, and the count, as phrased, does not assert that Respondent took affirmative action to ensure that Petitioner was barred from attending the games or that he was unable to obtain the schedule from another source. For these reasons, the demurrer is granted with leave to amend.

Count 12: This count alleges Respondent's scheduling of a medical appointment for the minor and failing to inform Petitioner of the appointment until after it was completed. Respondent demurs on the basis that the court's order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain. The demurrer to this count is overruled. The parties have been ordered to share joint legal custody which specifically "...means both parents shall share the right and responsibility to make the decisions relating to health..." MSA Dec. 16, 2019, Exhibit G. For this reason, taking the facts as alleged as true, the court does find that Petitioner would likely be entitled to relief therefore the demurrer is overruled.

Count 13: Count 13 alleges that Respondent refused to inform Petitioner that she would not be taking the minor to basketball. Given the pleadings it appears the minor informed Petitioner that he did not attend practice. This count is discharged pursuant to Penal Code § 1385 which vests the power to discharge any count of contempt in the interests of justice. The minor informing Petitioner that he did not attend practice does not constitute use of the minor to transmit messages therefore this count is discharged.

Count 14: This count alleges that Respondent violated the 2019 orders by unilaterally obtaining myopia control contact lenses over Petitioner's non-consent.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

Respondent demurs on the basis that the court's order is too vague, ambiguous, and uncertain. The demurrer to this count is overruled. The parties have been ordered to share joint legal custody which specifically "...means both parents shall share the right and responsibility to make the decisions relating to health..." MSA Dec. 16, 2019, Exhibit G. To argue that optometric care is not health care is without merit. The minor's health quite clearly includes treatment for optometric conditions therefore, the demurrer to this count is overruled.

Petitioner is granted 14 days leave to amend on count numbers 1, 6, and 11. Arraignment on the remaining counts is continued to 6/12/2025 at 1:30 PM in department 5.

RFO

Petitioner filed his RFO seeking final decision-making authority and make-up parenting time for ten days of missed visits due to Respondent's refusal to allow the visits. He also seeks reimbursement of \$800 pursuant to Family Code § 463(b)(4). He asks that Respondent cooperate in obtaining passports for the children and finally, he requests the appointment of a family therapist.

The RFO is continued to trail the OSC. The parties will be referred to CCRC upon completion of the OSC proceedings.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: COUNT 1: THE DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS SUSTAINED, WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.

COUNT 2: THE DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS OVERRULED.

COUNTS 3, 4, 5: THE DEMURRER TO THESE COUNTS IS OVERRULED.

COUNT 6: THE DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS GRANTED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.

COUNT 7: DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS OVERRULED.

COUNT 8: THIS COUNT IS DISCHARGED PURSUANT TO PENAL CODE § 1385.

COUNT 9: THE DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS OVERRULED.

COUNT 10: THIS COUNT IS DISCHARGED PURSUANT TO PENAL CODE § 1385.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

COUNT 11: THE DEMURRER IS GRANTED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.

COUNT 12: THE DEMURRER IS OVERRULED.

COUNT 13: THIS COUNT IS DISCHARGED PURSUANT TO PENAL CODE § 1385.

COUNT 14: THE DEMURRER TO THIS COUNT IS OVERRULED.

PETITIONER IS GRANTED 14 DAYS LEAVE TO AMEND ON COUNT NUMBERS 1, 6, AND 11. ARRAIGNMENT ON THE REMAINING COUNTS IS CONTINUED TO 6/12/2025 at 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

THE RFO IS CONTINUED TO TRAIL THE OSC. THE PARTIES WILL BE REFERRED TO CCRC UPON COMPLETION OF THE OSC PROCEEDINGS.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE 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 TELEPHONE 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 13, 2025

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

10. JOSHUA KHOSHSEFAT V. HEIDI KHOSHSEFAT

24FL0682

On December 11, 2024, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on Petitioner's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). At that time the parties stipulated to drop Petitioner's DVRO request and extend the Temporary Restraining Order requested by Respondent until December 10, 2026. They were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

On February 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child and spousal support orders as well as the imputation of income to Respondent. The RFO was electronically served on February 14th along with Petitioner's January 29th Income and Expense Declaration.

