

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

1. RONGJING BECKER V. GARY JAMES BECKER

25FL1187

On January 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody, visitation, and property control orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO or the CCRC referral. Additionally, neither party appeared at CCRC and Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

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

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

April 16, 2026

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

2. BRYAN CHAIX V. KRISTINA NEIDIGER

PFL20200265

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 16, 2025, seeking orders from the court to enter the judgment pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure 664.6 and reimbursement for overpayment of support. Respondent was served electronically on December 23, 2025. The court notes the Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on February 2, 2026. It was served electronically on February 2nd. Respondent consents in part to Petitioner's request and objects in part to the requests.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on February 6, 2026. It was served electronically the same day.

The matter was originally scheduled for hearing on February 19, 2026. The parties asked for a continuance, which was granted, and the hearing was continued to the present date.

On March 4, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a declaration.

The court finds there has not been a meeting of the minds of the parties as to the terms of the judgment. As such, the court is not entering the judgment pursuant to 664.6.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

3. LORA GERY V. GARY GERY

24FL1297

On August 22, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel discovery responses and bifurcation of the issue of date of separation. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were both served on August 25th, however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

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 requests 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 asks that the court set a trial date to determine the date of separation. He also asks for an order compelling Petitioner to provide further responses to Respondent’s Request for Production of Documents – By Respondent to Petitioner, Set No. 1 and sanctions in the amount of \$4,334.

Regarding the discovery motion, each party is permitted to use multiple methods of obtaining discovery to obtain information needed to prepare one’s case. Among the authorized forms of discovery is a request for the production of documents and other tangible things. “A party to whom a demand for inspection, copying, testing, or sampling has been directed shall respond separately to each item or category of item by any of the following:” (1) a statement that the party will comply, (2) a statement that the party lacks the ability to comply, or (3) an objection to the demand or request made. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2031.210.

After reviewing Respondent’s moving papers and the responses and amended Responses of Petitioner to the discovery requests, the court does find that the amended responses do not strictly comply with the Civil Discovery Act. Therefore, Respondent’s motion to compel is granted. Petitioner is ordered to serve further verified written responses with any non-privileged documents not previously produced to Respondent’s Request for Production of Documents – By Respondent to Petitioner, Set No. 1.

Sanctions are mandatory for one who “unsuccessfully *makes or opposes* a motion to compel a response...unless [the court] finds that one subject to the sanction acted with

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2031.300(c). In all other circumstances, the imposition of discovery sanctions is permissive. See Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.030 (the court *may* impose monetary sanctions for misuse of the discovery process). Conduct subject to discretionary sanctions includes, but is not limited to, “[m]aking an evasive response to discovery.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.010(f).

Where sanctions are awarded, the amount imposed is to include “...the reasonable expenses, including attorney’s fees, incurred by anyone as a result of...” the conduct of the party subject to sanction. Cal. Civ. Pro. 2023.030(a) & 2023.020. A party requesting sanctions must establish that the amount requested is reasonable, was incurred as a result of discovery abuse, and the requesting party must already be liable for those expenses before the court can award the costs as sanctions. See *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Servs.*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 1548 (2010) (anticipated costs for future deposition could not be included in award of sanctions). Notwithstanding the foregoing, the court is obligated to “...impose a one-thousand-dollar (\$1,000) sanction, payable to the requesting party...” if the court finds that the noncompliant party did not respond in good faith to a request for production of documents, or failed to make a reasonable good faith attempt to informally resolve a discovery dispute. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.050(a).

Here, while Petitioner did not oppose the motion, her responses were not entirely code compliant. Namely due to the use of the phrase “the production was allowed in whole” instead of affirming that “all documents...will be included in the production.” It does appear from the amended responses that she did produce the majority of the requested documents and the court does not find that she acted in bad faith. As such, the court is not ordering sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure Section 2023.050(a). And, while the court finds that sanctions may be warranted pursuant to § 2031.300(c), the court is concerned with Petitioner’s inability to pay which would make awarding the entire amount of sanctions unjust. Petitioner is therefore, sanctioned \$1,000. This amount is to be paid directly to Respondent’s attorney and may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$100 commencing on May 1, 2026, and continuing on the 1st of each month until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

The parties are ordered to appear to select a trial date on the issue of the date of separation.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT A TRIAL DATE ON THE ISSUE OF THE DATE OF SEPARATION.

RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO SERVE FURTHER VERIFIED WRITTEN RESPONSES WITH ANY NON-PRIVILEGED DOCUMENTS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRODUCED TO RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS – BY RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER, SET NO. 1.

