

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. BROOKE ATLAS V. KEVIN ATLAS

25FL0219

On January 28, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on the request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) filed by Petitioner. The court took the matter under submission but ultimately granted the DVRO and referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). A review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on February 23, 2026 but were unable to reach any agreements. As such, a report with recommendations was prepared on March 26, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on March 27th.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the March 26, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the 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 #1: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 26, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE 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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. JACINTA LASHAE BADELITA V. BOGDANEL BADELITA

22FL0797

On January 22, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders to travel to Romania. It was served the same day; however Respondent did not serve the requisite blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling as required.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: 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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. JENNIFER DANIELS V. JOSE CARRERO

PFL20170812

On March 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and an order for Respondent to attend anger management classes. The RFO was filed ex parte and the parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment. A review hearing was set for the present date. All required documents were served on March 10th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to the ex parte using the requisite FL-320. However, on March 16, 2026, he filed an Amended Responsive Declaration and a 2nd Amended Responsive Declaration, neither of which utilize the required FL-320 form therefore, the court has not read or considered these documents.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 17, 2026 and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 25, 2026.

On April 2, 2026, Respondent filed a response to the CCRC report. Petitioner also filed a Response to CCRC Report and Response to Respondent's Declaration(s), Objections and Request to Strike.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on April 2nd. He filed another Reply Declaration on April 3rd. 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 April 2nd the last day for filing a Reply Declaration therefore the April 3rd Reply is late filed and it has not been read or considered by the court.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor until Respondent has completed anger management. She also requests an order for Respondent to participate in anger management.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. MARK DAVIS V. MARY DAVIS

22FL0006

This matter is before the court for hearing on the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on October 1, 2024, to modify child support¹ and spousal support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration (I&E). The hearing on Petitioner's RFO has been continued multiple times based upon stipulation of the parties. The court notes, however, there is no stipulation in the court's file reserving the court's jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to the date the RFO was filed.

On March 24, 2026, the Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, as well as a current I&E. Both filings were electronically served upon the Petitioner's attorney that same day, according to the proof of service, also filed March 24, 2026. Respondent consents to guideline child support from October 1, 2024, through May 31, 2025² (Mary Davis Decl., ¶ 3.a.) and zero spousal support as of October 1, 2024 (Mary Davis Decl., ¶ 3.b.), but requests payment of Petitioner's outstanding arrears, plus interest, in a lump sum payment to be made no later than 30 days after the court's order³ (Mary Davis Decl., ¶ 3.c.).

On April 6, 2026, the Petitioner filed an updated I&E, which was electronically served upon Respondent's attorney that same day, according to the attached Proof of Service. The court does not consider the Petitioner's April 6, 2026 filing due to its untimeliness. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1005, subd. (b) [reply papers shall be filed at least five court days before the hearing].)

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

¹ During the period of October 1, 2024, through present, there is only one minor child for which the parties are obligated to provide support, namely, DD (DOB: 11/22/2006). Both parties acknowledge that their two older children previously "aged out." (Fam. Code, § 3901, subd. (a)(1).)

² It is the court's understanding that May 31, 2025, is the date in which DD, who has attained 18 years of age, was no longer a full-time high school student. (See Fam. Code, § 3901, subd. (a)(1).)

³ The court notes that Respondent's request for payment of outstanding arrears plus interest is a separate request for relief and thus would require a separate noticed RFO; presently, the issue is not before the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. ERIK FARAHMAND V. ABIGAIL CAGE

PFL20130874

This matter is set for a review hearing on the issues of custody and visitation. Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed on April 1, 2026. It was served on March 27th.

Petitioner has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

Respondent asks the court to maintain the current custody and parenting plan orders including, without limitation, the orders regarding the children's individual therapy and Claire's conjoint therapy. She asks that no further review hearings be set.

After reviewing the Supplemental Declaration of Respondent, the court finds that all current orders remain in the best interests of the children. As such, all current orders remain in full force and effect. This includes, but is not limited to, the orders regarding individual therapy for the children and conjoint therapy for Claire. No further review hearings are being set at this time.