The parties attended CCRC on January 8, 2025. A report with recommendations was prepared on February 28th and mailed to the parties on March 3rd.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 25th. Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on March 3, 2025.

The Reply Declaration of Joshua Khoshsefat was filed and served on March 5, 2025. This was followed by a Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner Joshua Khoshsefat which was filed and served on March 6, 2025. Petitioner's Reply Declaration in Reply to Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was also filed and served on March 6th.

On March 10th, Petitioner's Objection to CCRC Report was filed and electronically served. Petitioner objects to the report on the basis that it is hearsay. The objection is sustained. The court has not considered the report in making the below findings.

Regarding custody, Respondent states that Petitioner has failed to comply with the current DVTRO, and he has not rebutted the Section 3044 presumption. For these reasons she asks that all current custody and visitation orders remain in place.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the children with a plan to re-unify the children with Respondent after she completes a psychological evaluation. Alternatively, Petitioner request 50/50 joint legal and joint physical custody. Finally, in the event the court is not inclined to award 50/50 legal and physical custody, Petitioner requests that he continue on a step up plan, that his proposed non-professional

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

supervisors (Edward Tak, Claire Tak, Catherine Tak, Aaron Khoshsefat, Morgan Smith, Alyssa Blandford, and Garnet Mendoza) be approved, and that the court establish dates and times for his visitation that must be adhered to. He asks that Respondent not be allowed to dictate the location of the visits and not be allowed to refuse a non-professional supervisor without first giving the court a valid reason for the denial.

After reviewing the filings of the parties, the court does find the current orders remain in the best interests of the children. Edward Tak, Claire Tak, or Garnet Mendoza may act as the non-professional supervisor so long as they each complete and file the FL-324(NP) prior to supervising any visits. Petitioner's requests for Catherine Tak, Aaron Khoshsefat, Morgan Smith, and Alyssa Blandford to be approved as supervisors are denied. Visits may be supervised by any other individuals as agreed upon by the parties and upon completion and filing by the chosen individual of an FL-324(NP). Respondent shall not choose the location of the visits. All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. A review hearing is set for 7/17/2025 at 8:30 AM in department 5 to address the status of the visits and determine whether a step-up plan would be appropriate. Parties are ordered to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

Petitioner is requesting to impute Respondent with an annual income in the amount of \$157,860. He asks that child and spousal support be amended to reflect the imputation. He asks for a review hearing set in six months with the court to reserve on retroactivity.

Respondent opposes the support requests made by Petitioner. She asks that the current orders remain in place pending trial. She also asks that the current imputation of full-time minimum wage remain in place.

Given that this matter is set to commence trial on April 2, 2025, the issues of child support, spousal support, and imputation of income are continued to join with the April 2nd trial. The court reserves jurisdiction over the issue of support back to the date of filing the RFO.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: PETITIONER'S OBJECTION TO THE CCRC REPORT IS SUSTAINED. THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN. EDWARD TAK, CLAIRE TAK, OR GARNET MENDOZA MAY ACT AS THE NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR SO LONG THEY EACH COMPLETE AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

FILE AN FL-324(NP) PRIOR TO SUPERVISING ANY VISITS. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR CATHERINE TAK, AARON KHOSHSEFAT, MORGAN SMITH, AND ALYSSA BLANDFORD TO BE APPROVED AS SUPERVISORS ARE DENIED. VISITS MAY BE SUPERVISED BY ANY OTHER INDIVIDUALS AS AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES AND UPON COMPLETION AND FILING BY THE CHOSEN INDIVIDUAL OF AN FL-324(NP). RESPONDENT SHALL NOT CHOOSE THE LOCATION OF THE VISITS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR 7/17/2025 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ADDRESS THE STATUS OF THE VISITS AND DETERMINE WHETHER A STEP-UP PLAN WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE.

