

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

1. AMY KNIERIEM V. BEAU MICHAEL LEMIRE

24FL0133

On February 19, 2025, the court issued its tentative ruling in this matter. Petitioner requested oral argument. However, due to the court's unavailability on February 20th, the matter was continued to the present date. The court is reissuing its prior tentative ruling as set forth below. Parties are ordered to appear for oral argument.

On July 1, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for child support and various other orders. She did not file an Income and Expense Declaration and there is no Proof of Service for the RFO. Nevertheless, Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 24, 2024.

On October 11, 2024, Respondent filed an RFO seeking custody and visitation orders and an order prohibiting Petitioner from being present at, or sending others to, record visits with the minor. The RFO was mail served on November 7th.

Respondent filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration on December 2nd.

Petitioner filed and served a Reply Declaration and her Income and Expense Declaration on December 27th.

Petitioner filed and served a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and an Updating Declaration on February 10, 2025. Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Respondent Beau Lemire on February 11th.

Petitioner filed her RFO requesting the following: (1) guideline child support based on a 4.7% timeshare and an overtime table; (2) equal division of child support add-ons such as therapy, work-related childcare, uninsured healthcare expenses, travel expenses for visitation, etc.; and (3) name change of the minor to add Petitioner's last name to the last name of the minor. Additionally, Petitioner states that she intends to make an oral motion before the court for need based attorney's fees.

Respondent is requesting a step-up plan to increase his parenting time. He also asks that the court prohibit Petitioner from sending individuals to observe and record his visits with the minor. Regarding child support, Respondent is requesting a hardship for the cost of providing his own work tools, as well as a hardship of \$3,000 which accounts for the cost of supervised visitation. Respondent consents to the addition of Petitioner's last name to the minor as long as both last names are used.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 9, 2024. They reached some agreements but were not able to agree on all issues therefore a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on January 28, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on January 31, 2025.

As part of the CCRC report, the CCRC counselor addressed whether Respondent had rebutted the Family Code section 3044 presumption. Petitioner objects to this recommendation and objects to the CCRC report as hearsay. She argues that the 3044 presumption has not been rebutted and asks that the court take evidence on the issue prior to making such a finding.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court is ordering as follows. Petitioner's request to add her last name to the minor's name is granted. The child's name shall be changed to Blake Lemire-Knieriem.

Regarding Petitioner sending her sister and other individuals to observe and film the visits between Respondent and the minor, Petitioner is ordered to stop engaging in this conduct immediately. Petitioner shall not request others attend, observe, or record any visits between the minor and Respondent.

Finally, on the issues of custody, visitation, and child support, the parties are ordered to appear.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

2. ANDREW SELLEN V. REBECCA SELLEN

22FL0615

On December 11, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) for custody orders and child support as well as attorney's fees and costs, health insurance, sanctions and an Order Shortening Time (OST). The RFO was originally heard on an ex parte basis and the request as to insurance was granted. The OST and all other requests were denied on an ex parte basis as no exigent circumstances existed.

Respondent filed her Income and Expense Declaration on December 10, 2024 concurrently with her ex parte requests.

According to the Proof of Service, all required documents were mail served and electronically served on December 11th.

On January 13, 2025, Respondent filed and served a Declaration regarding the orthodontic exams for two of the minors.

On February 3, 2025, Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on February 10, 2025. It was served on February 10th along with her Final Declaration of Disclosure.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on February 24, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on February 26, 2025. It was electronically served on the 25th.

On March 4, 2025, Petitioner filed an Ex Parte Application and Declaration for Orders and Notice. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on the same day.

In Respondent's December RFO she requests sole legal custody of the minor children. She also requests child support for each of the minor children though there is an open case with the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), case number 22FL1078. She also requests \$3,111 be withdrawn from each party's share of the proceeds from the sale of the marital residence to cover the cost of orthodontic care for the children. She requests an order that each party share equally in all uninsured medical and dental expenses for the children although it appears this order has already been made in the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

DCSS matter. She is requesting \$5,000 in attorney's fees and sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 and Civil Procedure § 177.5.

Petitioner is opposing all of the aforementioned requests. He requests to vacate the order for coparenting counseling and Soberlink. He also requests primary physical custody of the minor Quest, as well as guideline support. He asks that the court postpone ruling on support and custody for further review.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on January 9, 2025 at which time they agreed to maintain joint legal custody and they agreed Respondent would submit documentation to the court regarding the necessity for orthodontic care and thereafter the parties would return for another CCRC appointment. A report with the agreements was prepared on January 9th and mailed to the parties on the 10th.

Despite the agreements at CCRC, Respondent is still requesting sole legal custody of the children and Petitioner is still requesting sole legal and physical custody of Quest.