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 #5: THE COURT FINDS THAT ALL CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN. AS SUCH, ALL CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THIS INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, THE ORDERS REGARDING INDIVIDUAL THERAPY FOR THE CHILDREN AND CONJOINT THERAPY FOR CLAIRE. NO FURTHER REVIEW HEARINGS ARE BEING SET AT THIS TIME.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. HOPE KINSMAN V. JEREMY KINSMAN

25FL0256

On March 9, 2026, Respondent filed and served an Amended Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 26th.

Respondent filed and served a Declaration on March 27th. Petitioner filed an Objection and Request to Strike on April 1st.

Petitioner objects to Section 12 and the last three paragraphs of Respondent's Declaration as these portions of the declaration improperly include statements made during settlement negotiations. The objection is sustained. The court strikes Section 12 and the last three paragraphs of Respondent's March 27th Declaration.

Respondent asks the court to review the parties' assets and make orders regarding the characterization of those assets. He further asks that the parties be ordered to correct and supplement any inaccurate or incomplete financial disclosures.

Petitioner opposes the requests in their entirety and notes that Respondent's default has been taken. Issues regarding property division are to be the subject of a prove-up hearing, not an RFO. Additionally, Petitioner notes that the original RFO requested a protective order for discovery, but the "amended" RFO makes entirely different requests and it is unclear what exactly is being requested of the court. Finally, Petitioner requests \$1,500 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 or Civil Procedure § 128.5.

Given that Respondent does not include his request for a protective order in his amended RFO, it appears the request has been dropped and therefore, the court declines to rule on it.

The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for a prove-up hearing.

The court reserves jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for sanctions until the time of the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: PETITIONER'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED. THE COURT STRIKES SECTION 12 AND THE LAST THREE PARAGRAPHS OF RESPONDENT'S MARCH 27TH DECLARATION. GIVEN THAT RESPONDENT DOES NOT INCLUDE HIS REQUEST FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER IN HIS AMENDED RFO, IT APPEARS THE REQUEST HAS BEEN DROPPED AND THEREFORE THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON IT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR A PROVE-UP HEARING.

THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF THE HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. MICHELLE MASTERS V. GUY SORBER

22FL0424

On January 30, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to enforce the terms of the judgment. All required documents were served on March 10th.

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

Petitioner asks that Respondent be ordered to endorse the check for the proceeds from the sale of the Tya Lane residence. Should he fail to do so within 7 days of the court’s order, Petitioner asks that the title company be ordered to reissue the check to “The Estate of Michelle Masters.”

Petitioner’s requests are granted. Respondent is ordered to endorse the check for the proceeds from the sale of the Tya Lane residence to “The Estate of Michelle Masters.” Should he fail to do so by April 16, 2026, then Petitioner may have the title company reissue the check and have it made out to “The Estate of Michelle Masters.”

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: PETITIONER’S REQUESTS ARE GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO ENDORSE THE CHECK FOR THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE TYA LANE RESIDENCE TO “THE ESTATE OF MICHELLE MASTERS.” SHOULD HE FAIL TO DO SO BY APRIL 16, 2026, THEN PETITIONER MAY HAVE THE TITLE COMPANY REISSUE THE CHECK AND HAVE IT MADE OUT TO “THE ESTATE OF MICHELLE MASTERS.”

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. MADISON MEXIA V. JOSEPH MEXIA

25FL0339

This matter was continued from January 15, 2026, regarding the Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO) filed October 10, 2025, to set child custody and visitation, child support and spousal support, and issue an award of need-based attorney fees (see Fam. Code, § 2030, et seq.) in the amount of \$6,500.00. At the January 15 hearing, the court (1) ordered both parties to file and serve their current Income and Expense Declarations (I&E) with supporting documentation; (2) referred the parties to a CCRC session set for February 5, 2026; and (3) authorized the parties to utilize a private mediator if they agree to do so.

On March 26, 2026, the Petitioner filed her current I&E, which was electronically served upon the Respondent that same day according to the proof of service, also filed March 26, 2026. Petitioner declares she is unemployed and has zero monthly income.

On April 1, 2026, the Respondent filed his current I&E. However, there is no supporting documentation (i.e., paystubs) attached to Respondent's I&E. Further, there is no proof of service for Respondent's I&E in the court's file. Because there is no proof of service, the court does not consider Respondent's I&E. The only evidence before the court of Respondent's income is found in Petitioner's I&E, which estimates Respondent's gross monthly income to be \$10,000.00. The court will use this figure to calculate child and spousal support amounts.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated March 27, 2026. A copy of the report was electronically served upon both parties, as well as the Petitioner's attorney, on March 27, 2026, according to the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that same day.