PETITIONER IS SANCTIONED \$1,000. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY AND MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$100 COMMENCING ON MAY 1, 2026, AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

4. SARAH LAVAGNINO V. ANTHONY LAVAGNINO

PFL20090640

On January 30, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to enforce the court's prior orders. All required documents were personally served on February 23, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending request and chose not to file an opposition. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner asks the court to enforce its prior orders regarding sanctions and the marital residence located at 222 Price Way in Folsom. The Judgment of Dissolution was entered on January 21, 2011. Respondent failed to abide by those terms therefore, on May 1, 2014, the court entered an order imposing sanctions on Respondent and granting Petitioner the right to sell the marital residence. To date, Respondent has not complied and the residence has not been sold.

Pursuant to Family Code § 291 "[a] money judgment or judgment for possession or sale of property that is made or entered under this code, including a judgment for child, family, or spousal support, is enforceable until paid in full or otherwise satisfied." Fam. Code § 291.

Here, Respondent has repeatedly failed to comply with court orders and as such, the court retains jurisdiction to enforce those orders. Accordingly, Respondent is ordered to relinquish possession of the premises located at 222 Price Way in Folsom, CA immediately. Petitioner is authorized to sell the home and utilize Respondent's portion of the net proceeds to satisfy the balance owed to her pursuant to the court's prior orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO RELINQUISH POSSESSION OF THE PREMISES LOCATED AT 222 PRICE WAY IN FOLSOM, CA IMMEDIATELY. PETITIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO SALE THE HOME AND UTILIZE RESPONDENT'S PORTION OF THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

NET PROCEEDS TO SATISFY THE BALANCE OWED TO HER PURSUANT TO THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDERS.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

5. KIMBERLEE MCKINSEY V. MONTANA MCKINSEY

22FL0175

On October 28, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to set aside and vacate the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH) dated September 11, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on January 7, 2026. Petitioner objects to service and notes that the responsive declaration is being filed without waiving the defect in service.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: 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

April 16, 2026

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

6. ANNE MCNELIS V. FERRIS NUESMEYER

PFL20160411

This matter is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by Petitioner on January 26, 2026, as well as an Order to Show Cause (OSC) for Contempt issued January 27, 2026.

OSC Re: Contempt

Proof of service filed January 30, 2026, shows personal service of the OSC upon the Respondent that same day. Therefore, appearances are required at 8:30 a.m., Thursday, April 16, 2026, in Department Five.

RFO Filed January 26, 2026

Petitioner's RFO seeks to (1) impose monetary sanctions against the Respondent under Family Code section 271; and (2) authorize the Petitioner to make life insurance premium payments on Respondent's behalf and require Respondent to reimburse Petitioner, should Respondent fail to make any required premium payments. Petitioner filed a current Income and Expense Declaration (I&E) concurrently with her RFO.

Proof of Service filed January 27, 2026, shows the RFO and supporting documents were served upon the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) by mail that same day; and Proof of Service filed January 30, 2026, shows personal service upon the Respondent on January 30, 2026.

On February 20, 2026, Petitioner filed another I&E, a copy of which was served upon the Respondent and DCSS via mail that same day, according to the Proof of Service filed February 23, 2026.

On February 27, 2026, the DCSS submitted Respondent's current I&E. Proof of Service filed February 27, 2026, shows a copy of the same was served upon on Petitioner via mail on February 26, 2026.

On March 6, 2026, Petitioner's attorney submitted an "updating declaration." Proof of Service attached to the declaration shows it was served upon Respondent and the DCSS via mail on March 5, 2026.

The RFO shall trail the OSC proceeding.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. THE RFO SHALL TRAIL THE OSC PROCEEDING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

7. LINDSAY MOFFETT V. PETER MOFFETT

24FL1070

On July 24, 2025, the parties appeared for the hearing on Petitioner's March 28, 2025, filed Request for Order (RFO). The parties reached agreements, including setting a review hearing for November 20, 2025.

Respondent filed a Request to Reschedule the November 20th hearing as the vocational evaluation was still pending. The court granted the Request to Reschedule and set the hearing for January 29, 2026. That hearing was once again continued to the present date.

On March 12, 2026, Respondent filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration. On April 9th, Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Peter Moffett.

Respondent makes the following requests: (1) Set guideline pendente lite child support; (2) Set no spousal support; and (3) Order Petitioner to seek work consistent with the findings in Patrick Sullivan's report and her recent work experience.