GIVEN THAT THIS MATTER IS SET TO COMMENCE TRIAL ON APRIL 2, 2025, THE ISSUES OF CHILD SUPPORT, SPOUSAL SUPPORT, AND IMPUTATION OF INCOME ARE CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE APRIL 2ND TRIAL. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE ISSUE OF SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

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

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

12. MICHAL ADAM MISIASZEK V. KATARZYNA MISIASZEK

24FL0421

On December 11, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and orders regarding reimbursements and a real estate appraisal. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration on January 2, 2025. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were mail served on February 13, 2025.

Petitioner filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on March 10, 2025. Both documents were served electronically on March 7th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposing 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 28, 2025 the last day for filing Petitioner's responsive documents. Therefore, these documents have not been considered by the court.

Respondent is requesting guideline spousal support in the amount of \$4,862 per month with an accompanying bonus table. She asks that the court determine what reimbursements Petitioner is entitled to and whether they should be included as part of the overtime table. She also requests need-based attorney's fees in the amount of \$7,500 and an order for Petitioner to advance the cost of a real estate appraisal with a joint expert and Respondent to reimburse half of that cost as part of the final equalization payment.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

13. SHAUNA COX V. MICHAEL BRYANT II

22FL0270

On December 16, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) for bifurcation and termination of the marital status. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were mail served on December 23rd, however there was no Notice of Tentative Ruling served as required.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 19, 2025. Respondent consents to the request for bifurcation on the terms as submitted in his FL-315.

The court finds good cause to grant the request for bifurcation of the issue of marital status. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

Additionally, parties are ordered to appear on the ex parte application filed by Petitioner on March 7, 2025.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO GRANT THE REQUEST FOR BIFURCATION OF THE ISSUE OF MARITAL STATUS. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. ADDITIONALLY, PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE EX PARTE APPLICATION FILED BY PETITIONER ON MARCH 7, 2025.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

14. ALICIA DAVIDSON V. RYAN BAXTER

PFL20170406

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 14, 2024, seeking a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on November 15, 2024, and a review hearing on January 16, 2025. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been served with the motion and other necessary documents.

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on October 29, 2024. Petitioner filed an Application for an Order Shortening Time (OST) on October 30, 2024. On October 30, 2024, the court denied both the ex parte application and the order shortening time, as the court had concerns about the UCCJEA, as the minor had resided in Hawaii for more than six months.

The court conducted a UCCJEA conference with Judge Nagata of Hilo Family Court on November 15, 2024. The courts agreed that due to the ongoing action in Hawaii, Hawaii has at a minimum emergency jurisdiction. Because of the nature of the proceedings in Hawaii, the Family Law matter in El Dorado County was stayed. The courts set a further UCCJEA conference for February 21, 2025.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on November 18, 2024. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

On December 18, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request to Continue the January 16, 2025, hearing. The court granted the request on December 19, 2024, and continued the hearing to March 13, 2025. Respondent was served with the order on January 2, 2025.

At the second UCCJEA conference, the courts confirmed Hawaii has continuing emergency jurisdiction and the El Dorado County matter shall remain stayed pending the results of the March 6, 2025 Hilo Family Court hearing. A subsequent UCCJEA conference was set for March 10, 2025.

At the March 10, 2025 UCCJEA conference, Judge Nagata informed the court that the hearing on March 6, 2025 had not been completed and was continued to March 13th. The judges agreed that Hawaii continues to have emergency jurisdiction, at a minimum, and that the Family Law case in El Dorado County remain stayed. A further UCCJEA

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

conference is set for April 14, 2025, to occur after the April 10, 2025 hearing in Hilo Family Court.

The court drops the matter from calendar. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the October 14th RFO.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. The El Dorado County Family Law matter remains stayed pending the outcome of the Hawaii proceedings.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR. THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE SHOWING RESPONDENT WAS PROPERLY SERVED WITH THE OCTOBER 14TH RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE FAMILY LAW MATTER REMAINS STAYED PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE HAWAII PROCEEDINGS.

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 13, 2025

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

15. BELINDA PESHECK V. BRENT ADAMS

24FL0249

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 13, 2025, requesting an order to compel Respondent's preliminary declaration of disclosure. Upon review of the file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served with the RFO and other necessary documents. The court notes, there is a Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with the FL-142 by mail on March 6, 2025.

