

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. DCSS V. CHAD MCCRACKEN (OTHER PARENT: YULIYA PALSSON) PFS20200179

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on August 13, 2024, seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties appeared before the court on October 31st for hearing on the RFO. A review hearing was set on the issues of custody and visitation.

At the review hearing, the parties agreed to return to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) to discuss the issues of a parenting plan and an Evidence Code section 730 evaluation. Another review hearing was set for July 10th.

At the July 10th hearing, the court adopted the recommendations as stated in the June 26, 2025 CCRC report and ordered a 730 evaluation. Another review hearing was set for November 6, 2025 at which time the court made several orders including its reiteration that a 730 evaluation was to be completed. A review hearing was set for February 5th which was continued to the present date for receipt and review of the 730 evaluation.

On February 25, 2026, Other Parent filed an RFO for custody and visitation orders. It was served on January 23rd, a month prior to filing. The hearing on that RFO is scheduled for May 14, 2026. Because it was served prior to filing, it is unclear to the court if Respondent was given proper notice of the hearing date and time. Additionally, according to the Proof of Service, the FL-300 was served without any of the other required documents.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on March 3, 2026. It was served on February 20th.

The 730 evaluation was completed and the report was filed with the court on May 1, 2026.

On May 6th, a Reply and Supplemental Declaration of Respondent was filed and served by Respondent.

The Other Parent's Reply Declaration to Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed on May 7, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting unsupervised parenting time with the minor or, alternatively, nonprofessional supervised visits conducted by an agreed upon supervisor. She asks the court to change the mediator pending review of an administrative complaint she filed against Rebecca Nelson and any other orders the court deems appropriate.

Respondent asks that the court to deny Other Parent's requests and suspend all non-professional supervised visits between Other Parent and the minor. He asks that the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

court restrict any direct communications between the two pending further court order. He further asks that Other Parent be precluded from discussing any litigation matters with the minor or showing him any of the adult communications. Finally, he requests \$6,000 in Family Code § 271 sanctions.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the current orders remain in the best interests of the minor. All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Other Parent is admonished that continued discussion of litigation matters (family or criminal) or showing the minor adult communications or communications regarding the ongoing legal proceedings may result in an order to show cause for contempt, sanctions, or other changes in her communication and visitation with the minor.

Other Parent's request to change the assigned mediator is denied.

The request for Section 271 sanctions is denied. Respondent requests \$6,000 for the fees incurred over the past 9 months however, Respondent has failed to establish the amount of fees actually incurred and how those fees were incurred directly as a result of Other Parent's frustration of the policy of the law to promote settlement and cooperation.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. OTHER PARENT IS ADMONISHED THAT CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF LITIGATION MATTERS (FAMILY OR CRIMINAL) OR SHOWING THE MINOR ADULT COMMUNICATIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THE ONGOING LEGAL PROCEEDINGS MAY RESULT IN AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CONTEMPT, SANCTIONS, OR OTHER CHANGES IN HER COMMUNICATION OR VISITATION WITH THE MINOR. OTHER PARENT'S REQUEST TO CHANGE THE ASSIGNED MEDIATOR IS DENIED.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED.

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

May 14, 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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. JACOB CLARK V. NICHOLE ROEMER-CLARK

24FL0798

On February 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. This is a post-judgment request and as such, all required documents were personally served on Respondent on February 21st in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 17th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 24, 2026. They were able to reach agreements on some, but not all issues. As such, a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on April 2nd.

The Supplemental Declaration of Respondent was filed and served on April 27th.

Petitioner filed a declaration on April 30th. It was served on May 4, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting a custody and visitation schedule in accordance with the MC-025 attachment to the RFO.