After reviewing the filings, the court is making the following support orders. For the period of May 1, 2026 through July 14, 2026, the court is adopting the Xspouse attached as Exhibit B to Respondent's Supplemental Declaration and Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$2,917 per month for child support and \$594 for spousal support. Commencing on July 14, 2026 and continuing thereafter until further order of the court or termination by operation of law, the court is adopting the Xspouse report attached as Exhibit C to Respondent's Supplemental Declaration and Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$1,745 as and for child support and \$648 for spousal support.

The court is reserving jurisdiction over the issue of an arrears overpayment until the time of trial.

Petitioner is ordered to comply with the recommendations made in Patrick Sullivan's November 24, 2025 vocational evaluation report.

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: FOR THE PERIOD OF MAY 1, 2026 THROUGH JULY 14, 2026, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE XSPOUSE ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT B TO RESPONDENT'S

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION AND RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,917 PER MONTH FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND \$594 FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT. COMMENCING ON JULY 14, 2026 AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE XSPOUSE REPORT ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT C TO RESPONDENT'S SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION AND RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,745 AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND \$648 FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT.

THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION OVER THE ISSUE OF AN ARREARS OVERPAYMENT UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO COMPLY WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN PATRICK SULLIVAN'S NOVEMBER 24, 2025 VOCATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

8. MAHCOYA-ROSE OSTROM V. MATTHEW BAKER

26FL0050

On January 27, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

The parties were originally scheduled to attend CCRC on February 19th, however, due to inclement weather, neither party was able to appear. Accordingly, CCRC was rescheduled for March 26th.

Only Petitioner appeared at the rescheduled CCRC appointment. It is unclear if either parent was properly served with notice of the rescheduled date.

In light of the circumstances, the court finds it best to re-refer the parties to CCRC. The parties are to attend CCRC on Thursday, May 28th at 9:00 AM. A review hearing is set for Thursday, July 23rd at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Hearing on the RFO is continued to join with the CCRC review hearing. Supplemental Declarations are due to be served no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE PARTIES ARE TO ATTEND CCRC ON THURSDAY, MAY 28TH AT 9:00 AM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23RD AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. HEARING ON THE RFO IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE CCRC REVIEW HEARING. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE TO BE SERVED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

9. JEREMIAS SMITH V. NICOLE HAMPTON

25FL0954

This matter is on calendar for a review hearing set per the stipulation of the parties reached on January 8, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served his Supplemental Declaration and his Income and Expense Declaration on April 3, 2026.

Respondent filed her Income and Expense Declaration on April 6th and her Supplemental Declaration on April 7th. Both were served on April 6th.

Petitioner requests the following orders: (1) Order Respondent to cease involving the minor in parental conflicts, including discussions about custody, schedules, or disputes between the parents; (2) Reinforce that all custodial exchanges occur in accordance with the existing parenting plan (2/2/5/5), including adherence to actual school dismissal times for minimum and regular days. When school is in session, exchanges to occur at the minor's school. The parent receiving the minor shall have his or her custodial time begin at the time the other parent drops the child off at school. When school is not in session, exchanges to occur at Safeway on Bass Lake Road at 8:30am; (3) Require Respondent to provide timely and complete notice of all medical appointments and treatment for the minor; (4) Order Respondent to refrain from making unilateral decisions regarding the minor's activities or schedule in a manner that undermines shared decision-making; (5) Order the parties to attend mediation to set a holiday schedule; (6) Order 16 make up days for Petitioner due to Respondent's noncompliance with court orders; and (7) any other orders the court deems to be in the best interests of the minor.

Respondent makes the following requests: (1) Deny Petitioner's request for make-up parenting time for any dates prior to January 8, 2026; (2) Consider Petitioner's conduct in ruling on Petitioner's prior request for Family Code § 271 sanctions; (3) Order Petitioner to allow uninterrupted phone or video contact between the minor and Respondent and communicate in a respectful and civil manner through the co-parenting application; and (4) Deny Petitioner's requests for sanctions and attorney's fees.

First and foremost, the parties are admonished not to discuss matters of custody, schedules, parental disputes, or anything associated with the court proceedings with the minor. The parties were already ordered to refrain from doing so as part of the January 8, 2026 order. Violations of these orders may result in contempt of court or the court modifying custody.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

Also, as part of the court's prior order, the parties are to share joint legal custody. This means that both parties are ordered to provide timely and complete notice of all medical appointments of the minor. Moreover, neither party may make unilateral decisions regarding the minor's schedule or activities that would affect the other party's custodial time with the minor. If the minor is requesting to participate in an activity that would take place during the custodial time of both parties, then both parties must agree to that activity.

