

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**1. ESPERANZA WOOLEVER V. CHRISTOPHER WOOLEVER**

**PFL20180325**

On January 14, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel discovery responses. It was served along with all other required documents on January 16<sup>th</sup> and again on January 19<sup>th</sup>.

On August 25, 2025, Respondent served Petitioner with Demand for Production of Documents and Tangible Things; Set One (Amended). The requests were served electronically thereby making responses due on or before September 25, 2025. As of the date of filing the RFO, no responses had been served. Respondent requests an order compelling Petitioner to respond within 10 days of the hearing date, monetary sanctions in the amount of \$2,000 and attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,500. It is unclear whether both of these requests are made as discovery sanctions or if Respondent is requesting the \$2,500 as need-based attorney's fees.

The Civil Discovery Act authorizes all parties to request documents from the opposing party by way of a Request for Production of Documents. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2031.210. Responses to requests for production are due within 30 days of the date of service. Cal Civ. Pro. §2031.300. Where a party fails to provide timely responses the party to whom the discovery was directed waives "any objection...including one based on privilege or on the protection of work product..." and "[t]he party making the demand may move for an order compelling response[s]..." Cal Civ. Pro. §2031.300(a).

Here, Respondent has sufficiently established Petitioner's failure to comply with her discovery obligations. Respondent has provided the court with copies of the discovery as well as the proofs of service thereof. As such, Respondent's Motion to Compel is granted. Petitioner shall provide full and complete verified responses, without objections, to Demand for Production of Documents and Tangible Things; Set One (Amended) no later than April 12, 2026.

Under the circumstances it appears monetary sanctions are also warranted. Where a party engages in the misuse of the discovery process, the court "shall" impose monetary sanctions "unless it finds that one subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Cal. Civ. Pro. 2023.030(a)(emphasis added) & 2023.020. Misuse of the discovery process includes, but is not limited to, failing to respond or submit to an authorized method of discovery. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.010. A party requesting sanctions for reasonable expenses that were incurred as a result of discovery abuse must already be liable for those expenses

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

before the court can award the costs as sanctions. See *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Servs.*, 186 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1548 (2010) (anticipated costs for future deposition could not be included in award of sanctions).

“... [I]n addition to any other sanctions imposed ...a court *shall* 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).

By failing to provide full and complete, verified responses within the allotted timeframe, Petitioner has engaged in misuse of the discovery process. That said, Respondent has not established that he has incurred \$2,500 worth of attorney’s fees associated solely with misuse of the discovery process (i.e. meet and confer efforts, preparation and filing of the motion, etc.). Moreover, the court does not find \$2,500 incurred to be reasonable where no responses were ever served thus making the meet and confer efforts and preparation of the motion rather quick and straightforward. As such, the court finds \$750 to be a more reasonable amount of fees incurred. Additionally, because Petitioner failed to produce documents, she is sanctioned \$1,000 pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2023.050(a).

Respondent is awarded \$1,750 in sanctions. Sanctions are to be paid by Petitioner directly to Respondent’s attorney. They may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$97.22 commencing on April 15, 2026 and continuing on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month until paid in full (approximately 18 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

To the extent the request for \$2,500 in attorney’s fees is pursuant to Family Code § 2030, the request is denied due to failure to file the requisite paperwork.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED. PETITIONER SHALL PROVIDE FULL AND COMPLETE VERIFIED RESPONSES, WITHOUT OBJECTIONS, TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND TANGIBLE THINGS; SET ONE (AMENDED) NO LATER THAN APRIL 12, 2026.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**RESPONDENT IS AWARDED \$1,750 IN SANCTIONS. SANCTIONS ARE TO BE PAID BY PETITIONER DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY. THEY MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$97.22 COMMENCING ON APRIL 15, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 15<sup>TH</sup> OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 18 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.**

**TO THE EXTENT THE REQUEST FOR \$2,500 IN ATTORNEY'S FEES IS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2030, THE REQUEST IS DENIED DUE TO FAILURE TO FILE THE REQUISITE PAPERWORK.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**2. BRANDON BERUMEN V. ZSANENN WARD-THOMAS**

**PFL20200128**

On November 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, attorney's fees and sanctions. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith.

All required documents were served by mail on Respondent on November 12, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), though they are a party to the action and the filing of an RFO necessitates service on all parties especially in instances where the request is for custody orders which may affect DCSS' decision to seek amended support orders.