The issue of child support is to be heard on the DCSS calendar and the RFOs in that regard must be filed with the proper case number for the DCSS case. Likewise, because the order to equally share uninsured medical costs has already been made in the DCSS case, the request for payment of orthodontics costs should be heard on the DCSS calendar. As such, the request for child support and the request for the payment of orthodontics costs are dropped from calendar.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on all other issues.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND THE REQUEST FOR THE PAYMENT OF ORTHODONTICS COSTS ARE DROPPED FROM CALENDAR. THE 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

3. ERIC WEXELMAN V. JAMAICA WEXELMAN

24FL0838

Joinder

On February 19, 2025, the court issued its tentative ruling in this matter. Petitioner requested oral argument. However, due to the court's unavailability on February 20th, the matter was continued to the present date. The court is reissuing its prior tentative ruling as set forth below. Parties are ordered to appear for oral argument.

Respondent filed a Motion for Joinder and Petitioner for Joinder on December 20, 2024. A Summons was issued the same day. Respondent seeks to join the parties' adult son to the action. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on December 27, 2024. There is no Proof of Service showing Claimant Spencer Wexelman doing business as Rambo Propane Tanks and Rambo Hauling LLC was served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and Supplemental Declaration on February 5, 2025. Respondent was mail and electronically served on February 6, 2025.

California Rule of Court 5.24(d)(1) requires: "[a]ll applications for joinder other than for an employee pension benefit plan must be made by serving and filing form a *Notice of Motion and Declaration for Joinder* (form FL-371)...The completed form must state with particularity the claimant's interest in the proceeding and the relief sought by the applicant, and it must be accompanied by an appropriate pleading setting forth the claim as if it were asserted in a separate action or proceeding. (2) A blank copy of *Responsive Declaration to Motion for Joinder and Consent Order for Joinder* (form FL-373) must be served with the *Notice of Motion* and accompanying pleading."

The court drops the matter from calendar for failure to serve the claimant.

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

Request for Orders

On December 10, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and an order to sell the community property residence. His Income and Expense Declaration was filed the day prior. The matter was originally filed with an Application for an Order Shortening Time (OST); as such, Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on December 10th.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

Respondent also filed an RFO on December 10th. She is also requesting spousal support and attorney's fees, as well as a Family Code § 4331 evaluation of Petitioner. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. These documents were served by mail on December 12th.

On January 28, 2025, Petitioner filed and served his Supplemental Declaration of Eric Wexelman in Support of his Request for Spousal Support.

On February 3, Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Respondent in Opposition to Petitioner's Request for Orders.

On February 20th, Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Response of Eric Wexelman in Opposition to Respondent's Request for Support. This was filed and served along with an Amended Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

A Supplemental Declaration of Respondent was filed and served on February 27th.

Petitioner is requesting guideline spousal support. He opposes the request for him to undergo a Family Code § 4331 evaluation. In the event such an evaluation is ordered, he asks that Respondent pay for the entirety of the evaluation or, alternatively, the cost of the evaluation be taken from the proceeds from the sale of the marital residence. Petitioner asks that the court appoint Kenneth Jamica as the real estate agent and list the home for sale with a sale price of 1.25 million. Alternatively, he proposes Jared Lundgren be used as the listing agent with the same price. He also asks that the Curbio company, or some other company as chosen by the real estate agent, be appointed to conduct any improvements on the home which are necessary for the sale. Once the home is sold, Petitioner asks that all proceeds from the home be placed in a blocked account until a determination on distribution is reached. He requests a timeline be put in place or a review hearing be set to address the status of the sale of the home. Finally, he is requesting need-based attorney's fees.

Respondent is making the following requests: (1) Deny Petitioner's request for attorney fees; (2) Deny Petitioner's request for spousal support; (3) Grant Respondent's request to join Spencer Wexelman, individually and doing business as Rambo Hauling LLC and Rambo Propane Tanks; (4) Grant Respondent's request for attorney fees in the amount of \$5,000; (5) Grant Respondent's request for spousal support; and (6) Grant Respondent's request for Petitioner to undergo, and pay for, a Section 4331 vocational evaluation with Patrick Sullivan.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

Regarding the sale of the home, it is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court's authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to "...make any orders [it] considers necessary..." Fam. Code § 2553. This includes ordering the sale and division of proceeds of the marital residence. Marriage of Holmgren, 60 Cal. App. 3d 869 (1976); See also In re Marriage of Horowitz, 159 Cal. App. 3d 368 (1984).

Here, the court does find that the sale of the home is necessary to preserve the community estate. As such, the parties are ordered to put the home located at 2174 Talon Drive in Shingle Springs up for sale forthwith. Petitioner shall provide Respondent with the names of three real estate agents no later than March 13, 2025. Respondent has until March 20th to choose one agent from Petitioner's list. If no such choice is made by that date, then Petitioner may choose the real estate agent. The sale price shall be determined solely by the real estate agent. The parties are ordered to timely cooperate with all reasonable requests made by the real estate agent for the sale of the home, this includes, but is not limited to, allowing the agent access to the property to show the home upon reasonable notice and signing any and all necessary documents to list and sale the home. Curbio or such other repair company may be retained to conduct any repairs on the home if deemed necessary by the real estate agent. The repair company is to be chosen by the real estate agent.