Regarding exchanges, when school is in session, the exchange shall occur at the time the minor is dropped off at school. This means if school is released early, or the minor needs to be picked up from school early, then the receiving parent is the parent to pick up the minor. When school is not in session, exchanges shall occur at Safeway on Bass Lake Road at 8:30am.

Petitioner's request for 16 make-up days with the minor is denied as there were no court orders regarding visitation in place prior to January 8th. Respondent is admonished that moving forward, the court may award make-up time should she fail to exchange the minor in accordance with the court ordered schedule.

The requests for attorney's fees and sanctions are both denied. The court finds that both parties have engaged in activity that frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement and reduce the cost of litigation.

The court is maintaining its prior orders regarding phone calls between the minor and the non-custodial parent.

The parties are referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on Monday, May 18th at 9:00 AM to address the issue of a holiday schedule. A review hearing is set for Thursday, July 16th at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing. The parties are admonished that the review hearing is solely to address the issue of a holiday schedule and Supplemental Declarations are to address that issue only. All other matters would require the filing of a new RFO.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED NOT TO DISCUSS MATTERS OF CUSTODY, SCHEDULES, PARENTAL DISPUTES, OR ANYTHING ASSOCIATED WITH THE COURT PROCEEDINGS WITH THE MINOR. THE PARTIES WERE ALREADY ORDERED TO REFRAIN FROM DOING SO AS PART OF THE JANUARY 8, 2026 ORDER. VIOLATIONS OF THESE ORDERS MAY RESULT IN CONTEMPT OF COURT OR THE COURT MODIFYING CUSTODY.

ALSO, AS PART OF THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER, THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. THIS MEANS THAT BOTH PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PROVIDE TIMELY AND COMPLETE NOTICE OF ALL MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS OF THE MINOR. MOREOVER, NEITHER PARTY MAY MAKE UNILATERAL DECISIONS REGARDING THE MINOR'S SCHEDULE OR ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD AFFECT THE OTHER PARTY'S CUSTODIAL TIME WITH THE MINOR. IF THE MINOR IS REQUESTING TO PARTICIPATE IN AN ACTIVITY THAT WOULD TAKE PLACE DURING THE CUSTODIAL TIME OF BOTH PARTIES, THEN BOTH PARTIES MUST AGREE TO THAT ACTIVITY.

REGARDING EXCHANGES, WHEN SCHOOL IS IN SESSION, THE EXCHANGE SHALL OCCUR AT THE TIME THE MINOR IS DROPPED OFF AT SCHOOL. THIS MEANS IF SCHOOL IS RELEASED EARLY, OR THE MINOR NEEDS TO BE PICKED UP FROM SCHOOL EARLY, THEN THE RECEIVING PARENT IS THE PARENT TO PICK UP THE MINOR. WHEN SCHOOL IS NOT IN SESSION, EXCHANGES SHALL OCCUR AT SAFEWAY ON BASS LAKE ROAD AT 8:30AM.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR 16 MAKE-UP DAYS WITH THE MINOR IS DENIED AS THERE WERE NO COURT ORDERS REGARDING VISITATION IN PLACE PRIOR TO JANUARY 8TH. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT MOVING FORWARD, THE COURT MAY AWARD MAKE-UP TIME SHOULD SHE FAIL TO EXCHANGE THE MINOR IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COURT ORDERED SCHEDULE.

THE REQUESTS FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND SANCTIONS ARE BOTH DENIED. THE COURT FINDS THAT BOTH PARTIES HAVE ENGAGED IN ACTIVITY THAT FRUSTRATES THE POLICY OF THE LAW TO PROMOTE SETTLEMENT AND REDUCE THE COST OF LITIGATION.

THE COURT IS MAINTAINING ITS PRIOR ORDERS REGARDING PHONE CALLS BETWEEN THE MINOR AND THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

THE PARTIES ARE REFERRED TO CHILD CUSTODY RECOMMENDING COUNSELING (CCRC) WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON MONDAY, MAY 18TH AT 9:00 AM TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF A HOLIDAY SCHEDULE. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, JULY 16TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED THAT THE REVIEW HEARING IS SOLELY TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF A HOLIDAY SCHEDULE AND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO ADDRESS THAT ISSUE ONLY. ALL OTHER MATTERS WOULD REQUIRE THE FILING OF A NEW RFO.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

10. LANE SQUIRES V. CAMBRIA SQUIRES

24FL1053

This matter is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Respondent on December 12, 2025, to (1) set child support; (2) set spousal support; (3) award tuition reimbursement as additional spousal support;¹ (4) award Respondent need-based attorney fees in the amount of \$15,000.00; and (5) impose sanctions against Petitioner in the amount of \$5,000.00. On December 22, 2025, the Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration (I&E). Two separate proofs of service, both filed December 22, 2025, show that the RFO and I&E were served upon the Petitioner by mail on December 17 and 22, 2025, respectively.