Additionally, this is a post-judgment request for modification of custody orders. As such, it was required to be personally served or, if served by mail, Petitioner was required to complete and file a Declaration Regarding Address Verification – Post Judgment Request to Modify a Child Custody, Visitation, or Child Support Order. See Fam. Code § 215. There is no such declaration in the file.

On December 29, 2025, Respondent filed a letter of participation in the Safe at Home, Confidential Address program.

On January 12, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Brandon Berumen in Support to [sic] Recuse Mediator Norman Labat. On January 13<sup>th</sup> Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration of Brandon Berumen in Support of the Request for Order.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Nevertheless, despite the defect in service of the RFO, both parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 10, 2025. The parties were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on March 19, 2026, it was mailed to the parties on March 20, 2026. Because both parties attended CCRC, the court finds good cause to proceed with the merits of the RFO.

On March 25<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Brandon Berumen in Response to the CCRC Report and in Support of the Request for Order.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor children as well as several other custody and visitation requests as set forth in his moving papers. He also requests \$2,500 in attorney's fees and costs.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**3. FRANCES D'AGOSTINI V. ROBERT D'AGOSTINI**

**23FL1070**

On January 20, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and orders regarding the payment of appraisal services. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. On January 23<sup>rd</sup>, she filed a Declaration of Attorney in Support of RFO. All documents were served on January 26<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on March 18<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served her Reply Declaration in Support of RFO on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Petitioner is requesting guideline temporary spousal support retroactive to December 22, 2023 based on a monthly income of \$102,189 for Respondent. She also requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$25,000 and an order for Respondent to pay appraisal costs subject to further allocation by the court. Finally, she asks that Respondent be ordered to reinstate Petitioner to her Board of Directors position for J&R Equipment Leasing.

Respondent opposes the requests and argues that his income is far less than the amount requested by Petitioner. Respondent asks that the court order the completion of the refinance with funds to be placed in an attorney trust account. He argues the funds may be used to pay for the appraisals and an agreed upon sum to be disbursed to each party for attorney fees and expenses. He further opposes the request for attorney's fees and the request to re-appoint Petitioner to the Board of Directors to J&R leasing.

Given that the parties are pending trial in just two months, the court is maintaining the current spousal support orders until the time of trial. It appears that spousal support is already an issue included in the trial, however, in an abundance of caution, the court is continuing the issue of spousal support to join with the trial commencing on June 1, 2026 at 8:30am in Department 5. The court reserves jurisdiction to award support back to December 22, 2023.

Regarding the appraisal fees, attorney's fees, and the refinance of the home, the parties are ordered to appear on these issues and to address why the home should not just be ordered sold at this juncture.

Finally, turning to the request to re-appoint Petitioner to the Board of Directors for J&R Leasing, Inc., if J&R Leasing is not a party to the action then the court does not believe

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

it has jurisdiction to make such an order. It appears Petitioner's remedy would be in civil court.

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 #3: GIVEN THAT THE PARTIES ARE PENDING TRIAL IN JUST TWO MONTHS, THE COURT IS MAINTAINING THE CURRENT SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDERS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. IT APPEARS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT IS ALREADY AN ISSUE INCLUDED IN THE TRIAL, HOWEVER, IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION, THE COURT IS CONTINUING THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO JOIN WITH THE TRIAL COMMENCING ON JUNE 1, 2026 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AWARD SUPPORT BACK TO DECEMBER 22, 2023.**

**REGARDING THE APPRAISAL FEES, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND THE REFINANCE OF THE HOME, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THESE ISSUES AND TO ADDRESS WHY THE HOME SHOULD NOT JUST BE ORDERED SOLD AT THIS JUNCTURE.**

**FINALLY, TURNING TO THE REQUEST TO RE-APPOINT PETITIONER TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR J&R LEASING, INC., IF J&R LEASING IS NOT A PARTY TO THE ACTION THEN THE COURT DOES NOT BELIEVE IT HAS JURISDICTION TO MAKE SUCH AN ORDER. IT APPEARS PETITIONER'S REMEDY WOULD BE IN CIVIL COURT.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**4. ROBERT WILLIAM DRAPER V. REBEKAH GAYLENE DRAPER**

**23FL1109**

On January 13, 2026, Minor's Counsel filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel Petitioner to bring the children to meet with Minor's Counsel. She filed a Declaration of Luke Warner and a Declaration of Rebecca Burke in support of the RFO. There is no Proof of Service for the moving papers therefore this matter is dropped from calendar.