The proceeds from the sale of the home are to be placed in Petitioner's attorney's account until written agreement of the parties or further court order. The court reserves jurisdiction over the proceeds from the sale until a final division of assets is completed. A review hearing is set for 6/5/2025 at 8:30 AM in department 5 to address the status of the sale of the home. Parties are ordered to file updating declarations no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing. If nothing is filed, the court may drop the hearing.

Turning to the issue of support and the vocational evaluation, "[i]n a proceeding for dissolution of marriage or for legal separation of the parties, the court may order a party to submit to an examination by a vocational training counselor...The focus of the examination shall be on an assessment of the party's ability to obtain employment that would allow the party to maintain their marital standard of living." Fam. Code § 4331(a). Prior to making an order for a vocational rehabilitation assessment, the court must make a finding of good cause to do so.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

Here, after reviewing the filings of the parties as well as the photos and text messages submitted by Respondent the court does find good cause for Petitioner to undergo a Family Code § 4331 vocational evaluation. The evaluation is to be conducted by Patrick Sullivan. Respondent shall pay the cost of the evaluation, subject to reallocation.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined in the attached DissoMaster report, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$454 per month. The court adopts the attached DissoMaster report and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$454 per month as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the 15th of the month commencing on March 15, 2025 and continuing until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of December 15, 2024.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$1,362 through and including February 15, 2025. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$113.50 on the 1st of each month commencing on April 1, 2025 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If a payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Finally, turning to both parties' requests for attorney's fees, both requests are denied. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2). Here, while there is a slight disparity in income, the court does not find that either party has the ability to pay their attorney's fees as well as those of the other party.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE REQUEST FOR JOINDER. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PUT THE HOME LOCATED AT 2174 TALON DRIVE IN SHINGLE SPRINGS UP FOR SALE FORTHWITH. PETITIONER SHALL PROVIDE RESPONDENT WITH THE NAMES OF THREE REAL ESTATE AGENTS NO LATER THAN MARCH 13, 2025. RESPONDENT HAS UNTIL MARCH 20TH TO CHOOSE ONE AGENT FROM PETITIONER'S LIST. IF NO SUCH CHOICE IS MADE BY THAT DATE, THEN PETITIONER MAY CHOOSE THE REAL ESTATE AGENT. THE SALE PRICE SHALL BE DETERMINED SOLELY BY THE REAL ESTATE AGENT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TIMELY COOPERATE WITH ALL REASONABLE REQUESTS MADE BY THE REAL ESTATE AGENT FOR THE SALE OF THE HOME, THIS INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, ALLOWING THE AGENT ACCESS TO THE PROPERTY TO SHOW THE HOME UPON

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

REASONABLE NOTICE AND SIGNING ANY AND ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO LIST AND SALE THE HOME. CURBIO, OR SUCH OTHER REPAIR COMPANY MAY BE RETAINED TO CONDUCT ANY REPAIRS ON THE HOME IF DEEMED NECESSARY BY THE REAL ESTATE AGENT. THE REAL ESTATE AGENT IS TO CHOOSE THE REPAIR COMPANY.

THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE HOME ARE TO BE PLACED IN PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S ACCOUNT UNTIL WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR FURTHER COURT ORDER. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE UNTIL A FINAL DIVISION OF ASSETS IS COMPLETED. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR 6/5/2025 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ADDRESS THE STATUS OF THE SALE OF THE HOME. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE UPDATING DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. IF NOTHING IS FILED, THE COURT MAY DROP THE HEARING.

THE COURT DOES FIND GOOD CAUSE FOR PETITIONER TO UNDERGO A FAMILY CODE § 4311 VOCATIONAL EVALUATION. THE EVALUATION IS TO BE CONDUCTED BY PATRICK SULLIVAN. RESPONDENT SHALL PAY THE COST OF THE EVALUATION, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION.

UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED DISSOMASTER REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$454 PER MONTH. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED DISSOMASTER REPORT AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$454 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF THE MONTH COMMENCING ON MARCH 15, 2025 AND CONTINUING UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF DECEMBER 15, 2024.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,362 THROUGH AND INCLUDING FEBRUARY 15, 2025. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$113.50 ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON APRIL 1, 2025 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF A PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

EACH PARTY'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED AS THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THAT EITHER PARTY HAS THE ABILITY TO PAY.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

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.

