

1. EDC DCSS v. BENJAMIN DAVID WOOD (OTHER PARENT: SYDNEY GANN) 23FL1216

On October 9, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and property control orders as well as a change of venue. This matter originally came before the court for hearing on January 15, 2026, at which time the court granted a continuance to allow time for proper service of the RFO.

There is no Proof of Service for the RFO or the Notice of Tentative Ruling. Nevertheless, Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 26th, thereby waiving any potential defect in service.

DCSS filed its Responsive Declaration to Request for Order however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Respondent is requesting a change of venue to Sacramento County. He further requests custody and visitation orders and sole use, and possession of the vehicle which is in the possession of Other Parent.

Other Parent proposes her own custody, visitation and holiday schedule. She opposes the request regarding the vehicle and asks that Respondent be ordered to continue making the payments on the vehicle.

The court may, upon a properly noticed motion, transfer any matter where the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 397(a). In matters of child custody, venue is typically tied to the child's residence or "home state" as defined under the UCCJEA. *K.R.L. Partnership v. Sup. Ct.*, 120 Cal. App. 4th 490 (2004). However, California Family Code Section 17400 provides that venue for an action or proceeding involving a local child support agency "shall be in the superior court in the county that is currently expending public assistance." Cal. Fam. Code Section 17400(n)(1)(A). The burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for a change of venue. *Fontaine v. Sup. Ct.*, 175 Cal. App. 4th 830 (2009).

Here, Respondent argues that Sacramento County is proper venue because that is where the child resided full-time until August of 2023. Since that time, Other Parent moved to Placerville and the child now resides in Placerville 50% of the time. Given that the child's place of residence is split evenly between Placerville and Sacramento; and given that the El Dorado County Department of Child Support Services is a party to the action, the court finds that El Dorado County remains the proper venue. The request for a change of venue is denied.

Turning to the issue of custody, it has been more than six months since the parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). As such, the parties are

referred to CCRC with an appointment on Thursday, April 16th at 9:00 am. A review hearing is set for Thursday, June 11th at 8:30 am in Department 5. The court reserves jurisdiction on the issue of the vehicle until the time of the review hearing. Parties are ordered to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

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 #1: THE REQUEST TO CHANGE VENUE TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY IS DENIED. TURNING TO THE ISSUE OF CUSTODY, THE PARTIES ARE REFERRED TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON THURSDAY, APRIL 16TH AT 9:00 AM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON THE ISSUE OF THE VEHICLE UNTIL THE TIME OF THE REVIEW HEARING. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.

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.

On January 7, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) and his Income and Expense Declaration. All required documents were served on January 29th.

On March 10th, Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration. They were served on March 9th. 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 March 6th the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration therefore it is late filed and cannot be considered by the court.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

On January 7, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a stay on proceedings pending appeal. The RFO was served on March 4th, however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served. The court finds the RFO to be late served pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states moving papers must 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 made February 25th the last day to serve the RFO and all other required documents.

Despite the defect in service, Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 5th.

Petitioner filed and served her Reply Declaration on March 12th.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on March 16th. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner is requesting a stay on the trial court proceedings pending a resolution of the appeal.

Respondent opposes the request, arguing that the issue is moot. He requests sanctions in the amount of \$750.

Generally speaking, the filing of an appeal does not automatically stay proceedings on the issues of custody and visitation. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 917.7. Such a stay is solely within the discretion of the trial court. *Id.*

Here, the court does not find grounds to stay proceedings pending a decision on the appeal. Especially where, as here, Petitioner concedes that her request is merely procedural in nature. The request for a stay is denied.

The request for sanctions is also denied. Family Code section 271 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 RFO was filed by Petitioner on a matter that was in dispute between the parties. The court does not find that such a filing was solely to frustrate the policy of the law. Accordingly, the request for sanctions 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE REQUEST FOR A STAY IS DENIED. THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS 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.

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.

On January 8, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees and sanctions. She filed and served a Declaration of Aleah McNabb, a Declaration of Steven R. Burlingham, and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities concurrently with her RFO.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 14th.

Petitioner filed and served her Reply Declaration on February 2nd.