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: 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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**5. TIFFANY HENDERSON V. SAMUEL HENDERSON**

**24FL1253**

On January 8, 2026, parties reached stipulations which the court adopted as its orders. Included was a review hearing set for April 2, 2026 to address the issues of custody and parenting time, as well as, progress on the sale of the home.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on March 23, 2026 as well as a Declaration of Respondent's Therapist. Both documents were served on Petitioner on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Petitioner has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**6. TASHA HOYT V. MICHAEL HOYT**

**25FL0460**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 4, 2025, seeking parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on July 2, 2025. Respondent was personally served on June 5, 2025.

Petitioner also filed an RFO in case number 25FL0458 seeking child support, spousal support, and attorney's fees.

Both parties had filed Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) requests which were set to be heard on September 9<sup>th</sup>. Given the pending DVRO requests, CCRC recommended the parties be re-referred upon resolution of the restraining order issues.

At the September 9<sup>th</sup> hearing, the court granted Petitioner's DVRO request and denied Respondent's. The parties were re-referred to CCRC, and a hearing was set for November 20<sup>th</sup> on the issues of custody, property control, child/spousal support, and attorney's fees. At the November 20<sup>th</sup> hearing, the court ordered a civil stand-by for Respondent to retrieve her personal property and the parties stipulated to continue all issues to the present date.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on October 21<sup>st</sup> along with an RFO seeking property control orders and sanctions. The RFO was originally filed ex parte therefore Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Orders the same day the RFO was filed.

The parties attended CCRC on October 1<sup>st</sup> and were unable to reach any agreements. As such, a report with custody and visitation recommendations was prepared on November 6<sup>th</sup> and sent to the parties on November 7<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended the hearing on the pending RFOs December 18, 2025 at which time they reached a stipulation on all issues. As part of that stipulation the court set a review hearing for the present date.

On March 23, 2023, Respondent filed and served an Updating Declaration.

Also on March 23<sup>rd</sup>, Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration. She filed and served her Reply Declaration to Respondent's Updating Declaration on March 25<sup>th</sup>.

On March 26<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed and served an Attorney Declaration.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Respondent asks the court to make a finding that he has overcome the § 3044 presumption. He requests joint legal custody and 50/50 physical custody utilizing a 2/2/3 plan. He also asks the court to set a holiday schedule. Finally, he asks that Petitioner be ordered to allow Respondent access to the home to gather his possessions.

Petitioner is renewing her request for child support, spousal support and attorney's fees. She further asks the court to maintain the current visitation schedule and order her proposed holiday schedule. She further requests an order for Respondent to immediately bring all past-due accounts current and provide a current statement for the car, mortgage, and utilities. She asks that Respondent be ordered to pay the children's extracurricular activities and reimburse Petitioner \$994.98 for tires and a cheer deposit she paid.

The requests regarding the tires, the cheer deposit, payment of the extracurricular activities, and payment of all past-due accounts are outside the scope of the current review hearing and therefore a new RFO must be filed to address those issues.

The parties are ordered to appear on the issues of custody, visitation, holidays and the § 3044 presumption. The parties are also ordered to appear on the issues of child and spousal support. Respondent is ordered to bring with him a completed Income and Expense Declaration with the required supporting documents.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE REQUESTS REGARDING THE TIRES, THE CHEER DEPOSIT, PAYMENT OF THE EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, AND PAYMENT OF ALL PAST-DUE ACCOUNTS ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE CURRENT REVIEW HEARING AND THEREFORE A NEW RFO MUST BE FILED TO ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES.**

**THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUES OF CUSTODY, VISITATION, HOLIDAYS AND THE § 3044 PRESUMPTION. THE PARTIES ARE ALSO ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUES OF CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO BRING WITH HIM A COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**7. SUNG LEE V. YUNJEE AHN**

**25FL1114**

On January 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and property control orders. The RFO was served on January 12<sup>th</sup> however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, nor was a blank FL-320.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 19<sup>th</sup>, it was served on March 18<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on February 2, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements and as such, a report with recommendations was prepared on March 19, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the children with a 2/2/5 schedule. He further requests temporary exclusive use and possession of the home located at 11084 International Drive in Rancho Cordova. He agrees to be responsible for timely payment of the mortgage for the property. He asks that the parties be ordered to use Our Family Wizard for communications and that the parties be ordered to respond to messages within 24 hours. He proposes a co-parenting class for the parties and asks that the court make any additional orders as it deems proper. Finally, he asks that Respondent be ordered not to use the children in online advertisements.