The matter is dropped 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 13, 2025

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

16. CO. OF EL DORADO V. SHAWN HOIEM (OTHER PARENT: NICOL BLACKKETTER)

PFS20200077

Other Parent filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on January 31, 2025. On February 3, 2025, the court denied the request but referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on February 11, 2025, and a review hearing on March 13th. Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 3, 2025, requesting the same orders as requested in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Respondent was electronically served on February 3, 2025. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with the RFO and other necessary documents.

Both parties attended CCRC and reached a full agreement. The parties submitted a stipulation and order which the court signed and adopted as its order on February 18, 2025. The court finds the parties' stipulation resolves the issues raised in the RFO. As such, the RFO is dropped from calendar as moot.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: 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

March 13, 2025

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

17. CRYSTAL STABLER V. BRYAN STABLER

23FL0783

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 12, 2024, requesting a modification of child support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served by mail on August 16th. Petitioner is requesting guideline child support based on a 20% timeshare.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on October 15, 2024.

Parties appeared on October 24, 2024, and reached agreements, including continuing the matter to January 2, 2025. Parties also agreed to meet with Mediator Neil Forester. The court ordered parties to file updated Income and Expense Declarations at least 5 days prior to the continued hearing date. The court reserved jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the date of the filing of the RFO.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on January 2, 2025, and informed the court parties had reached an agreement and were circulating a stipulation for signature. The court found good cause to once again continue the hearing. The matter was continued to March 13, 2025, and parties were directed to file and served updated Income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing. The court continued to reserve jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the date of the filing of the RFO.

Parties submitted a stipulation which the court signed and adopted as its order on February 21, 2025. The stipulation resolves all issues raised in the RFO, however, did not request the hearing be vacated. As such, the court finds the RFO to be moot and drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE MATTER 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

18. JACQUELINE MULLINAX V. BRYAN MULLINAX

22FL0920

On October 28, 2024, the parties reached a full stipulation, which included the parties attending Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing. The court adopted the parties' stipulation and referred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on November 13, 2024, and a review hearing on January 9, 2025.

Only Respondent appeared for the CCRC appointment on November 13th. As such, a single parent report was filed on November 18th. It was mailed to the parties the same day.

On January 9, 2025, the court rereferred the parties to CCRC for a further appointment on January 15, 2025, and a set a further review hearing on March 13th.

Both parties attended the CCRC appointment and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations as filed with the court on February 25, 2025, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on February 21, 2205. It was served on Respondent on the same day. Petitioner asserts Respondent has been inconsistent with supervised visitation.

Respondent filed a Declaration on February 28, 2025. It was served on Petitioner the same day. Respondent attached his certificates of completion for the 52-week Batterers Intervention Program, along with certificates of completion for Advanced Parenting, Co-Parenting, and Anger Management. Respondent also included an anger management assessment and domestic violence assessment.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on March 3, 2025. Petitioner was served on March 3, 2025. Respondent disputes the inconsistency in visitation.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the February 25th CCRC report to be in the minors' best interests. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth, except for Step-5 of the step-up plan, which includes overnight visitation out of state. The court is not adopting that portion of the step-up plan.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. The court is directing Petitioner to prepare and file an amended DV-130 and DV-140 which

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

reflect the change in visitation. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 25TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH, EXCEPT FOR STEP-5 OF THE STEP-UP PLAN, WHICH INCLUDES OVERNIGHT VISITATION OUT OF STATE. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THAT PORTION OF THE STEP-UP PLAN. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE COURT IS DIRECTING PETITIONER TO PREPARE AND FILE AN AMENDED DV-130 AND DV-140 WHICH REFLECT THE CHANGE IN VISITATION. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

19. JENNIFER STEVENS V. KEVIN STEVENS V. SAMANTHA BARAKATT 22FL0499

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 20, 2024, requesting a modification of the visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 13, 2025, and a review hearing on March 13th. Proof of Service shows Petitioners were served by mail on December 20, 2024.

