

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

1. STEVE ALLUMS V. JESSICA STAFFORD

PFL20140106

On February 11, 2026, Gregory Clark, Counsel for Petitioner filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. The motion was served on Respondent and on Petitioner's counsel the same day as filing. It was served on all parties on February 19th.

Counsel states that there has been an irreparable breakdown of the attorney-client relationship due to a conflict of interest that cannot be waived. The motion is granted pursuant to *Aceves v. Sup. Ct.*, 51 Cal. App. 4th 584 (1996) which states that the court may rely on Counsel's representation that there is a conflict, or that the attorney-client relationship has suffered an unrepairable breakdown, without knowing the underlying facts behind those statements. Withdrawal will be effective as of the date of filing the Proof of Service of the formal, signed order upon the client.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS GRANTED. WITHDRAWAL WILL BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE DATE OF FILING PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE FORMAL, SIGNED ORDER UPON THE CLIENT.

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

2. DCSS V. KRISTY ARROYO (OTHER PARENT: ANTHONY HESTER) PFS20180026

On February 19, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were personally served on Other Parent on February 23rd. The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), which is also a party to the action, was not served.

Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 23rd. However, there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on February 19, 2019 as the result of an RFO previously filed by Respondent. A report with recommendations was made on January 22, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on January 26th, however the copy that was mailed to Respondent was returned as undeliverable.

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

3. BRIAN CAMBRIDGE V. JORDAN FIERRO

25FL0981

On February 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders, custody and visitation orders, property orders and an order for attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. He filed an Amended Request for Order on February 13th. All required documents were personally served on February 17th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and an Income and Expense Declaration on April 16th. Respondent filed another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 17th. There is a Proof of Service filed April 16th for "Respondent's Declaration," it is unclear which, if either, of the responsive declarations was actually served.

Petitioner filed and served an updated Income and Expense Declaration on April 21st.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to address which, if either, of Respondent's responsive declarations was served and can be considered by the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO ADDRESS WHICH, IF EITHER, OF RESPONDENT'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATIONS WAS SERVED AND CAN BE CONSIDERED BY THE COURT.

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

4. APRIL LOCKHART V. DAVID MERCADO

PFL20200534

On February 4, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and clarification of the court's prior orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Respondent filed an RFO on February 5th seeking custody and visitation orders and sanctions. The RFO and the Notice of Tentative Ruling were served on February 13th, however Respondent failed to serve a blank FL-320 as required.

Minor's Counsel filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 17th.

Petitioner filed another RFO on February 24th seeking orders regarding expenses for the extracurricular activities of the minor.

Respondent filed another RFO on February 25th seeking removal of the CCRC mediator. The request was denied on an ex parte basis but the CCRC appointment was vacated and the issue was set to join with the already scheduled hearing date. It was served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling on March 25th. Again, the required blank FL-320 was not served.

Minor's Counsel filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 6, 2026.

On April 9th, Respondent filed and served Respondent's Objection to Untimely Service of Request for Order and Request for Sanctions.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 17th.

On April 22nd, Petitioner filed three Proof of Service documents alleging service of the following: "FL300 Declaration and Exhibits" on February 18th, "Request for Orders/Enforcement" on April 8th and "Amended Request for Orders/Enforcement" on April 8th.

Respondent objects to the April 8th service as untimely.

Respondent's objection is sustained. The court finds service of the RFO to be late pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all moving papers are to be

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

served at least sixteen court days before the hearing date. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1005(b). Additionally, any period of notice, or any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period on a date certain shall be extended by two court days when service is perfected electronically. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1010.6(a)(3)(B). Section 1005(b), in conjunction with Section 1010.6, would have made April 6th the last day for electronic service. As such, the objection is sustained and the February 24th RFO is dropped from calendar.

Petitioner asks the court to order co-parenting counseling to occur in person on weekdays at, or after, 4:00pm. She further requests an order regarding the scope of Minor's Counsel's final decision-making authority and clarification as to whether that authority extends to decisions regarding the format, scheduling, or method of counseling services. Finally, she asks that the court clarify its prior orders regarding Respondent's use of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) to change the format of co-parenting counseling.