Respondent asks the court to issue custody and visitation orders and order that neither parent involve the children in adult disputes or litigation matters. She asks for an order precluding both parents from making disparaging remarks about the other parent in the presence of the children. She asks that the parties each be ordered to complete a co-parenting class and order the parties to utilize a co-parenting communication platform. She asks that the court make any additional orders it deems necessary or appropriate in the best interests of the children.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the recommendations contained in the March 19, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors, they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Additionally, Respondent is ordered not to use the children in advertisements, including but not limited to online Facebook advertisements. This order does not preclude Respondent from posting photos of the children on her own personal Facebook page for purposes other than commercial advertisement.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Petitioner shall have temporary exclusive use and possession of the residence located at 11084 International Drive in Rancho Cordova. He is ordered to timely pay the mortgage and all other expenses associated with his occupancy of the home.

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 #7: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES FIND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 19, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS, THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ADDITIONALLY, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED NOT TO USE THE CHILDREN IN ADVERTISEMENTS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ONLINE FACEBOOK ADVERTISEMENTS. THIS ORDER DOES NOT PRECLUDE RESPONDENT FROM POSTING PHOTOS OF THE CHILDREN ON HER OWN PERSONAL FACEBOOK PAGE FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENT.**

**PETITIONER SHALL HAVE TEMPORARY EXCLUSIVE USE AND POSSESSION OF THE RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 11084 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE IN RANCHO CORDOVA. HE IS ORDERED TO TIMELY PAY THE MORTGAGE AND ALL OTHER EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH HIS OCCUPANCY OF THE HOME.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**8. SUKHDEEP NATT V. GUNEET NATT**

**25FL0866**

On November 13, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, spousal support, attorney's fees, and an order for Respondent to pay for extracurricular activities and school tuition for the children. All required documents were served by mail on November 14<sup>th</sup>. The Proof of Service indicates that a "courtesy copy of endorsed Income and Expense Declaration" was served, however after reviewing the court's file it does not appear that an Income and Expense Declaration was filed concurrently with the RFO. That said, Petitioner did file an Income and Expense Declaration on March 18, 2026. It was served on March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 19<sup>th</sup>. She filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on March 27<sup>th</sup>.

The Reply Declaration of Sukhdeep Natt in Support of RFO Filed on 11/13/2025 was filed on March 27, 2026. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all reply papers are to be filed at least five court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made March 25, 2026 the last day for filing Petitioner's Reply Declaration. Therefore, it is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Given that the RFO includes requests for support orders, the court is concerned with the untimely filings of Income and Expense Declarations by both parties. Pursuant to El Dorado County Rule of Court rule 8.03.01, the party requesting support shall file and serve their Income and Expense Declaration with the initial moving papers. Likewise, the party responding to a request for support must file an Income and Expense Declaration with his or her responsive documents or, where no responsive documents are filed, no less than 5 days prior to the hearing date. El Dorado Sup. Ct. Rule 8.03.01.

Here, Petitioner did not file his Income and Expense Declaration until March, over 4 months after filing the moving papers. Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration was also untimely as it was not filed with her Responsive Declaration. The court is inclined to drop this matter given the procedural defects. That said, it appears the parties are calendared for hearing on July 2<sup>nd</sup> on the issues of custody and visitation. The court is continuing this matter to join with the July 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing at 8:30am in Department 5. The

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

additional time should give both parties sufficient time to review and address the Income and Expense Declaration of the opposing party. Any supplemental declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date.

**TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE COURT IS CONTINUING THIS MATTER TO JOIN WITH THE JULY 2<sup>ND</sup> HEARING AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

**24FL0362**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FEBRUARY 27, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.**

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**10. MICHAEL BENJAMIN WOODARD V. AMBER LEIGH ASHLEY**

**25FL0885**

On January 6, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and sanctions. All required documents were served on January 8, 2026.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Declaration of Lucas Sprenkel on March 19<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on February 2<sup>nd</sup>. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 20, 2026.