Respondent requests clarification on several of the court's prior orders. She also requests three days of make-up time and an order precluding the parties from conditioning custody exchanges and routine cooperation on unilateral demands.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the April 2, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the following modifications and additions. The Vacation section of the CCRC report shall be amended to read as follows: "Parents shall have seven vacation days not to exceed 10 days in a row (when taken together with regular parenting time days). Vacation times do not have to be consecutive but may not be shorter than two consecutive days. Vacation time does not override the holiday schedule. The vacationing parent must notify the other parent in writing of vacation plans a minimum of 30 days in advance and provide the other parent with a basic itinerary that includes dates of leaving and returning, destinations, flight information, and telephone numbers and lodging information." Paragraph 1 of the Counseling section is amended to read – "The parties shall participate in co-parenting counseling at a frequency and duration as recommended by the counselor. The parties are to meet and confer to select a therapist. If they cannot agree on one then Respondent shall

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

propose the names of three therapists to Petitioner and Petitioner shall select one of the three.”

In addition to the above, the parties are to make the minor available for phone contact with the non-custodial parent once per day for a minimum of 15 minutes at an agreed upon time. The custodial parent shall not interfere with or monitor the calls in any way. The parties are ordered to notify one another of any extracurricular activities the child is involved in, including dates and times of classes/practices and performances/games. Both parties have a right to attend all school and extracurricular activities.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. This includes the court’s prior order regarding the right of first refusal and the court’s order for joint legal custody. As part of shared legal custody, the parties are ordered to notify one another of any medical appointments for the minor within 24 hours of making the appointment. If the custodial parent is unable to transport the minor to or from the medical appointment, the non-custodial parent shall be given the option to take the minor to the appointment prior to any third party being asked to do so.

Finally, Respondent’s request for make-up days is granted. The parties are ordered to exchange the minor on schedule regardless of whether or not there is a long weekend. This is with the exception of vacation time or the court ordered holiday schedule. As such, Respondent is granted three days of make-up time. The parties are ordered to meet and confer on the make-up days. If they cannot come to an agreement on the dates, Respondent shall have final decision making authority so long as her selection does not interfere with a preplanned vacation of Petitioner with the minor.

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 #2: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 2, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONS. THE VACATION SECTION OF THE CCRC REPORT SHALL BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:
“PARENTS SHALL HAVE SEVEN DAY’S VACATION NOT TO EXCEED 10 DAYS IN A ROW (WHEN TAKEN TOGETHER WITH REGULAR PARENTING TIME DAYS). VACATION TIMES DO NOT HAVE TO BE CONSECUTIVE BUT MAY NOT BE SHORTER THAN TWO**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

CONSECUTIVE DAYS. VACATION TIME DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE. THE VACATIONING PARENT MUST NOTIFY THE OTHER PARENT IN WRITING OF VACATION PLANS A MINIMUM OF 30 DAYS IN ADVANCE AND PROVIDE THE OTHER PARENT WITH A BASIC ITINERARY THAT INCLUDES DATES OF LEAVING AND RETURNING, DESTINATIONS, FLIGHT INFORMATION, AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS AND LODGING INFORMATION.” PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE COUNSELING SECTION IS AMENDED TO READ – “THE PARTIES SHALL PARTICIPATE IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE COUNSELOR. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER TO SELECT A THERAPIST. IF THEY CANNOT AGREE ON ONE THEN RESPONDENT SHALL PROPOSE THE NAMES OF THREE THERAPISTS TO PETITIONER AND PETITIONER SHALL SELECT ONE OF THE THREE.”

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE, THE PARTIES ARE TO MAKE THE MINOR AVAILABLE FOR PHONE CONTACT WITH THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT ONCE PER DAY FOR A MINIMUM OF 15 MINUTES AT AN AGREED UPON TIME. THE CUSTODIAL PARENT SHALL NOT INTERFERE WITH OR MONITOR THE CALLS IN ANY WAY. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO NOTIFY ONE ANOTHER OF ANY EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES THE CHILD IS INVOLVED IN, INCLUDING DATES AND TIMES OF CLASSES/PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCES/GAMES. BOTH PARTIES HAVE A RIGHT TO ATTEND ALL SCHOOL AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THIS INCLUDES THE COURT’S PRIOR ORDER REGARDING THE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL AND THE COURT’S ORDER FOR JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. AS PART OF SHARED LEGAL CUSTODY, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO NOTIFY ONE ANOTHER OF ANY MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS FOR THE MINOR WITHIN 24 HOURS OF MAKING THE APPOINTMENT. IF THE CUSTODIAL PARENT IS UNABLE TO TRANSPORT THE MINOR TO OR FROM THE MEDICAL APPOINTMENT, THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT SHALL BE GIVEN THE OPTION TO TAKE THE MINOR TO THE APPOINTMENT PRIOR TO ANY THIRD PARTY BEING ASKED TO DO SO.