On April 2, 2026, the Petitioner filed a reply declaration concerning the CCRC report, a copy of which was electronically served upon the Respondent that same day according to the proof of service filed April 3, 2026.

Respondent filed a Declaration on April 7, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, and as such, the court has not considered it. Further, the court finds this to be late filed, and would not have considered it on those grounds as well.

The court finds that the recommendations of the CCRC counselor in the March 27, 2026, report are in the best interests of the parties' children and so adopts them as the orders of the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Turning to the issue of child support, the court finds that Respondent's custody share of the parties' minor children, JM (age 4) and RM (age 2), is approximately 13 percent. The court bases this figure on the fact that Respondent shall have visitation with the children at least two times per month. According to the CCRC report, Respondent believes it is possible for him to visit the children one time per month in El Dorado County (where Petitioner resides) and one time per month in San Luis Obispo (where Respondent resides). Thus, the court approximates that Respondent will have visitation two weekends per month (96 hours of visitation / 720 hours in a month = 13 percent, rounded down to nearest whole number).

As shown in the attached XSpouse calculation printout, Respondent is ordered to pay child support to the Petitioner in the amount of \$3,324, and temporary guideline spousal support to the Petitioner in the amount of \$1,621.00. This order is effective November 1, 2025. Payments are due on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$29,676 for the months of November through April inclusive. The court is ordering Respondent to pay Petitioner \$1,483.80 per month as and for arrears beginning May 15, 2026. Further payments are due on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 20 months). If there is any missed or late payment, the full amount is due and owing.

Lastly, the court addresses the issue of attorney fees. Family Code section 2030, subdivision (a)(1) provides: "In a proceeding for dissolution of marriage ..., the court shall ensure that each party has access to legal representation, including access early in the proceedings, to preserve each party's rights by ordering, if necessary based on the income and needs assessments, one party ... to pay the other party, or to the other party's attorney, whatever amount is reasonably necessary for attorney's fees and for the cost of maintaining or defending the proceeding during the pendency of the proceeding."

When a request for attorney fees is made under Family Code section 2030, the trial court must make findings on (1) whether a fee award is appropriate, (2) whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and (3) whether one party is able to pay for the legal fees of both parties. (Fam. Code, § 2030, subd. (a)(2).) The court must award attorney fees if the findings demonstrate a disparity in access and ability to pay. (*Ibid.*) However, an award of attorney fees under Family Code section 2030 must be just and reasonable under the relative circumstances of the parties. (Fam. Code, § 2032, subd. (a); *In re Marriage of Sorge* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 626, 662–663.)

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

In light of the court's tentative ruling regarding child and spousal support, including the relatively large amount of arrears, the court finds that the Respondent does not presently have the ability to pay the legal representation fees of both parties. Therefore, the court denies Petitioner's request for attorney fees without prejudice.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE PETITIONER'S RFO IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CCRC COUNSELOR IN THE MARCH 27, 2026, REPORT ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES' CHILDREN AND SO ADOPTS THEM AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY CHILD SUPPORT TO THE PETITIONER IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,324, AND TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO THE PETITIONER IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,621.00. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1, 2025. PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$29,676 FOR THE MONTHS OF NOVEMBER THROUGH APRIL INCLUSIVE. THE COURT IS ORDERING RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,483.80 PER MONTH AS AND FOR ARREARS BEGINNING MAY 15, 2026. FURTHER PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 20 MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT, THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING.

THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY FEES IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6275 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO*

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. ASHLEY MILLS V. COLE MILLS

PFL20200476

On November 9, 2025, Petitioner filed an ex parte application for custody orders. The request was denied on an ex parte basis but set for trial on the regular law and motion calendar. She filed another ex parte on December 3, 2025, and she followed that by filing a Request for Order (RFO) renewing her ex parte requests.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 24, 2026.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on December 15, 2025. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 27th.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on March 30th, the court deems this to be a Reply Declaration.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody. She asks that Respondent have only supervised visits with the minor children. She further asks that Respondent be ordered to use SoberLink testing during his parenting time and an ignition interlock device while driving.