Petitioner is requesting sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure § 128.5 in the amount of \$4,700. The request is for sanctions against Respondent only.

Respondent opposes the request.

"A trial court may order a party...to pay the reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of actions or tactics, made in bad faith, that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 128.5(a). For purposes of Section 128.5, the term "frivolous" is defined as "...totally and completely without merit for the sole purpose of harassing an opposing party." *Id.* at (b)(2).

Here, the court does not find that Respondent's October 15, 2025 RFO was either *completely* without merit or filed for the *sole* purpose of harassing Petitioner. Petitioner points to the fact that there was no substantial change in circumstances as required by *Montenegro v. Diaz*, however, Petitioner is applying the incorrect standard. For the substantial change in circumstances standard to apply, there must be "...a clear, affirmative indication the parties intended" the stipulated orders to be a final judicial determination. *Montenegro v. Diaz*, 26 Cal. 4th 259 (2001). There is no such express language in the stipulation. Petitioner relies on Section 8 of the stipulation to argue that *Montenegro* applies. This reliance is misplaced. In fact, Section 8 of the stipulation expressly contemplates that there may be a future change in custody orders either by written agreement of the parties or court order. There is nothing indicating that the intent was for the stipulation to be a final order.

In the absence of a final judicial determination on custody, the standard for a change of custody is the best interests of the child. See Fam. Code § 3020. Here, according to Respondent's filing, and the text he sent to Petitioner, it was his opinion that the standing orders needed clarification because he did not feel they were working. That said, it does appear that Respondent filed his RFO without first meeting and conferring on the issues raised in the RFO. Respondent is cautioned that while he is not being sanctioned at this

time, filing future RFOs without first trying to resolve the matter may result in sanctions in the future.

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner's request for sanctions 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS 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.

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.

On January 7, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for a vocational evaluation, a seek-work order, and imputation of income. All required documents were electronically served on January 12, 2026.

On March 12th, Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. 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 March 6th the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Therefore, it is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Petitioner asks that Respondent be ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation pursuant to Family Code § 4331, at Petitioner’s expense. She further requests Respondent be ordered to seek work consistent with his skills and abilities as established by the vocational evaluation, or that Respondent be imputed with earnings pursuant to the findings and report of the vocational evaluator.

The request for a vocational evaluation is granted. Respondent is ordered to participate in a vocational evaluation with an evaluator chosen by Petitioner. Petitioner is to pay the cost of the valuation, subject to reallocation at trial.

Upon completion of the vocational evaluation, Respondent is ordered to seek work consistent with his earning ability and capacity as found by the vocational evaluator. Respondent is ordered to comply with any job search parameters as set by the vocational evaluator.

The request to impute income is denied as the court does not find this request to be ripe given that there is no pending request for support being made by either party. The request to impute income is denied without prejudice.

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 #5: THE REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PARTICIPATE IN A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION WITH AN

EVALUATOR CHOSEN BY PETITIONER. PETITIONER IS TO PAY THE COST OF THE VALUATION, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION AT TRIAL.

UPON COMPLETION OF THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SEEK WORK CONSISTENT WITH HIS EARNING ABILITY AND CAPACITY AS FOUND BY THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO COMPLY WITH ANY JOB SEARCH PARAMETERS AS SET BY THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR.

THE REQUEST TO IMPUTE INCOME IS DENIED AS THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THIS REQUEST TO BE RIPE GIVEN THAT THERE IS NO PENDING REQUEST FOR SUPPORT BEING MADE BY EITHER PARTY. THE REQUEST TO IMPUTE INCOME IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 10, 2025, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on October 31, 2025. Petitioner was mail served on November 1, 2025.

Petitioner is seeking sole legal and physical custody of the minor as well as limiting Respondent's parenting time to his days off work. Petitioner also seeks an order preventing Respondent from bringing the minor to work.

Respondent requests the current orders remain in full force and effect.

Both parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on November 7th and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on December 19, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

This matter came before the court for hearing on the RFO on January 8th at which time the court adopted the CCRC recommendations, referred the parties back to CCRC for the minor to be interviewed, and a review hearing was set for the present date. Parties were ordered to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the date of the review hearing.