FINALLY, RESPONDENT’S REQUEST FOR MAKE UP DAYS IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EXCHANGE THE MINOR ON SCHEDULE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A LONG WEEKEND. THIS IS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF VACATION TIME OR THE COURT ORDERED HOLIDAY SCHEDULE. AS SUCH, RESPONDENT IS GRANTED THREE DAYS OF MAKE UP TIME. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER ON THE MAKE UP DAYS. IF THEY CANNOT COME TO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

AN AGREEMENT ON THE DATES, RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE FINAL DECISION MAKING AUTHORITY SO LONG AS HER SELECTION DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH A PREPLANNED VACATION OF PETITIONER WITH THE MINOR.

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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. ISMAEL VAZQUEZ CONTRERAS V. SARAH ALANA KIDD

PFL20200408

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). The RFO was mail-served on January 6, 2026, however the CCRC referral was not served.

Petitioner did not attend the CCRC appointment as he was not served with the referral. The matter came before the court for hearing on February 19, 2026, at which time the parties were re-referred to CCRC and a review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on March 18th and reached agreements on all issues. A report containing those agreements was prepared on April 29, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on April 30th.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements contained in the April 29, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They 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 #3: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 29, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY 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.

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

May 14, 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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. DAVID LEE HUIBREGTSE V. ANA HUIBREGTSE

23FL0895

On March 4, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to withdraw funds held in trust. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration on April 21, 2026. All required documents were served on April 20th with the exception of the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 27th.

On May 5th, Petitioner filed a Declaration of Jordan Porterfield in Opposition to Respondent's Request to Deny Petitioner's Request to Withdraw Funds.

Petitioner, by and through his daughter who has durable power of attorney, is requesting to withdraw \$30,000 from the home sale funds which are currently held in trust by Respondent's counsel.

Respondent opposes the requested withdrawal, however, if the court does grant Petitioner's request, then Respondent asks that she be allowed to withdraw the same amount.

After reviewing the filings, the court finds it prudent to allow each party to withdraw a portion of their community property share of the funds held in trust from the sale of the marital residence. Accordingly, Petitioner and Respondent may each withdraw \$30,000 from the trust funds. The court reserves jurisdiction over the characterization of these funds until the time of trial on the issue of division of community property.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT MAY EACH WITHDRAW \$30,000 FROM THE TRUST FUNDS. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THESE FUNDS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF DIVISION OF COMMUNITY PROPERTY.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. DCSS V. BRIAN ORTEGA (OTHER PARENT: REBECCA GIERHART) PFS20160102

On February 19, 2026, Other Parent filed a Request for Order seeking visitation orders and attorney's fees. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were electronically served on February 23rd.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on May 1st.

Other Parent filed Mother's Reply Declaration to Responsive Declaration on May 5th, it was served on May 6th.

Other Parent is requesting an order allowing the children to attend the annual family camping trip from July 13, 2026, through July 20, 2026, and Respondent to receive his two hours of missed parenting time as make up time prior to July 13th. She further requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$3,000.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find it to be in the best interests of the children to attend the annual camping trip. Other Parent is hereby authorized to take the children on the annual family camping trip from July 13, 2026, through July 20, 2026. Other Parent is ordered to provide Respondent with travel itinerary as soon as she has it including, but not limited to, lodging location and contact information.

Respondent shall be allowed two hours of make-up time to account for the visit he will miss with the children while they are camping. The parties are to meet and confer to select dates and times for Respondent to make up his two hours of parenting time before July 13, 2026.