The Declaration of Petitioner Michael Woodward in Reply was filed and served on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner filed an Objection to Petitioner's [Late] Reply Declaration and Request to Strike.

The court finds the Reply Declaration to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b). Section 1005(b) mandates all reply papers to be filed at least five court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made March 25<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing Petitioner's Reply. Therefore, it is late filed. Respondent's objection is sustained. The Reply Declaration has not been read or considered by the court.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor with a 2-2-5 schedule and a holiday schedule and vacation time. He further asks that each party place \$50,000 in trust pending final dissolution of the marriage due to potential property issues. Finally, he requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,500 due to Respondent's failure to respond to meet and confer efforts on these issues.

Respondent agrees to joint legal custody and joint physical custody. She also agrees to the proposed 2-2-5-5 schedule with the caveat that the minor be returned to Respondent's care by 8pm the evening before Petitioner's early morning shift and that Petitioner be ordered to take the minor to all of her previously enrolled extracurricular and school activities. In the event Petitioner cannot provide such transportation, Respondent asks that she be allowed to provide transportation for these events. She opposes the request regarding the home sale proceeds and the request for sanctions.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the March 20, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Regarding the request to put funds in trust, 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 equally divide the community estate, the court holds broad discretion to "...make any orders [it] considers necessary..." Fam. Code § 2553. Here, other than citing anticipated "potential property issues" Petitioner provides no basis for his requested order. Given that he has failed to show that an order for the parties to deposit funds in trust is necessary to ensure the community estate is divided equally, the request is denied.

Turning to Petitioner's request for sanctions, the request does not cite any statutory basis. Presumably the request is made pursuant to Family Code § 271 which states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a).

Here, it does appear that the failure to meet and confer on the part of Respondent's attorney was inadvertent. That said, almost a month passed from the date of the meet and confer email until the filing of the RFO. Generally, the court would be inclined to order sanctions, however according to Respondent's counsel an attempt to meet and confer was made after receipt of the RFO and that attempt went unanswered by Petitioner's counsel. Ultimately, because both parties have been less than responsive in attempting to resolve this matter informally the court is not awarding sanctions. However, both parties are admonished that continued failure to meet and confer may result in monetary sanctions in the future.

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.

**TENATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 20, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE REQUEST FOR**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**EACH PARTY TO DEPOSIT \$50,000 IN TRUST IS DENIED. THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS DENIED. HOWEVER, BOTH PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED THAT CONTINUED FAILURE TO MEET AND CONFER MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE FUTURE.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**11. CHEYENNE BONARI V. JOHN HARTSOUGH**

**24FL0767**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 6, 2026, seeking a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had attended within the prior six months. Respondent was served with only the request for order on February 6, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services was served.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on March 19, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 23 and again on March 24<sup>th</sup>. The court granted the ex parte request in part on March 24, 2026 and referred the parties to an emergency set CCRC appointment for April 7, 2026 and a review hearing set for May 7, 2026. Respondent was served on March 24, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services was served.

On its own motion, for judicial economy, the court continues the matter to May 7, 2026. Petitioner is directed to perfect service.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #11: ON ITS OWN MOTION, FOR JUDICIAL ECONOMY, THE COURT CONTINUES THE MATTER TO MAY 7, 2026. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PERFECT SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS, INCLUDING THE EX PARTE ORDERS, REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**12. KRYSTAL CADWALLADER V. JOSEPH MECREDDY**

**25FL0641**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 9, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 6, 2026, and a review hearing on April 2, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at CCRC and were able to reach agreements on all matters, except on where Respondent's parenting time will take place. A report with the parties' agreements as well as a recommendation for location of Respondent's parenting time was filed with the court on February 19, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

The court finds good cause to proceed despite the lack of proper service as Respondent fully participated in CCRC and is aware of the requests being made by Petitioner. The court had read and considered the February 19<sup>th</sup> CCRC report. The court finds the agreements of the parties to be in the best interests of the minor. The court however, does not find the recommendation that Respondent's parenting time not take place at the transitional house to be in the minor's best interest. The court disagrees with the CCRC counselor's assessment of the transitional house. As such, Respondent's parenting time may take place at the transitional home, if permitted by the program.