A hearing was originally set for March 12, 2026. However, the matter was continued twice, once upon Respondent's request, and again upon stipulation of the parties. On April 2, 2026, the Petitioner filed (1) a Responsive Declaration; (2) a declaration from his attorney, Amanda Paull, regarding the Respondent's request for attorney fees; (3) a memorandum of points and authorities; and (4) an I&E. Proof of service filed the same day shows that each of these documents was electronically served upon the Respondent on April 1, 2026.

On April 6, 2026, the Respondent filed a supplemental declaration, a copy of which was served upon the Petitioner by mail that same day according to the proof of service, also filed April 6, 2026. Respondent declares that her I&E filed December 12, 2025, is still correct as to her lack of income. (C. Squires Decl., filed Apr. 6, 2026, ¶ 2.)

On April 9, 2026, the Respondent filed an objection to and request to strike portions of the Petitioner's Responsive Declaration. The Respondent also filed a reply declaration. Proof of service filed April 9, 2026 shows that both of these filings were personally served upon the Petitioner's attorney that same day (the court notes, however, that the proof of service does not identify the name of the person at the attorney's office who was personally served).

Pursuant to Evidence Code section 1152,² Respondent objects to the following portions of Petitioner's Declaration in Attachment 10 to his Responsive Declaration: (1) the

¹ Respondent is returning to school to pursue a master's degree in Speech-Language Pathology. The court notes that the Respondent voluntarily agreed to submit to a vocational examination. On April 14, 2026, Petitioner lodged a copy of the vocational evaluation dated April 9, 2026. However, said evaluation was not timely submitted, and therefore, the court does not consider it in ruling on the instant RFO.

² Evidence Code section 1152, subdivision (a) provides in relevant part: "Evidence that a person has, in compromise..., furnished or offered or promised to furnish money... to

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

following portion of Paragraph 12: “The following response was received from Cambria: ‘The letter dated August 25, 2025, which purports to be a global settlement offer is hereby rejected. We will not be responding to it. In the future, after the discovery and receipt of documents are received and reviewed, we hope to be in a position to present our own offer of settlement, but it is premature at this point given the circumstances...’”; (2) Paragraph 13 in its entirety; and (3) Paragraph 14 in its entirety. The court sustains Respondent’s objections to these portions of Petitioner’s declaration and strikes them from the record. Respondent also objects to the following exhibits attached to Petitioner’s Responsive Declaration: Exhibits A, C, D, E, and M.

Respondent objects to Exhibit A (photographs of the marital residence) on the grounds of lack of foundation and hearsay. The court sustains the objections and strikes Exhibit A from the record.

Respondent objects to Exhibit C (Custody Xchange Schedule Document) on the grounds of lack of foundation, hearsay, and confidential mediation privilege. The court reserves on these objections because the court presently does not have enough information to make a ruling. For purposes of ruling on the instant RFO, the court has not considered Exhibit C at this time.

Respondent objects to Exhibit D (email from a confidential mediator regarding the parties’ oldest child’s adjustment to the custody schedule) and Exhibit E (the parties’ purported custody agreement) on the grounds of confidential mediation privilege. The court sustains the objections and strikes both Exhibits D and E from the record. The court notes that Exhibit E is not signed, and thus, not a fully executed agreement. Lastly, Respondent objects to Exhibit M (November 15, 2025, email correspondence between counsel) on the grounds that it is incomplete. Respondent’s objection indicates she will include in her reply declaration the complete conversation; indeed, Respondent did include the “Complete Email Chain Between Counsel October 30, 2025, through November 3, 2026.” However, the court will strike Exhibit M, as well as the emails submitted by Respondent in her reply declaration as hearsay.

Child Support and Spousal Support

The parties do not dispute the custody share of their three youngest children – Me.S. (age 13), Ta.S. (age 11), and Ti.S. (age 7) – who are under Respondent’s physical custody approximately 55 percent of the time; and under Petitioner’s physical custody

another who has sustained or will sustain or claims that he or she has sustained or will sustain loss or damage, as well as any conduct or statements made in negotiation thereof, is inadmissible to prove his or her liability for the loss or damage or any part of it.” (Evid. Code, § 1152, subd. (a).)