Regarding the request for sanctions, it appears the request is being 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). While the purpose of Section 271 is to impose a punitive sanction, the court is not to impose a sanction that would create an "unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed." *Id.*

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Here, it does appear that Respondent's blanket refusal to allow the children to attend the camping trip may have frustrated the policy of the law, to promote settlement, the court is concerned that the imposition of sanctions, especially in the amount of \$3,000, would create an unreasonable financial burden on Respondent. Accordingly, the request for sanctions is denied. Respondent is admonished that continued failure to engage in cooperative coparenting may result in monetary sanctions in the future.

Other Parent 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: OTHER PARENT IS AUTHORIZED TO TAKE THE CHILDREN ON THE ANNUAL FAMILY CAMPING TRIP FROM JULY 13, 2026 THROUGH JULY 20, 2026. OTHER PARENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE RESPONDENT WITH TRAVEL ITINERARY AS SOON AS SHE HAS IT INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, LODGING LOCATION AND CONTACT INFORMATION.

RESPONDENT SHALL BE ALLOWED TWO HOURS OF MAKE-UP TIME TO ACCOUNT FOR THE VISIT HE WILL MISS WITH THE CHILDREN WHILE THEY ARE CAMPING. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER TO SELECT DATES AND TIMES FOR RESPONDENT TO MAKE UP HIS TWO HOURS OF PARENTING TIME BEFORE JULY 13, 2026.

THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS DENIED. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT CONTINUED FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN COOPERATIVE COPARENTING MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE FUTURE.

OTHER PARENT 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

May 14, 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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. STUART REMINGTON V. BRITTANY REMINGTON

24FL0061

On April 15, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel further discovery responses and sanctions. The RFO and supporting documents were served on April 16th, though it appears the Notice of Tentative Ruling and blank FL-320 were not served.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Declaration of Stephen M. Sirota on May 7th.

Respondent asks the court to compel further discovery responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Set Two.

Petitioner opposes the motion and the requested sanctions on the basis that the motion is untimely. He further asks for sanctions against Respondent in the amount of \$1,600 pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2031.310 and § 2023.030.

On receipt of responses to requests for production of documents, the requesting party may move for an order compelling further responses where the initial production is not in compliance with the Civil Discovery Act. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2031.310. That said, a motion to compel further responses shall (1) be filed and served within 45 days (50 with mailing) of the date the responses were served (Cal. Civ. Pro. §2031.310(c)); (2) be accompanied by a meet and confer declaration (Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2031.310(b)(2)), and (3) include a separate statement which complies with California Rules of Court rule 3.1345.

According to the filings of the parties, Petitioner served his discovery responses on January 22, 2026. That would make the 45 day deadline, March 8th. The motion was served electronically, which means the court need not account for the additional five days for mailing. Regardless, the motion was not filed until April 15th, almost a month after the deadline. As such, the RFO is denied as untimely.

Sanctions are mandatory for one who “unsuccessfully *makes or opposes* a motion to compel a response...unless [the court] finds that one subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2031.300(c). Where sanctions are awarded, the amount imposed is to include “...the reasonable expenses, including attorney’s fees, incurred by anyone as a result of...” the conduct of the party subject to sanction. Cal. Civ. Pro. 2023.030(a). A party requesting sanctions must establish that the amount requested is reasonable, was incurred as a result of discovery abuse, and the requesting party must already be liable for

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

Petitioner maintains that he has incurred three hours worth of attorney's fees reviewing the moving papers, researching, and responding to the moving papers. He expects to incur an additional 1 hour in preparing for and attending the hearing. Regarding the amount Petitioner expects to incur, but has not yet been incurred, this amount is not recoverable. Regarding the remaining three hours, Petitioner has failed to establish the reasonableness of the amount allegedly incurred and a nexus between that amount and the untimely filing of the motion. Without having met his burden of proof the court is inclined to award only \$800 to account for two hours of time reviewing the motion and preparing the response given that the motion and responsive papers are rather short and the issue is straightforward.

Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$800 as and for discovery sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2031.300(c). This amount is to be paid from Respondent's portion of the community property upon the final division of property.