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 #12: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS RESPONDENT FULLY PARTICIPATED IN CCRC AND IS AWARE OF THE REQUESTS BEING MADE BY PETITIONER. THE COURT HAD READ AND CONSIDERED THE FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT. THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT HOWEVER, DOES NOT FIND THE RECOMMENDATION THAT RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME NOT TAKE PLACE AT THE TRANSITIONAL HOUSE TO BE IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. AS SUCH, RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME MAY TAKE PLACE AT THE TRANSITIONAL HOME, IF PERMITTED BY THE PROGRAM. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**13. CARLA FORREST V. GARY FORREST**

**PFL20180899**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 30, 2026, seeking modification of visitation orders made on January 15, 2026. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had attended within the prior six months. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with only the RFO. The court notes this is a post-judgment request for modification and as such Family Code section 215 applies. Respondent was mail served without address verification.

The court finds the service to be deficient in that Respondent was not served with all the necessary documents. Further, there is no address verification as required. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS THE SERVICE TO BE DEFICIENT IN THAT RESPONDENT WAS NOT SERVED WITH ALL THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS. FURTHER, THERE IS NO ADDRESS VERIFICATION AS REQUIRED. THEREFORE, THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR. 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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**14. ANGELICA MOFFITT V. JAMES MOFFITT**

**22FL0121**

Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on November 21, 2025. Petitioner was personally served on January 5, 2026. The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was not served.

Respondent appeared for the hearing on February 5, 2026, however, Petitioner failed to appear. The court continued the matter to allow Respondent additional time to perfect service. The court directed Respondent to reserve Petitioner with all the documents, including a copy of the court's minute order from the February 5<sup>th</sup> hearing.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing either Petitioner or DCSS was served.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: 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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**15. JUSTIN NEFF V. KAYLA LATTIMER**

**22FL0990**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 22, 2026, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders as well as orders regarding a third party. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had participated in CCRC within the prior six months. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served some, but not all the necessary documents on February 28, 2026. The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

Petitioner filed an RFO on February 18, 2026, seeking a modification of the current parenting plan orders. Once again, the parties were not referred to CCRC for the reasons set forth above. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served some, but not all the necessary documents on February 22, 2026. The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on March 5, 2026. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 5<sup>th</sup>. The court denied the request on an ex parte basis, however, referred the parties to an emergency set CCRC appointment on March 24, 2026, and a review hearing on April 2, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 27, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore it cannot be considered by the court.

The parties attended CCRC as scheduled. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on March 31<sup>st</sup> and mailed to the parties on April 1<sup>st</sup>.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the March 31, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Petitioner is strongly admonished to abide by the Respect Guidelines. This includes ensuring that his significant other does not make disparaging remarks about Respondent in the presence of the children or within earshot of them. Failure to do so may be found to be contempt of court and punishable by monetary or other sanctions.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 #15: THE JANUARY 22, 2026 RFO AND THE FEBRUARY 18, 2026 RFO ARE BOTH DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 31, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER IS STRONGLY ADMONISHED TO ABIDE BY THE RESPECT GUIDELINES. THIS INCLUDES ENSURING THAT HIS SIGNIFICANT OTHER DOES NOT MAKE DISPARAGING REMARKS ABOUT RESPONDENT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE CHILDREN OR WITHIN EARSHOT OF THEM. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY BE FOUND TO BE CONTEMPT OF COURT AND PUNISHABLE BY MONETARY OR OTHER SANCTIONS.**

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**16. SIERRA OLSEN V. JUAN CHAVEZ**

**PFL20140209**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 2, 2026, seeking a change in venue to Sacramento County. Respondent filed a Declaration on February 3<sup>rd</sup>. Respondent filed an amended RFO on February 10, 2026. It appears to be identical to the February 2<sup>nd</sup> RFO, except it included multiple copies of the February 3<sup>rd</sup> declaration. Petitioner was mail served with the February 2<sup>nd</sup> RFO and other necessary documents on February 10<sup>th</sup>. There is no Proof of Service showing the February 10<sup>th</sup> amended RFO was served. The court drops the amended RFO from calendar and will proceed only with the February 2<sup>nd</sup> RFO.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 16, 2026. It was served on March 16<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner filed a further Declaration on March 19, 2026. It was served on March 19<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner opposes the transfer of the case to 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. 4<sup>th</sup> 830 (2009). Respondent has not met his burden. The court cannot find the convenience of the parties and the interest of justice are served by transferring the matter to Sacramento County. The court, therefore, denies the request to transfer venue to Sacramento County.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #16: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO TRANSFER TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY IS DENIED. THE COURT CANNOT FIND THE CONVENIENCE OF THE PARTIES AND THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE ARE SERVED BY TRANSFERRING THE MATTER TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY. THE COURT, THEREFORE, DENIES THE REQUEST TO TRANSFER VENUE TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH), HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**17. ZVISINEY MAGUWU SANCHEZ V. MILTON SANCHEZ**