Respondent asks that the court order co-parenting counseling to resume with Relationship Therapy Center and order that sessions be conducted via Zoom. He asks for a clear enforcement mechanism for the decisions of Minor's Counsel without the parties having to continue returning to court. He also asks for removal of the mediator, Rebecca Nelson, and appointment of a new mediator or an order for the parties to attend private mediation. Finally, he is requesting sanctions against Petitioner pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Minor's Counsel is in support of ongoing co-parenting counseling and does not have a preference regarding the format however she does note that continued co-parenting counseling is imperative for the wellbeing of the minor.

The request to conduct co-parenting counseling via Zoom is granted. Petitioner has failed to establish grounds for her refusal to participate in Zoom sessions and the court sees no reason why such sessions could not be beneficial to the parties. The court is not willing to weigh in on such minute detail as the date and time of the sessions, especially given that the provider's calendar will undoubtedly be a factor in scheduling. The parties are ordered to participate in co-parenting counseling, this includes working together in good faith to schedule the sessions.

As repeatedly stated in the court's prior orders, Minor's Counsel has final decision-making authority over all co-parenting issues. Co-parenting counseling is, by its very nature, a co-parenting issue. This includes providers, scheduling, format, etc. Minor's

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

Counsel has final decision-making authority. Refusal to comply with the decision of Minor's Counsel is effectively refusal to comply with a court order and thus enforcement may be had through an Order to Show Cause for Contempt.

The court grants the request to reassign the CCRC mediator. The clerk of the court will assign the next in order.

As to the request for sanctions, “[s]ection 271 provides that a family court may impose an award of attorney fees and costs ‘in the nature of a sanction’ where the conduct of a party or attorney ‘frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation between the parties and attorneys.’ (§ 271, subd. (a).)” (*In re Marriage of Tharp* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1295, 1316.) “Expressed another way, section 271 vests family law courts with an additional means with which to enforce this state’s public policy of promoting settlement of family law litigation, while reducing its costs through mutual cooperation of clients and their counsel.” (*Id.* at 1318.) The court finds both parties’ actions throughout the pendency of this case fall squarely within the behaviors section 271 is designed to alleviate. The number of RFOs that have been filed for this date alone is excessive and unnecessary. The court is not imposing sanctions at this time, as it finds Respondent equally culpable in his actions.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE REQUEST TO CONDUCT CO-PARENTING COUNSELING VIA ZOOM IS GRANTED. THE COURT IS NOT WILLING TO WEIGH IN ON SUCH MINUTE DETAIL AS THE DATE AND TIME OF THE SESSIONS, ESPECIALLY GIVEN THAT THE PROVIDER’S CALENDAR WILL UNDOUBTABLY BE A FACTOR IN SCHEDULING. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PARTICIPATE IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING, THIS INCLUDES WORKING TOGETHER IN GOOD FAITH TO SCHEDULE THE SESSIONS.

AS REPEATEDLY STATED IN THE COURT’S PRIOR ORDERS, MINOR’S COUNSEL HAS FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY OVER ALL CO-PARENTING ISSUES. CO-PARENTING COUNSELING IS, BY ITS VERY NATURE, A CO-PARENTING ISSUE. THIS INCLUDES PROVIDERS, SCHEDULING, FORMAT, ETC. MINOR’S COUNSEL HAS FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY. REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE DECISION OF MINOR’S COUNSEL IS EFFECTIVELY REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER AND

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

THUS ENFORCEMENT MAY BE HAD THROUGH AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CONTEMPT.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUE OF APPOINTING A NEW CCRC MEDIATOR AND ON THE ISSUE OF 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 30, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

5. NICOLE LONG V. KYLE LONG

24FL0660

On February 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, child support, and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on Respondent on February 17th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on April 14th.

Petitioner filed and served an updated Income and Expense Declaration on April 20th.