The parties attended CCRC on November 7, 2025. After interviewing the child, a report with recommendations was prepared on February 18th and attached to the December 19th CCRC report. It was mailed to the parties on February 18, 2026.

Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on March 4th.

The court has reviewed the recommendations contained in the CCRC report and finds them to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. This includes the recommendations in the December 19, 2025 report and the February 18, 2026 Child Interview addendum.

Respondent requests sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 3027.1, however the court finds this to be outside the scope of the original RFO. Sanctions pursuant to this section require a motion and proper notice to the opposing party.

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 #6: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT AND FINDS THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF

THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THIS INCLUDES THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE DECEMBER 19, 2025 REPORT AND THE FEBRUARY 18, 2026 CHILD INTERVIEW ADDENDUM.

RESPONDENT REQUESTS SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 3027.1, HOWEVER THE COURT FINDS THIS TO BE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO. SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION REQUIRE A MOTION AND PROPER NOTICE TO THE OPPOSING PARTY.

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.

On January 6, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding an interspousal transfer deed. The RFO and all other necessary documents were personally served on January 24th as required by Family Code § 215.

Petitioner 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 was timely and properly served on Petitioner. She had notice of the pending request and chose not to file an opposition. 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.

Respondent is requesting exclusive use, possession and control of property be given to Petitioner, but he has not identified what property or the basis for his request. It is unclear to the court exactly what the request is. Accordingly, the RFO 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE RFO 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.

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.

8. JESSICA ROBBINS V. RESTYN ROBBINS

21FL0115

On January 9, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding shared expenses by the parties. All required documents were mail served on January 15th.

Petitioner 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, it appears the RFO was timely and properly served on Petitioner. She had notice of the pending requests and chose not to oppose them. 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.

Respondent is requesting clarification of the existing custody orders which she states currently result in recurring disputes regarding extracurricular activities, shared expenses, transportation, medical care, communication, and grandparent trips. Attachment A to the RFO contains the proposed orders Respondent asks the court to adopt.

The court is adopting the proposed orders as stated in Exhibit A to the RFO with the exception of the following. The court is not adopting Section D – Grandparent Trips. Each party may arrange for the minors to visit their grandparents on his or her custodial time. The court is not adopting Section F – Uninsured Medical, Dental and Mental Health Expenses. Instead, the parties are ordered to follow the procedures set forth in the attached FL-192 for all childcare and healthcare cost reimbursements.

Respondent is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH). 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 #8: THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE PROPOSED ORDERS AS STATED IN EXHIBIT A TO THE RFO WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE FOLLOWING. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING SECTION D – GRANDPARENT TRIPS. EACH PARTY MAY ARRANGE FOR THE MINORS TO VISIT THEIR GRANDPARENTS ON HIS OR HER CUSTODIAL TIME. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING SECTION F – UNINSURED MEDICAL, DENTAL AND MENTAL HEALTH EXPENSES. INSTEAD, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE ATTACHED FL-192 FOR ALL CHILDCARE AND HEALTHCARE COST REIMBURSEMENTS.

RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH). 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.

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

Your child support order may include a provision for payment of childcare or uninsured health care costs. Childcare costs may be included as part of the monthly child support payment or reimbursable as a percentage of the costs. If the childcare costs are included as part of the monthly child support payment, you must pay that amount each month until the court changes (modifies) the child support order. If you need to change your child support order because there has been a change in the cost of childcare, see page 2.