**25FL0187**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 2, 2026, seeking enforcement of the judgment as well as sale of the former marital residence. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215, as this is a post-judgment request for modification.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Petitioner's request for Respondent to provide the LG Refrigerator is granted. Respondent is to deliver the LG Refrigerator to Petitioner on or before April 11, 2026. Respondent shall be responsible for the delivery and any costs associated with the delivery. If Respondent fails to deliver the LG refrigerator by April 11<sup>th</sup>, Respondent shall pay to Petitioner \$1,600 as and for the value of the refrigerator. Payment is due in full on April 15, 2026.

The home is Respondent's separate property. Petitioner has executed a quit claim deed. As such, any request for orders regarding title to the home are precluded as res judicata. The parties' judgment is silent as to the removal of Petitioner from the mortgage. The court no longer has jurisdiction to order the sale of the home. The request for an order to sell the home is denied. Petitioner may seek remedies in civil court.

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 #17: PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR RESPONDENT TO PROVIDE THE LG REFRIGERATOR IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS TO DELIVER THE LG REFRIGERATOR TO PETITIONER ON OR BEFORE APRIL 11, 2026. RESPONDENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DELIVERY AND ANY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DELIVERY. IF RESPONDENT FAILS TO DELIVER THE LG REFRIGERATOR BY APRIL 11<sup>TH</sup>, RESPONDENT SHALL PAY TO PETITIONER \$1,600 AS AND FOR THE VALUE OF THE REFRIGERATOR. PAYMENT IS DUE IN FULL ON APRIL 15, 2026. THE REQUEST FOR THE SALE OF THE MARITAL RESIDENCE IS DENIED AS RES JUDICATA.**

**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 2, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**18. CLARA STEWART V. FRANCISCO MARIN**

**SFL20190229**

This matter is pending receipt and review of the 3111 report. The parties last appeared before the court on January 22, 2026 at which time the court made custody and visitation orders pending receipt of the 3111 report. A review hearing was set for the present date.

On March 2, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, attorney's fees, sanctions and therapy orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on March 4, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Memorandum of Points and Authorities on March 19<sup>th</sup>. She filed and served an Amended Memorandum of Points and Authorities on March 20<sup>th</sup> and a Supplemental Declaration on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

The court received the Family Code section 3111 report on March 26, 2026.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**19. KIM VANACORE V. DEREK VANACORE**

**25FL0413**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 23, 2026, seeking bifurcation of marital status. Petitioner was personally served on March 23, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

California Rules of Court, rule 5.390(a) states that on noticed motion of a party, using form FL-300, "Request for Order," "the stipulation of the parties, case management, or the court's own motion, the court may bifurcate one or more issues to be tried separately before other issues are tried."

Family Code section 2337 provides that "[i]n a proceeding for dissolution of marriage, the court, upon noticed motion, may sever and grant an early and separate trial on the issue of the dissolution of the status of the marriage apart from other issues." (Fam. Code, § 2337, subd. (a).) The trial court may separately try the issue of termination of marriage if doing so "is likely to simplify the determination of the other issues." (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.390(b)(7).)

The minimum statutory requirements for bifurcating and terminating marital status are that six months must have passed since the date of service of the summons and petition (§ 2339, subd. (a)), and that the party seeking termination of marital status must have served a preliminary declaration of disclosure or obtained a written agreement to defer service to a later date (§ 2337, subd. (b)). Both requirements were met here.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #19: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
April 2, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**20. SVETLANA PROTSYUK V. OLEG PROTSYUK**

**23FL0358**

Petitioner filed an Order Shortening Time (OST) and Request for Order (RFO) on March 26, 2026, seeking to consolidate the pending child support hearing in Department 10 with the continuing trial in Department 5. The court granted the OST on March 27, 2026, and set the RFO for a hearing on April 2, 2026. The court directed the parties to be served on or before March 31, 2026. The court directed Responsive Declarations to be filed by April 1, 2026.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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