Respondent opposes the requests and asks that Petitioner be sanctioned \$2,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the recommendations contained in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Respondent is admonished that failure to abide by these orders may result in the court modifying its custody orders in the future.

“Section 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 denies Respondent’s request for sanctions. The court finds Petitioner’s actions do not fall

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

within the prohibited behaviors as contemplated by Family Code section 271. The court finds Petitioner's motions were brought in good faith.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES FIND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THESE ORDERS MAY RESULT IN THE COURT MODIFYING ITS CUSTODY ORDERS IN THE FUTURE. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE.

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. JANELL PALMER V. RAFA PALMER

24FL1174

On January 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support, spousal support, and dissolution of marriage orders. She did not file an Income and Expense Declaration as required. The RFO and Notice of Tentative Ruling were served on January 23rd, however she did not serve an Income and Expense Declaration or a blank FL-320.

On March 25th, Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration. Both were served on March 26th.

“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.

Here, Petitioner is the moving party, however she has not filed a current Income and Expense Declaration. As such, the requests for spousal and child support are denied due to failure to file the proper documentation.

Regarding the request for bifurcation, a party may request bifurcation of the issue of marital status, however prior to doing so the party must ensure that “[a]ll pension plans that have not been divided by court order that require joinder ...” have been joined. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(d)(1). A party seeking bifurcation is to submit a completed FL-315. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(a).

Petitioner did file the requisite FL-315 however, it is unclear if there are any pension or retirement plans that require joinder. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on this issue.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF BIFURCATION AND TERMINATION OF MARITAL STATUS.

THE REQUESTS FOR SPOUSAL AND CHILD SUPPORT ARE DENIED DUE TO THE FAILURE TO FILE THE PROPER DOCUMENTATION.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. ALISHA RAINS V. AARON BOYD

25FL0175

On January 14, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents, with the exception of a blank FL-320, were served on January 16th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on February 6, 2026, and were able to reach agreements on some issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on March 20, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on March 25th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 25th.

Petitioner is requesting orders regarding the safe transportation of the children, supervision of the children at all times, the proper storage of medication, and communication between the parties in the event of an emergency. She also asks that the parents be ordered to obtain independent study when removing the children from school for 5 days, and that they notify one another when the children are reported sick to school. She asks that each parent be allowed to have reasonable video calls with the children during their non-custodial time and that neither parent may unreasonably deny, restrict, monitor, or terminate the calls. She further requests orders clarifying the court's prior orders regarding vacations with the children. She asks that the court enforce its prior orders that neither party make unilateral decisions regarding issues of legal custody. Finally, she asks that both parents be allowed to attend extracurricular activities, school events, performances, games, ceremonies and similar events regardless of which parent has custody at the time of the event.

Respondent argues that the majority of the issues raised by Petitioner have already been resolved or addressed by the court previously. He opposes the request regarding attendance at extracurricular activities, and he asks for sanctions in the amount of \$1,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the March 20, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. In addition to the aforementioned, the court is ordering the following: (1) All medications and EpiPens shall be stored safely and outside of the reach of the minors; (2) The parties may use their allotted vacation time with the children on their assigned holiday, provided that the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

vacation does not interfere with the holiday schedule of the other parent; (3) The parties are each allowed to attend extracurricular activities and school events of the children regardless of who has custodial time with the children during the event, however, contact between the non-custodial parent and the children at the event is to remain brief.

Turning to the request for sanctions, an award for attorney's fees and sanctions may be made pursuant to Family Code section 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, while Respondent is adamant that many of the issues had already been addressed between the parties, Petitioner maintains that Respondent was not abiding by his agreements. Additionally, there remain other issues that the parties could not agree on which did need to be addressed in CCRC. For these reasons, the court does not find that Petitioner acted solely with the intent of frustrating the policy of the law. As such, the court does not find grounds to award sanctions and the request is denied.