If you have a child support order that includes a provision for the reimbursement of a percentage of childcare costs or a portion of the child's or children's health care costs and those costs are not paid by insurance, the **law says**:

1. **Notice.** You must give the other parent an itemized statement of the charges that have been billed for any childcare costs or health care costs not paid by insurance. You must give this statement to the other parent within a reasonable time, but no more than 90 days after those costs were given to you.
2. **Proof of full payment.** If you have already paid all of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid them and (2) ask for reimbursement for the other parent's court-ordered share of those costs.
3. **Proof of partial payment.** If you have paid only your share of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid your share, (2) ask that the other parent pay his or her share of the costs directly to the childcare or health care provider, and (3) give the other parent the information necessary for that parent to be able to pay the bill.
4. **Payment by notified parent.** If you receive notice from a parent that a childcare or uninsured health care cost has been incurred, you must pay your share of that cost within the time the court orders; or if the court has not specified a period of time, you must make payment (1) within 30 days from the time you were given notice of the amount due, (2) according to any payment schedule set by the health care provider, (3) according to a schedule agreed to in writing by you and the other parent, or (4) according to a schedule adopted by the court.
5. **Going to court.** Sometimes parents get into disagreements about childcare and health care costs. If you and the other parent cannot resolve the situation after talking about it, you can request that the court make a decision.
- a. **Disputed requests for payment.** If you dispute a request for payment made by the other parent, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute, but only if you pay the requested amount before filing your request.
- b. **Nonpayment.** If you claim that the other parent has failed to pay you back for a payment, or they have failed to make a payment to the provider after proper notice, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute.
- c. **Paid charges.** The court will presume that if uninsured health care costs or childcare costs for employment or necessary training for job skills have been paid, those costs were reasonable. If you want to dispute paid charges, you will have to show the court that the costs were unreasonable.
- d. **Attorney's fees.** If the court decides one parent has been unreasonable, it can order that parent to pay the other parent's attorney's fees and costs.
- e. **Court forms.** Use forms [FL-300](#) and [FL-490](#) to get a court date. See form [FL-300-INFO](#) for information about completing, filing, and serving your court papers.
6. **Court-ordered insurance coverage.** If a parent provides health care insurance as ordered by the court, that insurance must be used at all times to the extent that it is available for health care costs.
 - a. **Burden to prove.** The parent claiming that the coverage is inadequate to meet the child's needs has the burden of proving that to the court.
 - b. **Cost of additional coverage.** If a parent purchases health care insurance in addition to that ordered by the court, that parent must pay all the costs of the additional coverage. In addition, if a parent uses alternative coverage that costs more than the coverage provided by court order, that parent must pay the difference.
7. **Preferred health providers.** If the court-ordered coverage designates a preferred health care provider, that provider must be used at all times consistent with the terms of the health insurance policy. When any parent uses a health care provider other than the preferred provider, any health care costs that would have been paid by the preferred health provider if that provider had been used must be the sole responsibility of the parent incurring those costs.
8. **Need help?** Contact the family law facilitator in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

The court has made a child support order in your case. This order will remain the same unless one of the parents requests that the support be changed (modified). An order for child support can be modified by filing a request to change child support and serving the other parent. If both parents agree on a new child support amount, they can complete, sign, and file with the court a *Stipulation to Establish or Modify Child Support and Order* (form [FL-350](#)). (**Note:** If the local child support agency is involved in your case, it must be served with any request to change child support and approve any agreement.)

Online Self-Help Guide

For more information about how child support works, visit: <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support>.

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

The court considers several things when ordering the payment of child support.

- First, the number of children is considered, along with the percentage of time each parent has physical custody of the children.
- Next, the net disposable incomes of both parents are determined (which is how much money is left each month after taxes and certain other items like health insurance, union dues, or other child support ordered and paid are subtracted from a parent's paycheck). The court can also look at a parent's earning ability.
- The court considers both parents' tax filing status and may consider hardships, such as the cost of raising the parent's child from another relationship who lives with the parent.

A parent can request to change an existing order for child support when circumstances change significantly. For example if the net disposable income of one of the parents changes, parenting time changes, or a new child is born.

Examples

- You have been ordered to pay \$500 per month in child support. You lose your job. You will continue to owe \$500 per month, plus 10 percent interest on any unpaid support, unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a lower amount and the court orders a reduction.
- You are currently receiving \$300 per month in child support from the other parent, whose net income has just increased substantially. You will continue to receive \$300 per month unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a higher amount and the court orders an increase.
- You are paying child support based on having physical custody of your children 30 percent of the time. After several months it turns out that you actually have physical custody of the children 50 percent of the time. You may file a motion to modify child support to a lower amount.