Petitioner is requesting guideline child and spousal support along with an order for the parties to equally share in the costs of all extracurricular activities and uninsured medical expenses. She further requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,000 pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

Respondent agrees to guideline support but asks that the support calculations be made using Petitioner's updated income. He further agrees to equally splitting the cost of agreed upon extracurricular activities. He asks that the parties alternate claiming the children on their taxes, Petitioner in the odd years and Respondent in the even years. He asks that the parties be ordered to meet and confer on the issue of health insurance each year during open enrollment. Finally, Respondent opposes the request for attorney's fees.

Regarding support, utilizing the figures as outlined in the attached Xspouse report, the court finds that child support is \$1,908 per month and spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$436 per month. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$2,344 per month as and for child support and temporary spousal support, payable on the 15th of the month (and deemed late if paid after the 20th of the month) until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of February 15, 2026.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$7,032 through and including April 15, 2026. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$293 on the 1st of each month until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If a payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children, childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment,

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

and agreed upon extracurricular activities. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures as set forth in the attached FL-192.

The parties are ordered to alternate claiming the minors on their taxes. Petitioner is to claim both children for odd tax years. Respondent will claim the children on even tax years. Additionally, the parties are ordered to meet and confer on the issue of health care for the children annually during open enrollment.

Finally, regarding the request for attorney's fees the request is denied. 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).

Here, while there is a disparity in income between the parties, that disparity is significantly decreased by the support orders made herein. Additionally, Petitioner has over \$50,000 in liquid assets available to her to pay for her attorney's fees and costs. Therefore, the court does not find that there is unequal access to counsel and the request for attorney's fees is denied.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: REGARDING SUPPORT, UTILIZING THE FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$1,908 PER MONTH AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$436 PER MONTH. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,344 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF THE MONTH (AND DEEMED LATE IF PAID AFTER THE 20TH OF THE MONTH) UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF FEBRUARY 15, 2026.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,032 THROUGH AND INCLUDING APRIL 15, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$293 ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL

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

(APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF A PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.

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

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ALTERNATE CLAIMING THE MINORS ON THEIR TAXES. PETITIONER IS TO CLAIM BOTH CHILDREN FOR ODD TAX YEARS. RESPONDENT WILL CLAIM THE CHILDREN ON EVEN TAX YEARS. ADDITIONALLY, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER ON THE ISSUE OF HEALTH CARE FOR THE CHILDREN ANNUALLY DURING OPEN ENROLLMENT.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED.

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.

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly figures	Cash Flow	Guideline	Proposed
#of children	0	3	2026			
% time with NCP	40.00 %	0.00 %			13384	13470
Filing status	HH/MLA	HH/MLA	GUIDELINE	Comb. net spendable		
# exemptions	3	4 *	Nets(adjusted)	Percent change	0%	1%
Wages+salary	10881	4340	Father	8568		
Self-employed income	0	0	Mother	4816	-2344	-2236
Other taxable income	0	557	Total	13384	6224	6332
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support		0	108
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of combined spendable	47%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	1908	% of saving over guideline	0%
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Alameda SS	436	Total taxes	2313
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	2344	Dep. exemption value	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			# withholding allowances	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Net wage paycheck	7871
Health insurance	0	0			Mother	
Other medical expense	0	0			Payment cost/benefit	2344
Property tax expense	0	0			Net spendable income	7160
Ded interest expense	0	0	Proposed		Change from guideline	0
Charitable contributions	0	0	Tactic 9		% of combined spendable	53%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	2279	% of saving over guideline	0%
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	630	Total taxes	81
Required union dues	0	0	Total	2909	Dep. exemption value	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			# withholding allowances	0
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving	86	Net wage paycheck	3562
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	3		3562
Child care expenses	0	0	<i>Released to Father</i>			

Father pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

All children	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
	40 - 60	0	0	0	Father	1908	Father	1908	Father
	40 - 60	0	0	0	Father	316	Father	316	Father
	40 - 60	0	0	0	Father	567	Father	567	Father
	40 - 60	0	0	0	Father	1024	Father	1024	Father

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

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

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

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

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

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

Online Self-Help Guide

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

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

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

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

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

Examples

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

How to Change a Child Support Order

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

What forms do I need?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Need help?