The parties participated in CCRC on January 13th and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on March 3, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioners filed a Responsive Declaration on January 10th and again on January 13th. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court cannot consider them.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the March 3rd 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. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 3RD 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. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

20. JOSEPHINE CONNELLY V. DAVID KRELL

24FL0134

Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on September 17, 2024, alleging nine counts of contempt. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on October 2, 2024.

Respondent filed a second OSC on December 23, 2024. Petitioner was personally served on January 9, 2025.

The court notes Respondent has filed a third OSC which is set to be heard on March 13, 2025. Petitioner was personally served on February 18, 2025.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
March 13, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. KATHERINE FERRIS V. KYLE NELSON

25FL0081

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on January 31, 2025, requesting emergency custody orders. On February 3, 2025, the court denied the request, however, referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on February 11, 2025, and a review hearing on March 13th. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 3, 2025, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served with the RFO and other necessary paperwork on February 5, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on February 18, 2025. It was served on Respondent on the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and additional Declaration on February 19, 2025. Proof of Service shows Petitioner, rather than Petitioner's counsel was served electronically on February 19th. Further, it appears the email address used to serve Petitioner is not correct. Therefore, the court has not considered these documents.

Both parties attended CCRC on February 11th and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 5, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Response to Respondent's Declaration which the court deems to be a Reply Declaration, on February 5, 2025. It was served on Respondent on February 5th.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the February 5th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 5TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

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 13, 2025

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

22. KELLY ROBINSON V. DEVON DUBEY

PFL20170096

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 24, 2024, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on October 24, 2024, and a review hearing on December 20th. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on October 3, 2024.

Both parties and the minors participated in the October 24th CCRC appointment. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on November 26, 2024, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration to the CCRC report on December 2, 2024. Petitioner was served by mail on December 4, 2024. Respondent requests the court assign a new CCRC to the matter as he believes the CCRC is biased against him. Respondent has included a parenting program completion report as well as a batters intervention program report.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Parties appeared for the hearing on December 19, 2024. The parties reached several agreements. The court adopted its tentative ruling rereferring the parties to CCRC with an appointment on January 16, 2025, and a further review hearing on March 13th.

Both parties attended CCRC on January 16th and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 7th and mailed to the parties the same day.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the February 7th CCRC report and finds the recommendations to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FEBRUARY 7TH CCRC REPORT AND FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. ALL

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 13, 2025

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

23. TESS MCKAY V. SHAWN MADDEN

PFL20180342

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 13, 2024, requesting child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 17, 2025, and a review hearing on March 13, 2025. Proof of Service shows Molly McKay, who is not a party to this action, was served with the FL-300 and "Recommending Counselor." The court finds service to have been deficient.

Only Respondent appeared for CCRC.

The court finds the Family Law case is stayed. Therefore, this matter is dropped from calendar. Even if the matter was not stayed, the RFO would have been dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service. Further, even if service had been proper, the court would have denied Respondent's motion as he failed to set forth any grounds as to why his requested orders are in the best interest of the minors.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: THE COURT FINDS THE FAMILY LAW CASE IS STAYED. THEREFORE, THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR. EVEN IF THE MATTER WAS NOT STAYED, THE RFO WOULD HAVE BEEN DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. FURTHER, EVEN IF SERVICE HAD BEEN PROPER, THE COURT WOULD HAVE DENIED RESPONDENT'S MOTION AS HE FAILED TO SET FORTH ANY GROUNDS AS TO WHY HIS REQUESTED ORDERS ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. 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 13, 2025

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

24. THOMAS LUTZ V. KAREN LUTZ

23FL1270

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 17, 2025, requesting the court adopt the spousal support as ordered in case number 23FL0624. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was served on February 13, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on February 20, 2025. Petitioner consents to the spousal support order from 23FL0624 being incorporated in this case.

The court adopts the spousal support order as set forth in 23FL0624. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent \$2,500 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support. This order is effective January 1, 2025, with support payable on the 1st of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #24: THE COURT ADOPTS THE SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDER AS SET FORTH IN 23FL0624. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT \$2,500 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2025, WITH SUPPORT PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT*, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.