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

approximately 45 percent of the time. The court finds that the parties' oldest child, Ma.S. (age 18), who is a full-time high school student, is under Respondent's physical custody approximately 90 percent of the time; and under Petitioner's physical custody approximately 10 percent of the time.

Having reviewed and considered both parties' proposed XSpouse calculations, the court adopts the Respondent's XSpouse calculation attached to her April 6, 2026, reply. Therefore, the Petitioner is ordered to pay child support to the Respondent in the amount of \$8,790.00, and temporary spousal support to the Respondent in the amount of \$5,292.00. This order is effective January 1, 2026. Payments are due on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$56,328.00 for the months of January through April inclusive. The court is ordering Petitioner to pay Respondent \$7,041.00 per month as and for arrears beginning May 15, 2026. Further payments are due on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately eight months). If there is any missed or late payment, the full amount is due and owing.

Tuition Reimbursement

The court denies Respondent's request for tuition reimbursement because the RFO sets forth no legal authority upon which such relief can be granted.

Need-Based Attorney Fees

The court grants Respondent \$15,000.00 as advance on her community property share of the cash assets.

Sanctions

The court reserves on the issue of sanctions until the time of trial.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE RESPONDENT'S RFO IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY CHILD SUPPORT TO THE RESPONDENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,790.00, AND TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO THE RESPONDENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,292.00. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2026. PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$56,328.00 FOR THE MONTHS OF JANUARY THROUGH APRIL INCLUSIVE. THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$7,041.00 PER MONTH AS AND FOR

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

ARREARS BEGINNING MAY 15, 2026. FURTHER PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY EIGHT MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT, THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING.

THE RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR TUITION REIMBURSEMENT IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

THE COURT GRANTS THE RESPONDENT \$15,000.00 AS ADVANCE OF HER COMMUNITY PROPERTY SHARE OF CASH ASSETS.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE ISSUE OF SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY 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) 621-6275 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

April 16, 2026

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

11. KRISTINE WALLERMAN V. MERLE WALLERMAN

PFL20040449

On February 2, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding the equalization payment, attorney's fees, and sanctions. All required documents were personally served on February 9, 2026 in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 8, 2026. It was served on April 2nd.

Petitioner asks the court to order Respondent to immediately pay the equalization payment of \$9,672.65 with interest. She further requests attorney's fees and sanctions pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 2023.030 and Family Code § 271.

Respondent asks the court to deny the RFO in its entirety and find that no valid enforceable court order exists requiring Respondent to pay an equalization payment of \$9,672.65. Alternatively, find that Petitioner's claim is barred due to the doctrine of latches.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and the Marital Settlement Agreement (MSA) and it is unclear to the court how Petitioner has come to the conclusion that she is owed an equalization payment of \$9,672.65. Petitioner has failed to establish grounds for the requested order and therefore, the request is denied.

Because the underlying request for the equalization payment is denied, so too is the request for attorney's fees and sanctions.

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 #11: PETITIONER'S RFO IS DENIED IN ITS ENTIRETY. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

14. MARK BECKER V. LILLIAN BECKER

25FL0559

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 3, 2026, requesting the court order \$4,000 in spousal support. Respondent also is requesting Watts/Epstein credits. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on March 29, 2026. The court finds this to be untimely. Additionally, Petitioner was not served with Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration or a blank FL-150.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 30, 2026. Petitioner has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner does not raise the issue of the timeliness and incomplete service in his declaration; therefore, the court deems it to be waived. Petitioner objects to the requested amount of spousal support. Petitioner requests that Respondent be imputed with full time minimum wage income. Further Petitioner requests the court defer the issue of Watts and Epstein until the time of trial.

The court reserves on the issues of Watts and Epstein charges and/or credits until the time of trial.

Parties are ordered to appear on the request for spousal support. Petitioner is ordered to bring three copies of completed Income and Expense Declaration with him.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE REQUEST FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO BRING THREE COPIES OF COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH HIM.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE ISSUES OF WATTS AND EPSTEIN CHARGES AND/OR CREDITS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

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

April 16, 2026

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

15. PAMELA DEHERRERA V. JULIAN DEHERRERA

23FL0888

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 10, 2026, seeking property control and a move out order. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on March 20, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending request and chose not file an opposition. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on April 7, 2026. Respondent was served on April 6, 2026. The court finds this to be untimely, as it was filed less than 10 days prior to the hearing.

The court grants Petitioner’s motion in its entirety. Petitioner is granted exclusive use and control of the property. Respondent is to pay the property taxes owing for April 2026. Respondent is to vacate the property by no later than April 30, 2026.