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

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. MACHAELA MELROSE V. SHAWN SANTELIO

23FL1121

On January 29, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents, with the exception of a blank FL-320, were served on January 29th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 5, 2026 and were able to reach agreements on all issues. A report codifying those agreements was prepared on March 5th and served on the parties on March 6th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 17th.

Respondent is requesting a week on/week off schedule and he asks that Petitioner not have any phone calls with the child during his parenting time. He further asks that the child not attend daycare during his parenting time.

Petitioner asks the court not to adopt the agreements contained in the CCRC report. She states that a portion of the agreements were never discussed. She asks that the parties be re-referred to CCRC. Alternatively, she asks the court to award her primary physical custody and order visits for Respondent to occur every other weekend.

While Petitioner maintains that the agreements contained in the CCRC report were not, in fact, agreed upon, the court has reviewed them and does find them to be in the best interests of the minor. As such, the provisions of the March 5, 2026 CCRC report identified as agreements are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: WHILE PETITIONER MAINTAINS THAT THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT WERE NOT, IN FACT, AGREED UPON, THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THEM AND DOES FIND THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. AS SUCH, THE PROVISIONS OF THE MARCH 5, 2026 CCRC REPORT IDENTIFIED AS AGREEMENTS ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 30, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

8. GINNY ANNE SILVER V. MICHAEL JAMES SILVER

24FL0997

On February 4, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to set aside the Judgment and requesting custody and visitation orders, child support, and property control orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. Respondent did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. The RFO was electronically served on Petitioner only on February 5th, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore it was required to be personally served in accordance with Family Code § 215. Additionally, Respondent failed to serve the CCRC referral form, the Notice of Tentative Ruling and the required blank FL-320. Also, the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was not served even though they are a party to the case.

Despite the fact that there is no Proof of Service for DCSS, DCSS did file a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 25th thereby waiving any defect in service.

Neither party appeared at the scheduled CCRC appointment.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on April 2, 2026 and again on April 6th. The court finds this to be late filed. “For all hearings involving child, spousal, or domestic partner support, both parties must complete, file, and serve a current Income and Expense Declaration.” Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(1); See *also* Cal. Fam. Code §2100. The party requesting support shall file and serve their Income and Expense Declaration with the initial moving papers. El Dorado Sup. Ct. Rule 8.03.01.

Respondent filed another RFO on April 8, 2026. This time, the request was filed ex parte. It was denied on an ex parte basis but the court set the RFO to join with the already scheduled hearing date. It was electronically served on April 7th, again in violation of Section 215. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order the same day.

Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 13th objecting to the RFO as it was not properly served.

The RFOs are dropped from calendar due to the multiple defects in service and failure to timely file the required Income and Expense Declaration.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: BOTH RFOS ARE DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE NUMEROUS DEFECTS IN SERVICE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 30, 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 30, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

9. DEBRA STANLEY V. ROBERT STANLEY

PFL20210202

On Marh 18, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order seeking visitation and spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration on March 17th. Both documents were served on Petitioner on March 17th however Respondent did not serve the requisite blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling. The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was not served.

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

Respondent requests a modification of the parenting time orders with a summer vacation schedule, holiday schedule and soccer season schedule. He further asks the court to terminate spousal support.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 5, 2026 and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on April 17, 2026.

Given that both parties attended and participated in CCRC, and given that Respondent is not making a child support request, the court does find good cause to proceed with the matter on its merits despite the defect in service.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court does find the recommendations contained in the April 17, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Regarding the request to terminate spousal support, the court maintains broad discretion in determining whether a support award is warranted and if so, the amount and duration thereof. *In re Marriage of McLain*, 7 Cal. App. 5th 262, 269 (2017). While the factors listed in Family Code section 4320 may be considered by the court, an award for *temporary* support is generally unrestricted by any statutory authority. *See Marriage of Tong & Samson*, 197 Cal. App. 4th 23, 29 (2011). That said, Section 4320 does include consideration of the duration of the marriage and an award of support for a “reasonable time” for the supported party to become self-supporting.