How to Change a Child Support Order

To change a child support order, you must file papers with the court. *Remember:* You must follow the order you have now.

What forms do I need?

If you are asking to change a child support order, you must fill out one of these forms:

- Form [FL-300](#), *Request for Order* **or**
- Form [FL-390](#), *Notice of Motion and Motion for Simplified Modification of Order for Child, Spousal, or Family Support*

You must also fill out one of these forms, and attach proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs):

- Form [FL-150](#), *Income and Expense Declaration* **or**
- Form [FL-155](#), *Financial Statement (Simplified)*

What if I am not sure which forms to fill out?

Contact the family law facilitator in your county. You can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

After you fill out the forms, file them with the court clerk and ask for a hearing date. Write the hearing date on the form. The clerk may ask you to pay a filing fee. If you cannot afford the fee, fill out these forms, too:

- Form [FW-001](#), *Request to Waive Court Fees and*
- Form [FW-003](#), *Order on Court Fee Waiver (Superior Court)*

You must serve the other parent. If the local child support agency is involved, serve it too.

- This means someone 18 or over—not you—must deliver copies of your filed court forms to the other parent, at least **16 court days** before the hearing. Add **5 calendar days** if delivered by mail within California (see Code of Civil Procedure section 1005 for other situations).
- **Court days** are weekdays when the court is open for business (Monday through Friday except court holidays). **Calendar days** include all days of the month, including weekends and holidays. To find court holidays, go to: www.courts.ca.gov/holidays.htm.

Blank copies of both of these forms must also be served:

- Form [FL-320](#), *Responsive Declaration to Request for Order*
- Form [FL-150](#), *Income and Expense Declaration*

Then the server fills out and signs a *Proof of Service*. Take this form, plus one copy, to the clerk and file it at least one week before your hearing.

Go to your hearing and ask the judge to change the support. Bring your tax returns from the last two years and your proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs). The judge will look at your information, listen to both parents, and make an order. After the hearing, fill out:

- Form [FL-340](#), *Findings and Order After Hearing* **and**
- Form [FL-342](#), *Child Support Information and Order Attachment*

Need help?

Contact the **family law facilitator** in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

1. Child support. As of September 27, 2022, child support automatically stops if the parent who has to pay is confined against their will for more than 90 days in a row in jail, prison, juvenile detention, a mental health facility, or other institution.

Exception. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay has money available to pay child support.

2. Past confinement. Child support also automatically stops during past confinement if it was ordered from October 8, 2015, through December 31, 2019, or January 1, 2021, through September 26, 2022, and the parent who has to pay was confined for more than 90 days in a row during the same time frame.

Exceptions for past confinement. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay was in jail or prison for failing to pay child support or for domestic violence against the other parent or the child, or if they had money available to pay support.

3. Timing. The date child support automatically restarts will depend on the parent's release date. If you need to change your child support order, see page 2.

- a. **If released before January 1, 2024,** child support automatically restarts the first day of the first full month after the parent is released.
- b. **If released after January 1, 2024,** child support will automatically restart the first day of the 10th month after the parent is released.

Employment before the 10-month period ends: If the parent who has to pay support starts working before the date child support is set to automatically restart, the person who is owed support or the local child support agency can request the court restart the child support order early. The court may order a different amount of child support if appropriate.

4. More info. For more information about child support and incarcerated parents, see [Family Code section 4007.5](#) or go to <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support/incarcerated-parent>.

You can also contact the family law facilitator in your county and can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

On October 8, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for support and attorney's fees, orders regarding the sale of the rental property, and a business evaluation. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith.

Respondent filed an RFO on December 13, 2024, seeking an order compelling discovery responses and sanctions. He filed another RFO the same day seeking an order for the residential rental properties to be managed by a third party. Both RFOs were served on December 16th.

A hearing was held and orders made on all issues on May 29, 2025 and then again on September 4, 2025. At the September 4th hearing the court was informed that the parties had reached a full stipulation which they would be filing soon. As such, the matter was continued to January 8, 2026 and the court continued to reserve jurisdiction on the issue of retroactivity of support. At the January 8th hearing the parties once again stated that they had reached a stipulation and they once again requested a continuance. The request was granted and the matter was continued to the present date.

The Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner Bryn Scharf-Williams was filed and served on March 5, 2026 along with her Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on March 6th; it was served on March 5th.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does not find grounds to modify support at this time. The parties are still awaiting the completion of the business valuation and there have been clear fluctuations in the business income in the past year which would likely require a broader view of the business to get a more accurate picture of its value and Respondent's actual income for purposes of calculating support. The court is reserving jurisdiction to modify support back to the date of filing the RFO until after receipt and review of the business valuation. All current support orders 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES NOT FIND GROUNDS TO MODIFY SUPPORT AT THIS TIME. THE PARTIES ARE STILL AWAITING THE COMPLETION OF THE BUSINESS VALUATION AND THERE HAVE BEEN CLEAR FLUCTUATIONS IN THE BUSINESS INCOME IN THE PAST YEAR

WHICH WOULD LIKELY REQUIRE A BROADER VIEW OF THE BUSINESS TO GET A MORE ACCURATE PICTURE OF ITS VALUE AND RESPONDENT'S ACTUAL INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF CALCULATING SUPPORT. THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION TO MODIFY SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO UNTIL AFTER RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF THE BUSINESS VALUATION. ALL CURRENT SUPPORT ORDERS 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.

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.

10. DONNA LORRAINE WILLS V. DANIEL RAY WILLS

PFL20080071

On January 7, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for spousal support, attorney's fees, sanctions, and an order to sell the marital residence. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. In compliance with Family Code § 215, all required documents were personally served on January 24th.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on March 4th. He filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 5th.

Petitioner is requesting \$2,843.92 in need-based attorney's fees. She further requests spousal support arrears and interest as of October 31, 2025, sanctions against Respondent, and an order for Respondent to refinance the marital residence to remove Petitioner's name from the mortgage and pay all amounts owed to Petitioner from the equity proceeds. In the event the refinance is not timely completed then an order for the parties to sell the home and the arrears to be paid from the net proceeds.

Respondent asks the court to either deny or substantially reduce the amount of spousal support arrears owed. He further asks that the court deny the request for attorney's fees and deny the request for sanctions. Finally, he requests a "reasonable and realistic" timeframe for resolution on the marital residence.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

11. ALANA BARBIERY V. DANIEL BARBIERY

23FL0609

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 14, 2026, seeking orders directing Respondent to sign the FL-130 and FL-144. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

The matter is dropped from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

13. NATHANIEL DEPEE V. CHERYL COVINGTON

23FL0491

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on October 17, 2025. Respondent was personally served on November 1, 2025.

Parties were ordered to appear for the hearing on January 8, 2026. Respondent failed to appear. The court issued a bench warrant for Respondent which was stayed pending the next hearing date. The court directed Petitioner to personally serve Respondent with a copy of the court's minute order with the next hearing date, as well as the issuance of the bench warrant, and stay.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service on January 20, 2026, showing that Respondent was personally served with a copy of the minute order on January 17, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR ARRAIGNMENT.

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 16, 2026, seeking a modification of the parenting plan orders as well as child support. Respondent did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner or the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) were properly served.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration requesting the child support issue be heard in Department 10 pursuant to Family Code section 4251.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as the failure of Respondent to file an Income and Expense Declaration as required.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS THE FAILURE OF RESPONDENT TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AS REQUIRED.

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.

15. DCSS V. DAVID HARTSOCK III (OTHER PARENT: SYNDALEE VILLAFUERTE)

PFS20140004

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 22, 2025, seeking a modification of child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 21, 2026, and a review hearing on March 19, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with only the FL-300 and RA-010 and 0202. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Only Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such a single parent report was filed with the court on March 3, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 4th.

There have been no Responsive Declarations filed by either Petitioner or Respondent.

The court drops the matter from calendar for failure to properly served Petitioner and Respondent.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT. 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.