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 #11: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 20, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. IN ADDITION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED, THE COURT IS ORDERING THE FOLLOWING: (1) ALL MEDICATIONS AND EPIPENS SHALL BE STORED SAFELY AND OUTSIDE OF THE REACH OF THE MINORS; (2) THE PARTIES MAY USE THEIR ALLOTTED VACATION TIME WITH THE CHILDREN ON THEIR ASSIGNED HOLIDAY, PROVIDED THAT THE VACATION DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE OF THE OTHER PARENT; (3) THE PARTIES ARE EACH ALLOWED TO ATTEND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND SCHOOL EVENTS OF THE CHILDREN REGARDLESS OF WHO HAS CUSTODIAL TIME WITH THE CHILDREN DURING THE EVENT, HOWEVER, CONTACT BETWEEN THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT AND THE CHILDREN AT THE EVENT IS TO REMAIN BRIEF.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

THE REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. MELANIE SCHWARTZLER V. ROBERT CLINTON

PFL20170631

On January 16, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. Petitioner was personally served on January 22, 2026, as is required by Family Code § 215.

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

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the children. He asks that Petitioner have visitation on the second and fourth Sunday of each month from 9:00am to 5:00pm.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the requests made by Respondent are in the best interests of the minors. Respondent shall have sole legal and physical custody of the minors. Petitioner shall have parenting time the second and fourth Sunday of each month from 9:00am to 5:00pm. All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME THE SECOND AND FOURTH SUNDAY OF EACH MONTH FROM 9:00AM TO 5:00PM. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. MARIA VARGAS-COOK V. REILLY COOK

PFL20180521

On January 30, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking modification of permanent spousal support. Respondent did not file an Income and Expense Declaration and there is no Proof of Service for the RFO. This matter is dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: 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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. MARK BARRY V. JENNIFER BARRY

25FL0627

On March 18, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking modification of support orders, and an order for the sale of the marital residence. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Petitioner concurrently filed an Order Shortening Time (OST) which was granted. All required documents were served on March 23rd.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and Income and Expense Declaration on March 27th; however, Respondent did not use the FL-320, which is a mandatory use form. Therefore, the court cannot consider the Responsive Declaration.

Petitioner asks the court to reduce child and spousal support or temporarily set them to zero dollars, due to his current inability to work. Petitioner is also requesting an order for the marital residence located on Azalea Circle in Pollock Pines to be listed for sale. Petitioner asserts the home is in danger of entering foreclosure due to his inability to pay the mortgage.

The court finds Petitioner is currently unable to work, and as of March 16, 2026, is not earning income. Petitioner has applied for, but is not yet receiving, disability pay. As such, the court temporarily sets guideline child support at \$0 effective April 15, 2026. Likewise, the court temporarily sets temporary guideline spousal support at \$0 effective April 15, 2026. The court is reserving jurisdiction to retroactively modify support to April 15, 2026. The court sets a review hearing for July 9, 2026 at 8:30 AM to review child and spousal support.

Regarding the sale of the marital residence, it is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court's authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to "[a]t any time during the proceeding...order the liquidation of community or quasi-community assets so as to avoid unreasonable market or investment risks..." Cal. Fam. Code § 2108. Here, the residence does appear to be in present danger of foreclosure or destruction. Thus, the court orders the sale of the home to preserve the community interest. Petitioner is ordered to provide the names of three potential real estate agents to Respondent on or before April 23, 2026. Respondent is ordered to select one of the three by no later than April 30, 2026. The home is to be listed for sale by no later than May 7, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

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

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 #14: THE COURT TEMPORARILY SETS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT AT \$0 EFFECTIVE APRIL 15, 2026. LIKEWISE, THE COURT TEMPORARILY SETS TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT AT \$0 EFFECTIVE APRIL 15, 2026. THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY SUPPORT TO APRIL 15, 2026. THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING FOR JULY 9, 2026 AT 8:30 AM TO REVIEW CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT.

THE COURT ORDERS THE SALE OF THE HOME TO PRESERVE THE COMMUNITY INTEREST. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE THE NAMES OF THREE POTENTIAL REAL ESTATE AGENTS TO RESPONDENT ON OR BEFORE APRIL 23, 2026. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SELECT ONE OF THE THREE BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 30, 2026. THE HOME IS TO BE LISTED FOR SALE BY NO LATER THAN MAY 7, 2026.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL IS AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE THE LISTING PRICE FOR THE HOME.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE ARE TO BE PLACED IN PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR UNTIL COURT ORDER TO RELEASE THE PROCEEDS. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE COURT'S AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO ACT AS ELISOR FOR RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE IF NECESSARY.