Respondent is ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home in furtherance of its sale. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional to make the home available for showings and to communicate with the real estate professional as needed. The real estate professional is authorized to determine the listing price for the home. The parties are ordered to accept any reasonable offer for the purchase of the home if one is received. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner. The court reserves jurisdiction over all aspects of the sale and distribution of the net proceeds of the sale, including, but not limited to, the court’s authority to direct the clerk to act as elisor for Respondent’s signature if necessary.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however, this order is effective immediately upon the court’s adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S MOTION IN ITS ENTIRETY. PETITIONER IS GRANTED EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY. RESPONDENT IS TO PAY THE PROPERTY TAXES OWING FOR APRIL 2026. RESPONDENT IS TO VACATE THE PROPERTY BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 30, 2026.

RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL IS AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE THE LISTING PRICE FOR THE HOME. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE COURT'S AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO ACT AS ELISOR FOR RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE IF NECESSARY.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

April 16, 2026

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

16. JAMIE LUPER V. RICHARD LIMING

PFL20180266

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 23, 2026, following the court's denial of her ex parte application for emergency custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 20, 2026, and a review hearing on April 16, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Both parties appeared at CCRC, however, Respondent did not participate as he asserted he had not been properly served with the moving papers. Despite this, the CCRC counselor produced a report with recommendations. It was filed with the court on March 27, 2026 and copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 3, 2026. It was served on Petitioner on April 3, 2026. Respondent objects to the court hearing the matter as he was never properly served. Further, there are Domestic Violence Restraining Orders out of Sacramento County, which protect the minors.

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 #16: 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

17. BEVERLY MOORE V. KENNETH MOORE

25FL0651

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order appointing the clerk of the court as elisor. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on April 2, 2026. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states, “[u]nless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. That would have made March 24, 2026, the last day for service.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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

April 16, 2026

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

18. KRISTY REDPATH V. THOMAS PISILLO

21FL0148

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 28, 2026, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders, child support, as well as a name change for the minor. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 19, 2026, and a review hearing on April 16, 2026. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on January 29, 2026. It does not appear Respondent was served with all the required documents, namely a blank FL-320 and Blank FL-150.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on February 19, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on February 23, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration or Income and Expense Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the defects in service.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE DEFECTS IN 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

19. JESSICA RUBALCAVA V. ISIAH RUBALCAVA

24FL0018

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 18, 2026, requesting spousal support as well as modification of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on February 13, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 2, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served electronically on April 6, 2026. Respondent asserts he was not 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

20. GAGE TAYLOR V. KAYLA TAYLOR

23FL1171

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 13, 2026, requesting reimbursement for uninsured medical expenses as well as enforcement of sanctions. Respondent and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) were personally served on March 13, 2026 and March 16, 2026 respectively.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on March 25, 2026, requesting the child support issues be heard in Department 10, before the child support commissioner. Petitioner and Respondent were served on March 24, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 8, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document. Even if the document had been properly served, Code of Civil Procedure section 1005(b) 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 April 3rd the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

The court finds good cause to continue this matter to be heard on (Monday, June 22nd at 8:30 AM) in Department 10. The court reserves jurisdiction over the request for sanctions.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THIS MATTER TO BE HEARD ON (MONDAY, JUNE 22ND AT 8:30 AM) IN DEPARTMENT 10. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

21. REGINA WILKIN V. WILLIAM WILKIN

26FL0229

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 11, 2026, requesting Respondent have exclusive use and control of the former marital residence and that Respondent be responsible for all costs associated with the home. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 24, 2026. It was served on Respondent on March 25, 2026. Respondent objects to the requested orders. Respondent proposes all payments be shared equally, except the Regions Bank loan for the pool.

The court grants Petitioner's request that Respondent be granted exclusive use and control of the former marital residence. Respondent shall be responsible for all costs as set forth in Petitioner's RFO. The court reserves on reallocation of the costs at final disposition, as well as all Watts Charges and Epstein credits.

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 #21: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST THAT RESPONDENT BE GRANTED EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF THE FORMER MARITAL RESIDENCE. RESPONDENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COSTS AS SET FORTH IN PETITIONER'S RFO. THE COURT RESERVES ON REALLOCATION OF THE COSTS AT FINAL DISPOSITION, AS WELL AS ALL WATTS CHARGES AND EPSTEIN CREDITS.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

April 16, 2026

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

22. MICHAEL WOODARD V. AMBER ASHLEY

25FL0885

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 6, 2026, requesting child and temporary guideline spousal support, as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was served electronically on March 10, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 3, 2026, along with an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner also filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities. Respondent was served electronically on April 3, 2026. Petitioner submits on the request for guideline child and temporary spousal support. Petitioner objects to Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner asserts Respondent's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees is defective due to Respondent not including the requisite information and that the fees are unreasonable.