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: THE RFO IS DENIED AS UNTIMELY. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$800 AS AND FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO CIVIL PROCEDURE § 2031.300(C). THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID FROM RESPONDENT'S PORTION OF THE COMMUNITY PROPERTY UPON THE FINAL DIVISION OF PROPERTY.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. SUSAN SOHAL V. RISHI SOHAL

PFL20180510

On February 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. All required documents were served electronically on March 9, 2026, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore personal service of the moving papers was required in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC on March 20th, therefore CCRC was unable to make any recommendations.

On April 30th, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Susan Talwar.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

10. Stephen Cass v. Pamela Cass

24FL0586

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 19, 2026, requesting a modification of temporary spousal support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Respondent was only served with the RFO and not the other required documents.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on May 1, 2026. Petitioner was served the same day. Respondent objects to the court modifying the current orders as Respondent was not properly served with all the required documents.

“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. Petitioner failed to comply with the Rule of Court as well as the local rule. The court denies Petitioner’s request to modify temporary guideline spousal support.

The court find the parties are currently set for trial on all issues set to commence September 8, 2026. The court adds spousal support as an issue and continued to reserve jurisdiction to retroactively modify spousal support to August 28, 2024.

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 #10: “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. PETITIONER FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE RULE OF COURT AS WELL AS THE LOCAL RULE. THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER’S REQUEST TO MODIFY TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT.

THE COURT FIND THE PARTIES ARE CURRENTLY SET FOR TRIAL ON ALL ISSUES SET TO COMMENCE SEPTEMBER 8, 2026. THE COURT ADDS SPOUSAL SUPPORT AS AN

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

ISSUE AND CONTINUED TO RESERVE JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO AUGUST 28, 2024.

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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. TRAVIS BASKINS V. DESTINEE BASKINS

PFL20200285

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on April 15, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the court granted Respondent temporary sole physical custody of the minors until Petitioner cleared his outstanding criminal warrants. The court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on April 28, 2026 and set a review hearing for May 14, 2026. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 17th, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and reached a full agreement. The parties submitted a stipulation, which the court adopted as its order on May 6, 2026.

The court drops the matter from calendar based on the parties' stipulation. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. MICHAEL BUNIO V. CHRISTINE MCKAY

26FL0013

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 17, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 18, 2026 and a review hearing on May 14, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and requested the CCRC appointment and the review hearing be vacated.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as the parties' request.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS THE PARTIES' REQUEST.

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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON

23FL0077

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 26, 2026, seeking health insurance decision making rights as well as reassignment of the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) counselor. Respondent and Minors' Counsel were served electronically on November 26, 2025. However, they were not served with a blank FL-320.

Parties appeared for the hearing on February 19, 2026. Petitioner requested the matter be continued to allow service to be perfected. The court granted the request to continue the request to reassign the CCRC counselor to May 14, 2026. The court found the issue of health insurance to be moot.

Petitioner filed Proof of Service on February 19, 2025, showing all the required documents were served on November 16, 2026

Neither Respondent nor Minors' Counsel has filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above and the April 3, 2025 CCRC report. While the court understands Petitioner's concerns, the court cannot find the CCRC counselor has violated any rules of court or has demonstrated bias. It appears Petitioner disagrees with the counselor's assessment of the circumstances and disagrees with the counselor's recommendation. Those are not grounds to reassign the counselor. Petitioner's request to reassign the CCRC counselor is denied.

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 #13: THE COURT CANNOT FIND THE CCRC COUNSELOR HAS VIOLATED ANY RULES OF COURT OR HAS DEMONSTRATED BIAS. PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO REASSIGN THE CCRC COUNSELOR IS DENIED.

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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. STANLEY DURAN, JR. V. ROSE DURAN

25FL0820

The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 8, 2026, and a review hearing on March 26, 2026, following the court issuing a permanent restraining order protecting Respondent.

The parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and reached agreements regarding custody and parenting time. The agreements appear to conflict with the orders issued in the DV-140, which themselves are contradictory. A report with the parties' agreements and recommendations was filed with the court on January 20, 2026, and mailed to the parties on January 22nd.

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on March 17, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the court granted an order shortening time, as the parties had a review hearing set for March 26th. Petitioner filed the Request for Order (RFO) on March 18, 2026. Respondent was served on March 19th.