Here, the marriage was less than three years in duration and support was originally ordered in April of 2021, approximately five years ago. Given that at this point support has been ongoing almost twice as long as the marriage itself, the court does find that Petitioner has had a sufficiently reasonable amount of time to become self-supporting. Accordingly, the request to terminate spousal support is granted.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 30, 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 #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT DOES FIND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 17, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE REQUEST TO TERMINATE SPOUSAL SUPPORT IS GRANTED.

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

10. KIMBERLY WALTS V. KEVIN WALTS

PFL20170517

On February 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents, with the exception of the Notice of Tentative Ruling, were personally served on Petitioner on March 6th.

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

This is a post-judgment request for modification of permanent spousal support orders. As such, the court is required to take evidence on, and address, the Family Code § 4320 factors. The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

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

11. SCOTT YODER V. JENNIFER YODER

PFL20180901

On February 6, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, spousal support, and support arrears. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. He filed another Income and Expense Declaration on February 23rd. There is no Proof of Service for these documents. There is a Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt, though it is signed by Respondent's attorney, not Respondent. This is a post-judgment request for support orders and therefore, service was required to comply with Family Code § 215.

Despite the defect in service, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on April 23rd. Both documents were served on April 21st.

Petitioner is requesting the reduction or termination of spousal support. He further requests \$6,365.34 in support arrears associated with the payments of expenses for the children.

Respondent opposes the requests. However, in the event the court is inclined to alter support, Respondent requests an evidentiary hearing. Finally, she asks for \$10,000 in attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

After reviewing the filings, the court finds that the issue regarding arrears requires the taking of additional evidence. Likewise, in facing a request to amend permanent spousal support, the court is required to take evidence on, and make findings regarding the Family Code § 4320 factors. As such, the parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing.

Regarding the request for 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. It "is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party," but rather "parity." *Alan S. v. Sup. Ct.*, 172 Cal. App. 4th 238,251(2009). 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).

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

Here, the request for attorney's fees is granted. There is a significant disparity in income between the parties and Petitioner does have the ability to pay for the attorney's fees of himself and Respondent. Petitioner is ordered to pay \$10,000 directly to Respondent's attorney as and for attorney's fees. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$2,500 with the first payment due no later than May 15th and payments continuing thereafter on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 4 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

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: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY \$10,000 DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$2,500 WITH THE FIRST PAYMENT DUE NO LATER THAN MAY 15TH AND PAYMENTS CONTINUING THEREAFTER ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 4 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

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

12. VELEN AMBROSE V. JUSTUS AMBROSE

24FL0097

On April 3, 2025, the court adopted its tentative ruling, except for the portion regarding the bonus table. The court set a further review hearing on the issue of the bonus table on June 5, 2025. The parties have stipulated to continue the review hearing multiple times, most recently on February 19, 2026, to continue the matter to the present hearing.

Neither party has filed a supplemental declaration.

The court lifts its stay on the bonus table portion of the prior tentative ruling. The court also finds that both parties earn income in addition to their respective base salaries of \$13,704 per month for Petitioner and \$19,704 per month for Respondent. As such, the court is adopting the two-way bonus table which is attached as Exhibit F to Petitioner's Reply Declaration filed on March 26th. Commencing on January 1, 2025, the parties are to reconcile their bonus income in accordance with the bonus table on a quarterly basis. Parties are ordered to exchange paystubs for the quarter no later than 7 days after the end of the quarter. Bonus payments are due, if any, no later than 30 days from the end of each quarter.

The court reserves on the bonus arrears calculations.

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.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT LIFTS ITS STAY ON THE BONUS TABLE PORTION OF THE PRIOR TENTATIVE RULING. THE COURT ALSO FINDS THAT BOTH PARTIES EARN INCOME IN ADDITION TO THEIR RESPECTIVE BASE SALARIES OF \$13,704 PER MONTH FOR PETITIONER AND \$19,704 PER MONTH FOR RESPONDENT. AS SUCH, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE TWO-WAY BONUS TABLE WHICH IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT F TO PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION FILED ON MARCH 26TH. COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 2025, THE PARTIES ARE TO RECONCILE THEIR BONUS INCOME IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BONUS TABLE ON A QUARTERLY BASIS. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EXCHANGE PAYSTUBS FOR THE QUARTER NO LATER THAN 7 DAYS AFTER THE END OF THE QUARTER. BONUS PAYMENTS ARE DUE, IF ANY, NO LATER THAN 30 DAYS FROM THE END OF EACH QUARTER.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE BONUS ARREARS CALCULATIONS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 30, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

13. RILEY BEBITA V. NICHOLAS BEBITA

26FL0071

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 5, 2026, seeking custody and parenting time orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 4, 2026, and a review hearing on April 30, 2026.