ATTORNEY (NAME AND ADDRESS): California	TELEPHONE NO:	Superior Court Of The State of California,County of COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: BRANCH NAME:
ATTORNEY FOR: Husband		
DISSOMASTER REPORT 2025, Monthly		CASE NUMBER:

Input Data	Husband	Wife	Guideline (2025)	Cash Flow Analysis	Husband	Wife
Number of children	0	0	Nets (adjusted)	Guideline		
% time with Second Parent	0%	0%	Husband	2,445	Payment (cost)/benefit	454 (454)
Filing status	MFJ->	<-MFJ	Wife	4,191	Net spendable income	2,899 3,737
# Federal exemptions	1*	1*	Total	6,636	% combined spendable	43.7% 56.3%
Wages + salary	0	5,080	Support (Nondeductible)	Total taxes	235	889
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	SS Payor	Wife	Comb. net spendable	6,636
Self-employment income	0	0	Santa Clara	454	Proposed	
Other taxable income	2,680	0	Total	454	Payment (cost)/benefit	454 (454)
Short-term cap. gains	0	0	Proposed, tactic 9		Net spendable income	2,899 3,737
Long-term cap. gains	0	0	SS Payor	Wife	NSI change from gdl	0 0
Other gains (and losses)	0	0	Santa Clara	454	% combined spendable	43.7% 56.3%
Ordinary dividends	0	0	Total	454	% of saving over gdl	0% 0%
Tax. interest received	0	0	Savings	0	Total taxes	235 889
Social Security received	0	0	Mother	0	Comb. net spendable	6,636
Unemployment compensation	0	0	Father	0	Percent change	0.0%
Operating losses	0	0	No releases		Default Case Settings	
Ca. operating loss adj.	0	0				
Roy, partnerships, S corp, trusts	0	0				
Rental income	0	0				
Misc ordinary tax. inc.	2,680	0				
Other nontaxable income	0	0				
New-spouse income	0	0				
SS paid other marriage	0	0				
CS paid other relationship	0	0				
Adj. to income (ATI)	0	0				
9.3% elective PTE payment	0	0				
Ptr Support Pd. other P'ships	0	0				
Health insurance	0	0				
Qual. Bus. Inc. Ded.	0	0				
Itemized deductions	0	2,182				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	0	682				
Ded. interest expense	0	1,500				
Charitable contribution	0	0				
Miscellaneous itemized	0	0				
State sales tax paid	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0*	0*				
Other gdl. adjustments	0	0				
AMT info (IRS Form 6251)	0	0				
Child support add-ons	0	0				
TANF,SSI and CS received	0	0				

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

4. GERGANA MUDROVA V. PAUL BONDAR

22FL0444

On September 9, 2024, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). The OSC was personally served on October 27th.

The parties appeared for arraignment on December 12, 2024, at which time the Public Defender was appointed and the matter was continued to the present date.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

5. JESSICA BELIZ V. JUAN BELIZ

PFL20150768

On August 1, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was personally served on Shaun Brooks and Megan Tonkin on August 2nd. This is a post judgment request for modification of custody orders which is required to be served in accordance with Family Code section 215. However, it does not appear that it was personally served on Petitioner. Nevertheless, Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on October 1, 2024, thereby waiving any defect in service. Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on February 20th.

Respondent is requesting visitation with the minor 2-3 times a month for a few hours gradually leading to 2 weekends a month and unsupervised visitation.

Petitioner currently has sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor. Respondent is to have reunification therapy with the minor at the discretion of the minor's therapist. Petitioner requests the court maintain the prior orders and order sanctions against Respondent in the amount of \$3,000 pursuant to Family Code section 271.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on August 30, 2024 and were able to reach agreements regarding reunification therapy between Respondent and the minor. The agreements were codified in a CCRC report dated August 30th and mailed to the parties on September 4th.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and does find the agreements reached at CCRC to be in the best interests of the minor; they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. The court declines to increase Respondent's visitation with the minor as Respondent has failed to show that doing so would be in the minor's best interest where Respondent has been absent from the minor's life for such a significant period of time. As such, all prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

Petitioner's request for \$3,000 in sanctions is denied. However, Respondent is admonished regarding his failure to discuss this matter with Petitioner or her counsel prior to filing his RFO. Failure to do so in the future may result in monetary sanctions.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE AUGUST 30, 2024 CCRC REPORT ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO INCREASE HIS PARENTING

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

TIME IS DENIED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR \$3,000 IN SANCTIONS IS DENIED. HOWEVER, RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED REGARDING HIS FAILURE TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER WITH PETITIONER OR HER COUNSEL PRIOR TO FILING HIS RFO. FAILURE TO DO SO IN THE FUTURE MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS.

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 6, 2025

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

6. JODI GRAHAM V. NICHOLAS GRAHAM

22FL1083

On December 5, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The RFO was mail served on Respondent's attorney on December 11, 2024.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order or an Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner's Declaration Re: Respondent's Non-Compliance was filed and served on February 28, 2025.

Judgment in this matter was entered on July 25, 2023. As such, this is a post-judgment request for modification of support orders which is required to be served personally on Respondent, not Respondent's attorney. Fam. Code § 215. Service by mail is only acceptable if a Declaration Regarding Address Verification – Post Judgment Request to Modify is completed and filed with the court. *Id.* This matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

8. KIRK SODERQUIST V. RENEE BINGAMAN

22FL0324

On September 9, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on December 5, 2024, at which time they presented the court with a stipulation to continue the matter and participate in mediation prior to the continued date. The adopted the agreement of the parties and continued the matter to the present date. Parties were ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing and jurisdiction was reserved back to the date of filing the RFO.