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. DAVID KNIGHT V. AUBREY KNIGHT

23FL0645

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 13, 2025, seeking enforcement of the judgment and Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. This is a post-judgment request for enforcement, and as such Family Code section 215 applies. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail-served on January 7, 2026, with address verification. Enforcement of the judgment and attorney's fees do not fall within the exceptions of Family Code section 215 that allow for mail service with address verification. The public policy behind Family Code § 215 is to ensure actual notice to a party where matters such as custody are often ongoing past final judgment in a case. The policy is to treat the new motion as akin to a newly filed Complaint. Therefore, personal service is required.

Respondent appeared for the hearing on February 5, 2026. Petitioner failed to appear. Respondent requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to perfect service. The court granted the request to continue and scheduled the matter for a hearing on April 9, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Respondent filed a Proof of Personal Service on March 18, 2026, showing that the process server substitute served Petitioner on March 13, 2026. Petitioner was subsequently electronically served on March 17, 2026. The court finds service to have been perfected.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on March 25, 2026. It was mail-served the same day. Respondent is seeking enforcement of the judgment that Petitioner pay the \$600,000 equalization payment along with legal interest in the amount of \$42,000, for a total payment of \$642,000. Additionally, Respondent is seeking \$5,000 in attorney's fees for being forced to file this motion to enforce the judgment. Additionally, Respondent is seeking \$3,500 in Family Code section 271 sanctions for the behavior of Petitioner in avoiding service and the additional fees incurred to effectuate service.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, therefore, the court deems his failure to do so as an admission that Petitioner's moving papers have merit. See El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C).

The court grants Respondent's motion in its entirety. Petitioner is ordered to pay the equalization payment of \$600,000, along with legal interest, on or before May 1, 2026. Petitioner is to withdraw the funds from his 401(k) as set forth in the parties' judgement provision 7.01.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Pursuant to provision 12.08 of the parties' judgment, the court grants Respondent's request for reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of \$5,000. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent's counsel, Aaron Dosh \$5,000 as and for attorney's fees. The payment is due on or before May 1, 2026.

"Section 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 Petitioner's actions fall squarely within the prohibited behaviors outlined in Family Code section 271. The court grants Respondent's request for sanctions in the amount of \$3,000 payable directly to Respondent's counsel. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent's counsel, Aaron Dosh, \$3,000 as and for sanctions in the form of attorney's fees on or before May 1, 2026.

All prior orders not in conflict with these 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 #15: THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S MOTION IN ITS ENTIRETY. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY THE EQUALIZATION PAYMENT OF \$600,000, ALONG WITH LEGAL INTEREST, ON OR BEFORE MAY 1, 2026. PETITIONER IS TO WITHDRAW THE FUNDS FROM HIS 401(K) AS SET FORTH IN THE PARTIES' JUDGEMENT PROVISION 7.01.

PURSUANT TO PROVISION 12.08 OF THE PARTIES' JUDGMENT, THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR REASONABLE ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL, AARON DOSH \$5,000 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. THE PAYMENT IS DUE ON OR BEFORE MAY 1, 2026.

THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,000 PAYABLE DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL, AARON DOSH, \$3,000 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS IN THE FORM OF ATTORNEY'S FEES ON OR BEFORE MAY 1, 2026.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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.

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. KATIE MOYER V. RODNEY LONG

PFL20190731

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on January 15, 2026. The court denied the request on January 16th. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 16, 2026, seeking a modification of child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 13, 2026 and a review hearing on April 9th. Petitioner was personally served on January 17, 2026.

The court issued an ex parte minute order on January 28, 2026, reassigning the CCRC appointment. Parties were mailed copies at their addresses listed with court.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on February 13, 2026 and mailed to the parties on February 18th.

Petitioner filed a Declaration regarding the missed CCRC appointment on February 17, 2026. Respondent was mail served on February 17th. Petitioner asserts she never received the reassignment order and appeared at the originally scheduled location. Petitioner is requesting to be referred back to CCRC.

Respondent filed a Declaration on February 23, 2026. Petitioner was served on February 24th.

Respondent filed additional Declarations on March 16, 2026. They were served on March 16, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 18, 2026. It was served on March 11, 2026. Petitioner objects to the requests made by Respondent and requests the current orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner proposes slight modifications to the current orders.

Respondent filed a Declaration on April 1, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, and as such, the court has not considered it.

Petitioner filed a Notice of Objection to Respondent's April 1st Declaration. The court finds the objections to be moot.