Upon review of the file, the court finds there is no Proof of Service showing the Petition and Summons have been properly served. As such, the court has not obtained jurisdiction over the parties. Further, the Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with the referral to CCRC.

Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court. Copies were mailed to the parties on April 23rd.

The court drops the matter from calendar, as the court has not obtained jurisdiction over the parties.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE COURT'S LACK OF JURISDICTION.

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

14. SARAH CALLAHAN V. IAN HALL

PFL20120486

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 19, 2026, seeking a change in venue from El Dorado County to Sacramento County as none of the parties reside in El Dorado County. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served some of the documents on February 24, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing that the Department of Child Support Services, who is a party to the case, was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

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

16. MADDY AND JOHN NAVARRO V. MELISSA HOLMAN AND THOMAS BROWN JR.

26FL0215

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 9, 2026, seeking a change in the minor's birth certificate. Proof of Service does not show who was served as there are two Respondent's. Further the Proof of Service does not indicate all the required documents were served.

The Proof of Service of Summons and Petition likewise does not show who was served. However, Respondents have filed a Response. As such, the court finds the defect in service of the Petition and Summons to be waived.

Respondents have not filed a Responsive Declaration to the RFO.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE DEFECTS IN 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 30, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

17. MATILDE RIOS V. SANTOS RIOS

25FL0977

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, property control, as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. There is no Proof of Service showing that Respondent was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

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

18. CHELSEY ROMERO V. ROBERT ROMERO

PFL20190274

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 6, 2025, requesting to augment the current orders. Petitioner was mail served on November 6th. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), who is a party to the case, was properly served. Additionally, this is a post-judgment request for modification and as such compliance with Family Code section 215 is required.

Respondent appeared at the hearing on January 15, 2026 and requested the matter be continued to allow time for proper service. The court granted the request to continue and set the matter for a further hearing on March 12, 2026.

On March 12, 2026, Respondent again appeared for the hearing and requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to perfect service. The court granted the request and continued the matter to the present date.

Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served in Nevada on April 9, 2026. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states: "Unless 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. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California and 10 calendar days if either the place of mail or the place of address is outside the State of California..." This would have made March 29, 2026, the last day for mail service.

Proof of Service shows DCSS was mail served on April 9, 2026. The court finds this to be late service as well. As set forth above, the last day for mail service within the State of California would have been April 3, 2026.

Neither Petitioner nor DCSS have filed Responsive Declarations.

The court drops Respondent's November 6th filed RFO due to the lack of proper service.

Petitioner filed an RFO on February 26, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing either Respondent or DCSS were properly served. As such, the court drops the matter from calendar.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 30, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

TENTATIVE RULING #18: RESPONDENT'S NOVEMBER 6, 2025 FILED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. PETITIONER'S FEBRUARY 26, 2026 FILED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

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

19. TIFFANY SCHNEIDER V. NATHAN SCHNEIDER

PFL20210326

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 20, 2026, seeking modification of child custody orders. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner or the Department of Child Support Services was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE 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 30, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

20. MONICA SMITHCAMP V. GAVIN SMITHCAMP

PFL20180819

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a modification of child support or March 6, 2026. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on March 16, 2026. The court notes this is a post-judgement request for modification. As such, Family Code section 215 applies, requiring either personal service or address verification. Respondent has not complied with the requirements of Family Code section 215.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 16, 2026. Respondent included her Income and Expense Declaration as an attachment to the Responsive Declaration. Both were mail served on April 17, 2026. Petitioner does not raise the issue of the defect in service in her Responsive Declaration, therefore, the court finds the issue to be waived.