Petitioner Kirk Soderquist's Status Declaration Re Child Support was filed on February 27, 2025, along with Petitioner's updated Income and Expense Declaration. The court finds these documents to be untimely as they were filed just seven days prior to the hearing.

Respondent has not filed either a status declaration or an Income and Expense Declaration.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to both parties' failure to timely file updated Income and Expense Declarations and status declarations.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO BOTH PARTIES' FAILURE TO TIMELY FILE UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AND STATUS DECLARATIONS.

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 6, 2025

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

9. NANCY DORIS DARNELL V. DALE A. DARNELL

22FL0976

On December 4, 2024, Respondent filed his Request for Order (RFO) and his Income and Expense Declaration. All required documents were mail served on December 5, 2024.

Respondent filed and served a Reply Declaration of Dale Darnell on February 26, 2025. The Reply indicates that Respondent has reviewed Petitioner's "responsive pleading" however there has been no Responsive Declaration to Request for Order filed by Petitioner.

Respondent is requesting bifurcation and termination of the marital status. He also requests a release his retirement funds to allow for the payment of attorney fees and living expenses. Alternatively, he requests spousal support and an order for Petitioner to pay \$15,000 as and for attorney's fees. He is also asking for an order to sell the marital residence and place the proceeds in trust.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing. Petitioner is ordered to bring with her a full and complete Income and Expense Declaration with the required supporting documents.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO BRING WITH HER A FULL AND COMPLETE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

10. REBECCA BURT-ORTIZ V. DAVID J. ORTIZ

23FL0384

Order to Show Cause

On August 16, 2024, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). It was personally served on September 5th. The parties appeared before the court for arraignment on November 7, 2024 at which time the court continued the matter to the present date.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

Request for Order

On November 4, 2024, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and visitation orders as well as child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail served on November 5th.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order or an Income and Expense Declaration.

According to the caption on the RFO, Respondent states he is seeking custody and visitation orders however, there is no such request made in the body of the document. Additionally, the parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 5, 2024 and agreed that they are not seeking any changes to the current custody or visitation schedule. A report containing their agreement was prepared on December 5, 2024, it was mailed to the parties on December 6th. Given that there appears to be no pending request for custody or visitation orders, all prior custody and visitation orders remain in full force and effect.

Regarding support, Respondent is requesting \$1,000 a month in child support and \$3,500 a month for spousal support. In addition to the foregoing, he is requesting Petitioner pay half all taxes owed, half of the SBA loan, and half of the boat payment (\$300) monthly. Respondent is also requesting exclusive temporary use, possession and control of the 2018 NXT 22 Mastercraft boat. He is requesting \$36,000 in attorney's fees and costs. Finally, he asks that the children not be involved in serving documents and he asks that payments between the parties not be made through the children's bank accounts.

Given that Petitioner has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration, the court is left to rely on Respondent's estimate of Petitioner's income. However, Respondent states

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

only that Petitioner's income is "unknown." Because the court cannot calculate support without further information, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on the issues of support, attorney's fees, property control, and monthly contributions to the expenses listed in the RFO. Petitioner is ordered to bring an updated Income and Expense Declaration with her along with the required supporting documents.

Regarding involvement of the children in court proceedings, Respondent's request is granted. The parties are ordered not to use the children to serve one another with legal documents, the parties are ordered not to use the children's bank accounts to make payments to one another, and the parties are ordered not to use the children to pass messages to one another.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT. ALL PRIOR CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED NOT TO USE THE CHILDREN TO SERVE ONE ANOTHER WITH LEGAL DOCUMENTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED NOT TO USE THE CHILDREN'S BANK ACCOUNTS TO MAKE PAYMENTS TO ONE ANOTHER, AND THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED NOT TO USE THE CHILDREN TO PASS MESSAGES TO ONE ANOTHER. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUES OF SUPPORT, ATTORNEY'S FEES, PROPERTY CONTROL, AND MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EXPENSES LISTED IN THE RFO. PETITIONER ORDERED TO BRING AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH HER ALONG WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS. 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 6, 2025

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

12. YEKATERINA VRONSKIY V. YURIY VRONSKIY

23FL1068

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 10, 2024, seeking a change of venue. The RFO was filed concurrently with a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and both documents were mail served on December 18th. Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Respondent requests to change venue from El Dorado County to Sacramento County on the basis that Sacramento is a more convenient venue, and all of the children reside with Respondent in Sacramento County.

Pursuant to Civil Procedure Section 397, 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). 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). After reviewing the filings, the court does find that Respondent has met this burden. The change of venue request is granted.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE IS GRANTED. 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 6, 2025

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

13. ADAM MIKLOSKO V. KRISTEN MIKLOSKO

24FL1027

Petitioner filed a Petition for Dissolution on October 1, 2024. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting spousal support and an Income and Expense Declaration.

On December 23, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request to Continue the January 2, 2025 hearing, due to the papers not being served. The court granted the request and continued the matter to March 6th.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service of the Petition and Summons. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been properly served with the RFO.