The court finds good cause to rerefer the parties to CCRC. Petitioner is admonished to keep her address on file with the court current. Parties are to attend CCRC on Friday, May 1st at 9:00 AM and return for a review hearing on Thursday, June 25th at 1:30 PM in

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Department 5. Pending the review hearing all prior orders remain in full force and effect. Any Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO REREFER THE PARTIES TO CCRC. PETITIONER IS ADMONISHED TO KEEP HER ADDRESS ON FILE WITH THE COURT CURRENT. PARTIES ARE TO ATTEND CCRC ON FRIDAY, MAY 1ST AT 9:00 AM AND RETURN FOR A REVIEW HEARING ON THURSDAY, JUNE 25TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. DOMINIC OZENNE V. NICOLE OZENNE

25FL0396

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 10, 2026, seeking guideline temporary spousal support. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on March 27, 2026. Petitioner does not assert a defect in service; therefore, the court finds any defect to have been waived. Petitioner requests guideline spousal support be calculated based solely on his main income and that the court not include his secondary employment, as he seeks to terminate that employment.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. Utilizing the figures as set forth in the parties' Income and Expense Declarations, the court finds temporary guideline spousal support to be \$1,105 per month per the Alameda Formula, payable from Petitioner to Respondent. (see attached X-Spouse) The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$1,105 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support, effective March 1, 2026, and payable on the 1st of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this results in an arrears balance of \$2,210 for the months of March and April inclusive. The court further finds based on Petitioner's declaration there have been voluntary support payments in the amount of \$900 per month since January 2026. The court finds the total amount of arrears owing to be \$410. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$410 as and for arrears on or before May 15, 2026.

All prior orders not in conflict with these 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 #17: THE COURT FINDS TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO BE \$1,105 PER MONTH PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA, PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT. (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE) THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$1,105 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT, EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2026, AND PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

THE COURT FINDS THIS RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$2,210 FOR THE MONTHS OF MARCH AND APRIL INCLUSIVE. THE COURT FURTHER FINDS BASED ON PETITIONER'S DECLARATION THERE HAVE BEEN VOLUNTARY SUPPORT PAYMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$900 PER MONTH SINCE JANUARY 2026. THE COURT FINDS THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ARREARS OWING TO BE \$410. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$410 AS AND FOR ARREARS ON OR BEFORE MAY 15, 2026.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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.

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 9, 2026

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

18. JEFFREY SHASKY V. KATHERINE SHASKY

PFL20210259

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 4, 2026, seeking enforcement of the court's November 4, 2025 orders. Petitioner filed an amended RFO on February 6, 2026, seeking the same orders. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration on March 16, 2026. In her Responsive Declaration, Respondent asserts she was served on March 9, 2026, however, she does not state the manner in which she was served. The court finds March 9, 2026 service to be timely. While, this is a post-judgment request for modification, and as such, service must comply with Family Code section 215, the court finds any defect in service to have been waived by Respondent's filing of a Responsive Declaration which addresses the issues raised in the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to proceed on the merits.

Petitioner asserts that Respondent has failed to comply with the court's orders for reunification services between Petitioner and the minors. Petitioner seek an order compelling the minors to attend reunification therapy and for Respondent to support such therapy. Petitioner further seeks court orders regarding payment for reunification therapy.

Respondent objects to the orders for reunification services and she asserts there is a no contact order preventing Petitioner for having contact with the minors.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court has considered the orders from Sacramento County, which were ordered on July 17, 2025, which are modifiable by further court orders, and specifically state that issues relating to child custody and child visitation are to be addressed by El Dorado County. The court finds the current orders remain in the minor's best interest. The current orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent is to ensure the minor's full participation in all therapeutic services, including reunification therapy with Petitioner. The parties are to share in the cost of reunification therapy equally.

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 #18: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 9, 2026

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

EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS TO ENSURE THE MINOR'S FULL PARTICIPATION IN ALL THERAPEUTIC SERVICES, INCLUDING REUNIFICATION THERAPY WITH PETITIONER. THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE IN THE COST OF REUNIFICATION THERAPY EQUALLY.

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 9, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. GARY SHOFFNER V. QACEE SANDOVAL

23FL1093

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO), on February 5, 2026, seeking an order waiving Petitioner's disclosures. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

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

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