**16. KYRA MCAFFEE V. MAXWELL MCAFFEE (JOINED PARTIES: BRIAN BUNCH AND
CORINNE BUNCH)**

PFL20210499

Joined Party Corrine Bunch filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on January 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was personally served on January 20, 2026. Joined Party Brian Bunch was served on January 16, 2026. Respondent was personally served on January 16, 2026. Petitioner was personally served on January 16, 2026.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

On February 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel discovery responses and sanctions. The RFO and all other required documents were electronically served the same day as filing.

Petitioner filed her Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Compel on March 10th. It was served on March 6th.

Respondent filed and served his Reply Declaration on March 12th.

Respondent brings his RFO requesting the following: (1) Compel Petitioner's responses, without objections, to Respondent's Request for Admission Set One – Truth of Facts and Genuineness of Documents; (2) Compel Petitioner's responses, without objections, to Respondent's Request for Production of Documents – By Respondent to Petitioner, Set One; (3) Compel Petitioner's Response to Family Code § 2107 Demand for Clarification Regarding Final Declaration of Disclosure, as requested by Respondent's counsel; (4) Order Petitioner to pay sanctions directly to Respondent's counsel in the amount of \$3,518.40.

Petitioner argues the motion is untimely pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2024.020(a) which mandates all discovery motions are to be heard no later than 15 days before the date initially set for trial. She says this deadline is calculated on the date the motion is heard, not the date it is filed; however, she does not provide the court with any legal authority to support this position. In fact, case law directly contradicts Petitioner's position in this regard. When a party files a discovery motion and that motion is set to be heard after the 15-day cutoff date, nothing in Section 2024.020 precludes the court from hearing the motion after the cutoff date. *Pelton-Shepherd Industries, Inc. v. Delta Packaging Products, Inc.*, 165 Cal. App. 4th 1568 (2008). Instead, the statute simply means that the party filing the motion does not have the *right* to have it heard, it does not mean the court has no power to hear it. *Id.*

Petitioner further objects to the motion on the basis that the discovery was served on the "eve of trial." She once again relies on the discovery cutoff date set forth in Section 2024.020 which states that "...any party shall be entitled as a matter of right to complete discovery proceedings on or before the 30th day." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2024.020(a). Once again, Petitioner's reliance is misplaced as the statute does not support her position. Section 2024.010 states "[a]s used in this chapter, discovery is considered completed on the day a response is due..." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2024.010. Here, the discovery in question was served electronically on January 19th thereby making responses due no later than February 18th

which is more than 30 days prior to the start of trial. As such, the requests were served timely.

Finally, Petitioner objects to the discovery as it is harassing. Petitioner has waived her right to make substantive objections to the discovery requests themselves. If a party fails to provide timely responses, as Petitioner did here, that party waives any right to object to the interrogatories, and waives the right to produce writings in response. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2030.290 (a).

In light of the foregoing, the court is inclined to granted the motion in its entirety. That said, there is concern regarding timing for the upcoming trial and whether or not that trial date should be continued. The parties are ordered to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 25, 2026, seeking entry of a status only judgement. The matter was set on a shortened time basis. Respondent was directed to serve Petitioner on or before February 27, 2026. The court granted Petitioner until March 10, 2026 to file a Responsive Declaration.

Respondent'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, Respondent did not file the requisite FL-315 nor address the issue of any potential pension plans. Accordingly, the request to bifurcate is denied.

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.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST BIFURCATION AND ENTRY OF A STATUS ONLY JUDGMENT ARE DENIED. 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.

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 14, 2026, seeking a change of venue. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

20. JACK YOUNGBLOOD V. COLLEEN YOUNGBLOOD

23FL0236

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on October 23, 2025 seeking an order for Respondent to vacate the former marital residence, as well as attorney's fees and sanctions. The court granted the request in part on October 27, 2025, ordering Respondent to vacate the residence by no later than November 21, 2025, at 5:00 PM. The court reserved on the request for attorney's fees and sanctions. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served on October 27, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 27, 2025 reiterating the ex parte requests. Respondent was served on October 27, 2026.

The matter was originally set to be heard on February 5, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the parties submitted a letter agreement to continue the February 5th hearing to March 19, 2026, at 1:30 PM. The court granted the request to continue.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

There have been no new filings since the January 20th letter.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