The matter is dropped from calendar as the court lacks jurisdiction to proceed and for the failure to serve Respondent with the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS THE COURT LACKS JURISDICTION TO PROCEED AND FOR THE FAILURE TO SERVED RESPONDENT WITH THE RFO.

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 6, 2025

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

14. CHALLYN WILLIAMS V. MARK WILLIAMS

PFL20210389

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on December 10, 2024. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration the same day. On December 11, 2024, the court denied the ex parte application and referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 9th and a review hearing on March 6, 2025. Petitioner filed her Request for Order (RFO) on December 11, 2024, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Respondent was personally served on December 14, 2024.

Both parties attended CCRC and were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as additional recommendations was filed with the court on February 24, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the February 24th CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 24TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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 6, 2025

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

15. CHRISTINA PETANOVICH V. THOMAS PETANOVICH

24FL0847

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 17, 2024, requesting to set aside the default. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner has been properly served.

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 6, 2025

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

16. GABRIEL TEIXEIRA V. CATARINA BORELLO

22FL0769

On February 7, 2024, the Third District Court of Appeal issued a remittitur directing the trial court to reinstate the Domestic Violence Restraining Order and proceed on the Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship.

The court notes the prior Domestic Violence Restraining Order was set to expire on December 2, 2024. The court is unaware if a restraining order or parentage findings have been made in another jurisdiction.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

17. GAGE TAYLOR V. KAYLA TAYLOR

23FL1171

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 30, 2024, requesting the court amend the August 27, 2024 Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH). Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on December 30th. Petitioner asserts the FOAH submitted to the court was not the FOAH he signed off on, as it was missing an attachment.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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, due to Respondent’s failure to file a Responsive Declaration, despite the fact that the RFO was properly and timely served, the court finds she has acquiesced to this request. Petitioner’s request to add the additional page is granted. The court finds the additional page includes orders the court made.

Petitioner filed an additional RFO on January 23, 2025, requesting the court order Respondent comply with Family Code section 2104 and serve Petitioner with her Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure. Respondent was served by mail on January 24, 2025. Respondent is seeking sanctions for the failure to comply with Family Code section 2104, pursuant to Family Code section 2107(c).

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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, due to Respondent’s failure to file a Responsive Declaration despite the fact that the RFO was properly and timely served, the court finds she has acquiesced to this request.

Family Code sections 2104 and 2105 impose on each party the obligation of making preliminary and final disclosures of assets within specified timeframes. Where a party fails to comply with their disclosure requirements, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). Where such a motion to compel is filed, “...the court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney’s fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust.” Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Here, Petitioner has established his compliance with Section 2104 as well as Respondent’s failure to do the same. Respondent has not submitted an explanation for her failure to comply with her disclosure obligations therefore, the court cannot find that he acted with substantial justification. The court grants Petitioner’s request. Respondent is ordered to serve Petitioner with her Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure on or before March 20, 2025.

Given the mandatory nature of Family Code section 2107(b), the court grants Petitioner’s request for sanctions in the amount of \$60 for the cost of filing this motion. Petitioner has not pleaded any additional costs incurred for the filing of this motion. Although he did refer to missing work, he has provided no evidence of such. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$60 on or before March 20, 2025 as and for monetary sanctions pursuant to Family Code section 2107(b).

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: PETITIONER’S REQUEST TO ADD THE ADDITIONAL PAGE IS GRANTED. THE COURT FINDS THE ADDITIONAL PAGE INCLUDES ORDERS THE COURT MADE. PETITIONER SHALL SUBMIT AMENDED FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING FOR THE JULY 23, 2024 HEARING TO THE COURT FOR SIGNATURE.

THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER’S MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONDENT’S PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE PETITIONER WITH HER PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE ON OR BEFORE MARCH 20, 2025. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER’S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$60 FOR THE COST OF FILING THIS MOTION. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$60 ON OR BEFORE MARCH 20, 2025.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE 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*

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

18. GREG HAWTHORNE V. KOREENA HAWTHORNE

24FL1162

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 13, 2024, requesting the court make orders as to temporary guideline spousal support as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Respondent was electronically served on December 13th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 13, 2025, along with an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served by mail on February 13, 2025. Respondent objects to the requested orders, as there is currently a temporary Domestic Violence Restraining Order in place. Respondent requests the court deny the requests, or in the alternative, continue the hearing until after the Domestic Violence Restraining Order request is heard on March 18th.

The court finds good cause to continue the RFO until after the Domestic Violence Restraining Order has been resolved. The matter is continued to 5/8/2025 at 8:30 AM in Department 5.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE RFO UNTIL AFTER THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER HAS BEEN RESOLVED. THE MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 5/8/2025 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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 6, 2025

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

19. JACQUELINE MULLINAX V. BRYAN MULLINAX

22FL0920

Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on December 13, 2024, alleging one count of contempt against Petitioner. 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO SERVE PETITIONER.

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 6, 2025

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

20. JOSEPHINE CONNELLY V. DAVID KRELL

24FL0134

Order to Show Cause Re: Contempt

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.