Respondent filed a Reply on April 9, 2026. It was electronically served the same day. Respondent disputes Petitioner's calculation of income. Further Respondent addresses the issues raised by Petitioner regarding the attorney's fees request and the request to split an escrow disbursement check.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court adopts the proposed X-Spouse included as Exhibit 1 in Petitioner's Responsive Declaration, including the bonus/overtime table.

The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$459 per month as and for guideline child support. This order is effective March 15, 2026, with payments due on the 15th of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$918 for the months of March and April inclusive. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$229.50 as and for arrears on May 1, 2026, with future payments due on the 1st of each month until paid in full (approximately four months). If there are any missed or late payments, the full amount is due and owing along with legal interest.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children, as well as childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures set forth in the FL-192.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

The court finds temporary guideline spousal support to be \$511 per the Alameda formula, payable from Petitioner to Respondent. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$511 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support effective March 15, 2026, with payments due on the 15th of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$1,022 for the months of March and April inclusive. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$255.50 as and for arrears effective May 1, 2026, with further payments due on the 1st of each month until paid in full (approximately four months). If there is any missed or late payment, the full amount is due and owing with legal interest.

The court denies Petitioner's request to split the escrow disbursement. The court finds Respondent utilized the disbursement to community expenses.

Turning to Respondent's request for Family Code Section 2030 attorney's fees. The public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." *In re Marriage of Keech*, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. "In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party's case adequately." *Id.* at (b). Financial resources are only one factor to be considered though. *Id.* In addition to the parties' financial resources, the court may consider the parties' trial tactics. *In Re Marriage of Falcone & Fyke*, 203 Cal. App. 4th 964; 975 (2012).

The court finds Respondent has set forth the bare minimum information required for the court to ascertain whether an award of attorney's fees would be appropriate. The court further finds Respondent's fees are not unreasonable. However, the court finds after the payment of support, Petitioner does not have the ability to pay for both his attorney's fees and Petitioner's. Further, the court finds Petitioner has sufficient resources available,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

namely the cash funds as set forth in section 11 of her Income and Expense Declaration, to pay for counsel. As such, the request for attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code section 2030 is denied.

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 (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 #22: THE COURT ADOPTS THE PROPOSED X-SPOUSE INCLUDED AS EXHIBIT 1 IN PETITIONER'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATION, INCLUDING THE BONUS/OVERTIME TABLE.

THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$459 PER MONTH AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE MARCH 15, 2026, WITH PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$918 FOR THE MONTHS OF MARCH AND APRIL INCLUSIVE. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$229.50 AS AND FOR ARREARS ON MAY 1, 2026, WITH FUTURE PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY FOUR MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT, THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING ALONG WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING MONTHLY SUPPORT PAYMENTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SHARE IN ANY UNINSURED MEDICAL CARE COSTS FOR THE CHILDREN, AS WELL AS CHILDCARE COSTS WHEN SUCH COSTS ARE INCURRED AS A RESULT OF EMPLOYMENT OR NECESSARY EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE FL-192.

THE COURT FINDS TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO BE \$511 PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA, PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$511 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT EFFECTIVE MARCH 15, 2026, WITH PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$1,022 FOR THE MONTHS OF MARCH AND APRIL INCLUSIVE. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$255.50 AS AND FOR ARREARS EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2026, WITH FURTHER PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY FOUR MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT, THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO SPLIT THE ESCROW DISBURSEMENT. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT UTILIZED THE DISBURSEMENT TO COMMUNITY EXPENSES.

THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS SET FORTH THE BARE MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE COURT TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. THE COURT FURTHER FINDS RESPONDENT'S FEES ARE NOT UNREASONABLE. HOWEVER, THE COURT FINDS AFTER THE PAYMENT OF SUPPORT, PETITIONER DOES NOT HAVE THE ABILITY TO PAY FOR BOTH HIS ATTORNEY'S FEES AND PETITIONER'S. FURTHER, THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER HAS SUFFICIENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE, NAMELY THE CASH FUNDS AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 11 OF HER INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION, TO PAY FOR COUNSEL. AS SUCH, THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 IS DENIED.

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 (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 16, 2026

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