Respondent seeks an order reducing child support to \$0 as Petitioner is now earning a higher income. Petitioner requests the court order guideline child support based on the parties' incomes. Petitioner also requests the court order the production of paystubs for Respondent from March 18, 2021 to present.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court denies Petitioner's request to order Respondent to produce paystubs from March 2021 to present. The court finds this request exceeds the scope of the requested modification and discovery as to that time frame has closed.

The court finds guideline child support to be \$603 per month payable from Petitioner to Respondent (see attached X-Spouse). The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$603 as and for child support effective May 1, 2026, with future payments due on the first of each month, until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court further finds that Respondent does routinely have the ability to earn overtime. The court orders Respondent to prepare an overtime table. Respondent is to provide Petitioner paystubs on a quarterly basis and to true up any overpayment based on gross monthly income earned over \$9,618.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children, childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment,

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

and agreed upon extracurricular activities. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures as set forth in the attached FL-192.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER REQUEST TO ORDER RESPONDENT TO PRODUCE PAYSTUBS FROM MARCH 2021 TO PRESENT. THE COURT FINDS THIS REQUEST EXCEEDS THE SCOPE OF THE REQUESTED MODIFICATION AND DISCOVERY AS TO THAT TIME FRAME HAS CLOSED.

THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$603 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$603 AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2026, WITH FUTURE PAYMENTS DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH, UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS THAT RESPONDENT DOES ROUTINELY HAVE THE ABILITY TO EARN OVERTIME. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PREPARE AN OVERTIME TABLE. RESPONDENT IS TO PROVIDE PETITIONER PAYSTUBS ON A QUARTERLY BASIS AND TO TRUE UP ANY OVERPAYMENT BASED ON GROSS MONTHLY INCOME EARNED OVER \$9,618.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDER 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.

New Case

2026 Guideline Summary Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow		
Number of children	0	2	2026		Combined net spendable		13489
Percent time with NCP	49.99%	0.00%			Father		
Filing status	HH/MLA	HH/MLA	Nets (adjusted)				
Number of exemptions	1	2	Father	5552	Payment cost/benefit		603
Wages and salary	9618	10383	Mother	7937	Net spendable income		6156
Self employed income	0	0	Total	13489	Federal income tax		595
Other taxable income	0	0	Support		Federal employment tax		662
TANF CS received	0	0	Addons	0	State income tax		125
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Guideln CS	603	State employment tax		113
New spouse income	0	0	Alameda SS	0	Total taxes		1496
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Total	603	Federal filing status		HH/MLA
Adjustments to income	0	0			State filing status		HH/MLA
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			Mother		
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Payment cost/benefit		-603
Health insurance	958	185			Net spendable income		7333
Other medical expenses	0	36			Federal income tax		1026
Property tax expenses	0	0			Federal employment tax		780
Ded interest expense	0	0			State income tax		322
Contribution deduction	0	0			State employment tax		133
Misc tax deductions	0	0			Total taxes		2261
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			Federal filing status		HH/MLA
Required union dues	171	0			State filing status		HH/MLA
Mandatory retirement	1441	0					
Hardship deduction	0	0					
Other GDL deductions	0	0					
Child care expenses	0	0					

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		50 - 50	0	0	0 Father	603 Mother	603 Mother
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	226 Mother	226 Mother
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	377 Mother	377 Mother

Superior Court of California
County of El Dorado

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

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

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

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

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

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

Online Self-Help Guide

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

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

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

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

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

Examples

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

How to Change a Child Support Order

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

What forms do I need?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Need help?

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

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Print this form

Save this form

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

21. KAYLA STABILE V. SEAN STABILE

PFL20180042

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 30, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 2, 2026, and a review hearing on April 30, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on February 1, 2026.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on April 20, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court denies Petitioner's request for modification due to her failure to appear at the CCRC appointment.

All prior 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 #21: PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CURRENT CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN ORDERS IS DENIED DUE TO PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

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

22. LUBOSLAV VACLAVEK V. SYLVIA VACLAVEK

25FL07898

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 6, 2026, seeking an order compelling Petitioner's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served with only the FL-300 on March 8, 2026.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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