For judicial economy, the court on its own motion, continues the arraignment on the September 17th and December 23rd filed OSCs to March 13, 2025 at 1:30 PM.

Request for Order

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 18, 2024, requesting modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders as well as to enforce the current orders and a referral to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). Petitioner was personally served on October 20, 2024. Respondent is seeking joint legal and physical custody of the minors.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on January 2, 2025. Proof of Service shows it was personally served on January 2, 2025.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on January 8, 2025. Petitioner was personally served on January 9, 2025.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on January 23rd and another on February 18th. It is unclear if the January 23rd declaration has been filed. The court further notes it is 186 pages long, which the court finds to be excessive. The February 18th Declaration was served on Petitioner on February 18th. This declaration is 106 pages, which the court finds to be excessive as well.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds there has been a finding of domestic violence perpetrated by Respondent against Petitioner within the prior five years. As such, Family Code section 3044 applies. Section 3044 gives rise to a rebuttable presumption that an award of sole or joint physical or legal

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

custody to an individual who has perpetrated domestic violence is not in the best interest of the child. *Id.* “This presumption may only be rebutted by a preponderance of the evidence.” *Id.* To overcome the presumption, the perpetrator bears the burden of proving (1) giving sole or joint legal or physical custody to the perpetrator is in the best interest of the child; and (2) a balancing of the factors listed in Section 3044(b)(2) supports the legislative findings in Section 3020. Fam. Code § 3044(b). Among the factors to be considered are the following: Completion alcohol or drug abuse counseling, completion of a batterer’s treatment program, completion of a parenting class, compliance with terms and conditions of probation, parole or a restraining order, if any, and whether or not further acts of domestic violence have occurred. *Id.* The court finds Respondent has failed to set forth sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption. As such, the court finds the current orders remain in the minors’ best interests. The court is however, modifying the exchange location. All exchanges are to take place at the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Department. Any licensed and insured driver with proper child restrains may transport the minors. Petitioner is admonished, that failure to abide by court orders may result in sanctions, a modification of custody orders, and/or contempt.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: FOR JUDICIAL ECONOMY, THE COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION, CONTINUES THE ARRANGEMENT ON THE SEPTEMBER 17TH AND DECEMBER 23RD FILED OSCS TO MARCH 13, 2025 AT 1:30 PM.

THE COURT FINDS THERE HAS BEEN A FINDING OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PERPETRATED BY RESPONDENT AGAINST PETITIONER WITHIN THE PRIOR FIVE YEARS. AS SUCH, FAMILY CODE SECTION 3044 APPLIES. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO SET FORTH SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO REBUT THE PRESUMPTION. AS SUCH, THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINORS’ BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT IS HOWEVER, MODIFYING THE EXCHANGE LOCATION. ALL EXCHANGES ARE TO TAKE PLACE AT THE EL DORADO COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT. ANY LICENSED AND INSURED DRIVER WITH PROPER CHILD RESTRAINS MAY TRANSPORT THE MINORS. PETITIONER IS ADMONISHED, THAT FAILURE TO ABIDE BY COURT ORDERS MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS, A MODIFICATION OF CUSTODY ORDERS, AND/OR CONTEMPT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

21. MICHAELA RENEE JOHNSON V. MATTHEW ERIC JOHNSON

22FL0137

Petitioner filed an ex parte application on October 28, 2024, requesting property control orders. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration opposing the ex parte request. On October 29, 2024, the court denied the ex parte request. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 29, 2024, requesting property control orders for Red Line Engineering. Respondent was mailed served on October 31, 2024.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on December 20, 2024. Respondent was served the same day. Petitioner renews her request for property control or in the alternative to be removed from the lines of credit for the business.

Parties appeared for the hearing on January 2, 2025, and reached several agreements. The court continued the matter for trial setting to March 6, 2025. There have been no new filings since January 2nd.

The court orders parties to appear to select Mandatory Settlement Conference and trial dates.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT ORDERS PARTIES TO APPEAR TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

22. SAMUEL MATTILA V. KRISTIANNA HEIMAN

PFL20210271

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 20, 2024, requesting court authorization to travel for summer vacation on a cruise leaving from the port of Miami. Respondent was mail served on January 2, 2025.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application on January 7, 2025, requesting to advance the March 13, 2025, hearing date as the deadline for the final payment on the cruise is March 8th. On January 8th, the court granted the ex parte request and advanced the hearing to March 6th. Respondent was served with the ex parte orders on January 15, 2025.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 20, 2025. Petitioner was served on the same day.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on February 24, 2025. It was served on Respondent on February 21st. Petitioner filed a subsequent Reply Declaration on February 26, 2025, it was served on February 25th.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court finds Respondent has not set forth any grounds upon which the request should be denied. The court grants Petitioner's request for travel and authorizes the minor to travel with Petitioner on the cruise. Petitioner is authorized to travel with the minor from June 6, 2025, until return to the Sacramento area on June 14, 2025.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS NOT SET FORTH ANY GROUNDS UPON WHICH THE REQUEST SHOULD BE DENIED. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR TRAVEL AND AUTHORIZES THE MINOR TO TRAVEL WITH PETITIONER ON THE CRUISE. PETITIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO TRAVEL WITH THE MINOR FROM JUNE 6, 2025, UNTIL RETURN TO THE SACRAMENTO AREA ON JUNE 14, 2025. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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 6, 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 6, 2025

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

23. SHYLO RAE BELL V. CHRISTOPHER LOVELESS

22FL0232

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 16, 2024, requesting the court modify the current orders for child custody and child support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on October 4, 2024 and a review hearing on December 19th. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with a “Notice of Hearing” on October 4, 2024. The court notes the December 12, 2024 filed Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with any of the necessary documents.