Parties appeared at the hearing on March 26, 2026. The court re-referred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on April 7, 2026 and set a further review hearing on May 14th.

Both parties appeared at CCRC on April 7th. The minors were interviewed as well. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 1, 2026 and mailed to the parties on May 4th.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above. The court has also considered the Domestic Violence Restraining Order issued on December 17, 2025. The court finds the custody orders issued in the Domestic Violence Restraining Order, namely that Respondent was granted sole legal and physical custody, are in the minors' best interests. Further, the current parenting plan of week on/week off is incongruent with the orders for Respondent to have sole legal and physical custody. The court finds the presumption under Family Code section 3044 applies. The court further finds that Petitioner has failed to rebut the presumption. As such, the court is adopting the recommendations as set forth in the May 1st CCRC report that Respondent shall have sole legal and physical custody. Petitioner shall have parenting time every other weekend from Friday after school to Sunday at 7:00 PM. The court is adopting the remaining recommendations as set forth.

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,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 14, 2026

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

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 FINDS THE CUSTODY ORDERS ISSUED IN THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER, NAMELY THAT RESPONDENT WAS GRANTED SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY ARE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. FURTHER, THE CURRENT PARENTING PLAN OF WEEK ON/WEEK OFF IS INCONGRUENT WITH THE ORDERS FOR SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY. THE COURT FINDS THE PRESUMPTION UNDER FAMILY CODE SECTION 3044 APPLIES. THE COURT FURTHER FINDS THAT PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO REBUT THE PRESUMPTION. AS SUCH, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 1ST CCRC REPORT THAT RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME EVERY OTHER WEEKEND FROM FRIDAY AFTER SCHOOL TO SUNDAY AT 7:00 PM. THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE REMAINING RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. 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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. SARAH MACCIA V. GEROGE MACCHIA

22FL1202

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 6, 2026 seeking spousal support. The RFO was personally served along with the Notice of Tentative Ruling on March 27th.

Parties appeared for the hearing on April 23, 2026. Petitioner requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to perfect service. The court found good cause to continue the matter and set the matter for a further hearing on May 14, 2026. The court shortened time for service of the documents to May 1, 2026.

Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with the FL-150, a blank FL-150, as well as the minute order from the April 23rd hearing on April 27, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on April 30, 2026. Both were mail served on April 30th.

The court finds this is a request to modify permanent spousal support. The court must take evidence on the Family Code section 4320 factors. The parties are ordered to appear to select Mandatory Settlement Conference (MSC) and trial dates.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE (MSC) AND TRIAL DATES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. ANNE MCNELIS V. FERRIS NUESMEYER

PFL20160411

Parties appeared before the court for hearing on Petitioner's Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on April 16, 2026. The court appointed the office of the Public Defender to Respondent continued the arraignment to May 14, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO) filed January 26, 2026 is trailing the OSC.

Parties are ordered to appear for further arraignment and the RFO.

**TENTATIVE RULING #17: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR FURTHER
ARRAIGNMENT AND THE RFO.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. PHILLIP PALOMBI V. STACEY WILLIAMSON

26FL0145

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 19, 2026, seeking custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 19, 2026 and a review hearing on May 14, 2026. Respondent was personally served on February 19, 2026. However, it does not appear Respondent was served with a copy of the referral to CCRC or the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC on March 19, 2026. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on May 4, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #18: 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
May 14, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. HOLLIE WALLACE V. JASON WALLACE

24FL1139

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 18, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as orders regarding the division of property. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 15, 2026 and a review hearing on March 12, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on December 24, 2025. However, the Proof of Service does not show Respondent was served with a blank FL-320 form.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment on January 15th. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on January 15th. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on January 22, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court has not considered it.

Petitioner appeared at the hearing on March 12, 2026. Respondent failed to appear. The court found good cause to continue the hearing to allow Petitioner to perfect service. The court set a further review hearing for May 14, 2026, and directed Petitioner to serve all the required documents as well as a copy of the minute order from the March 12, 2026 hearing on Respondent.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service as well as an address verification showing Respondent was served by overnight delivery on April 21, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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