Petitioner filed an amended Proof of Service on December 27, 2024, which shows Respondent was served with the RFO, and Income and Expense Declaration, a blank FL-320, and a blank FL-150. It further states that a total of 23 pages were served on Respondent, however, once again, it does not specify that all necessary documents were served.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment on October 4, 2024. As such a single parent report was filed on October 7, 2024 and mailed to the parties the same day.

On December 19, 2024, Petitioner appeared for the hearing. The court found good cause to continue the hearing and rerefer the parties to CCRC. The court set a further CCRC appointment for January 10, 2025, and a review hearing for March 6th. The court directed Petitioner to provide notice to Respondent.

Once again, only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on January 10, 2025. A second single parent report was filed with the court on January 10th and mailed to the parties on the same day.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on February 21, 2025. Respondent was electronically served on February 21st. In her Declaration, Petitioner’s Counsel recounts the notice to Respondent on the RFO and original referral to CCRC as well as the subsequent referral and review hearing date. Respondent and Petitioner’s Counsel corresponded via email wherein Respondent agreed to accept service via email.

Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on March 5th, though there is no Proof of Service for this document, and it is late filed therefore the court cannot consider it. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

24. VANESSA PREUSS V. KEVIN PREUSS

21FL0118

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency court orders on January 16, 2025. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration the same day. On January 17, 2025, the court denied the ex parte request but referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on February 4, 2025, and a further review hearing on March 6th. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 17th, seeking the same orders as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served on January 24, 2025.

Both parties attended CCRC on February 4, 2025. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on February 25, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court joins in the sentiments expressed in the CCRC report. The court appoints Minors' Counsel Rebecca Esty-Burke to the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the February 25th CCRC report as they are in the best interest of the minors. The court is ordering both parties to enroll in and complete a co-parenting class by no later than June 4, 2025. Parties are to file proof of completion with the court by no later than June 11, 2025. The court is also ordering the parties to enroll in co-parenting counseling as set forth in the February 25th CCRC report recommendations by no later than April 21, 2025. Parties are to file proof of enrollment and participation in co-parenting counseling with the court by no later than April 28, 2025. The parties are to ensure the minors are enrolled in counseling services as set forth in the February 25th CCRC report recommendations by no later than April 21, 2025. Parties are to file proof of enrollment and the minors' participation in counseling services by no later than April 28, 2025. The court is setting a further review hearing to ensure these orders are being complied with and to assess the parties' and minors' progress in counseling services, as well as to receive input from Minors' Counsel. The review hearing is scheduled for July 10, 2025, at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations and Minors' Counsel's Statement of Issues and Contentions are due at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

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 #24: THE COURT JOINS IN THE SENTIMENTS EXPRESSED IN THE CCRC REPORT. THE COURT APPOINTS MINORS' COUNSEL REBECCA ESTY-BURKE TO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

March 6, 2025

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

THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 25TH CCRC REPORT AS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT IS ORDERING BOTH PARTIES TO ENROLL IN AND COMPLETE A CO-PARENTING CLASS BY NO LATER THAN JUNE 4, 2025. PARTIES ARE TO FILE PROOF OF COMPLETION WITH THE COURT BY NO LATER THAN JUNE 11, 2025. THE COURT IS ALSO ORDERING THE PARTIES TO ENROLL IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 25TH CCRC REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 21, 2025. PARTIES ARE TO FILE PROOF OF ENROLLMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING WITH THE COURT BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 28, 2025. THE PARTIES ARE TO ENSURE THE MINORS ARE ENROLLED IN COUNSELING SERVICES AS SET FORTH IN THE FEBRUARY 25TH CCRC REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 21, 2025. PARTIES ARE TO FILE PROOF OF ENROLLMENT AND THE MINORS' PARTICIPATION IN COUNSELING SERVICES BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 28, 2025. THE COURT IS SETTING A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING TO ENSURE THESE ORDERS ARE BEING COMPLIED WITH AND TO ASSESS THE PARTIES' AND MINORS' PROGRESS IN COUNSELING SERVICES, AS WELL AS TO RECEIVE INPUT FROM MINORS' COUNSEL. THE REVIEW HEARING IS SCHEDULED FOR JULY 10, 2025, AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS AND MINORS' COUNSEL'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND CONTENTIONS ARE DUE AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING. 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.