3. COLBY BROWN V. AMY PARKKO

PFL20180460

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 22, 2024 seeking custody and visitation orders. It was mail served on February 26th. Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 13th. It was mail served on March 14th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 21st and were able to reach only a partial agreement. A report containing the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 25th.

Petitioner brings his RFO requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the parties' minor child with a visitation schedule to be agreed upon in mediation. He states that Respondent has refused to cooperate in obtaining tutoring for the minor and there have been issues with the right of first refusal. The parties are currently exercising a 2-2-5 schedule.

Respondent opposes the request and asks that the parties maintain the current orders which were agreed to in 2022.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the March 21, 2024 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are therefore adopted as the orders of the court.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONATINED IN THE MARCH 21, 2024 CCRC REPORT ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

4. CURTIS CHRISTENSEN V. GINA CHRISTENSEN

PFL20170845

On March 1, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as discussed in further detail below. Concurrently therewith, he filed Attorney Amanda D. Yasbek's Declaration in Support of Petitioner's Request for Order Regarding Attorney's Fees. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were served on March 8th. Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration was filed on May 6th. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner brings his RFO making the following requests: (1) Respondent to read any messages from Petitioner within 24 hours and to provide a response within 48 hours on matters regarding the general welfare of the children, including the health, education, sports, and extracurriculars; (2) Petitioner asks the court to vacate its prior order which grants Respondent final decision-making authority after 10 days of good faith discussions; (3) Petitioner asks that Respondent not have final decision-making authority regarding out of state travel; (4) Require 30 days' notice for any out of state travel; (5) Enforcement of the week-on/week-off summer schedule; (6) Petitioner requests vacation time with the children for up to two weeks every year, including vacations outside the state of California without Respondent's prior consent. Specifically, he requests an order allowing him to take the children to see their grandmother in Idaho; (7) The children be allowed to work for Petitioner or his fiancée during Petitioner's visitation time; (8) Order a psychological evaluation of Respondent and the children to be conducted by Dr. Craig Childress; (9) Attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,000; (10) Sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 and Code of Civil Procedure § 177.5.

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, it appears the RFO and supporting documents were timely and properly served on Respondent and she has chosen not to respond. Therefore, the court deems her failure to respond as an admission as to the merit of Petitioner's requests.

After reviewing Petitioner's filings and given Respondent's admission, the court does find that Respondent has abused her final decision-making authority. It is in the best interests of the children to ensure that both parents are actively involved in making decisions regarding their general health and wellbeing. As such, both parties are ordered to read messages regarding matters of legal custody within 24 hours of receipt and provide a response within 48 hours of receipt. Neither party shall have final decision-making authority.

Regarding out of state travel and two-week vacations, the court notes that reunification therapy had not commenced as of the date of Petitioner's declaration. Therefore, the court is hesitant to make orders in this regard until reunification therapy has commenced and the court

has had the opportunity to assess the progress thereof. As such, Petitioner's requests for two weeks of vacation time and out-of-state travel are continued to join with the review hearing currently set for June 20th at 8:30am in Department 5.

The request to allow the children to work for Petitioner and his fiancée during the summer is also continued to June 20th as it is unclear to the court exactly what type of work Petitioner and his fiancée are engaged in and what type of work the children will be expected to do.

Petitioner's request for a psychological evaluation of Respondent and the children is granted. Dr. Craig Childress shall conduct the evaluation. Both parties are to equally split the cost of the evaluation subject to reallocation.

As Respondent has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration, the court reserves jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and sanctions to the review hearing on June 20th. Respondent is directed to file and serve an Income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order shall remain in full force and effect. Parties are admonished to comply with all court orders including prior custody orders. Failure to do so may result in an Order to Show Cause for contempt. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: BOTH PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO READ MESSAGES REGARDING MATTERS OF LEGAL CUSTODY WITHIN 24 HOURS OF RECEIPT AND PROVIDE A RESPONSE WITHIN 48 HOURS OF RECEIPT. NEITHER PARTY SHALL HAVE FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY.

PETITIONER'S REQUESTS FOR TWO WEEKS OF VACATION TIME AND OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL ARE CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE REVIEW HEARING CURRENTLY SET FOR JUNE 20TH AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

THE REQUEST TO ALLOW THE CHILDREN TO WORK FOR PETITIONER AND HIS FIANCÉE DURING THE SUMMER IS ALSO CONTINUED TO JUNE 20TH AS IT IS UNCLEAR TO THE COURT EXACTLY WHAT TYPE OF WORK PETITIONER AND HIS FIANCÉE ARE ENGAGED IN AND WHAT TYPE OF WORK THE CHILDREN WILL BE EXPECTED TO DO.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF RESPONDENT AND THE CHILDREN IS GRANTED. DR. CRAIG CHILDRESS SHALL CONDUCT THE EVALUATION. BOTH PARTIES ARE TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE COST OF THE EVALUATION SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION.

AS RESPONDENT HAS NOT FILED AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION, THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND SANCTIONS TO THE REVIEW HEARING ON JUNE 20TH. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO FILE AND SERVE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED TO COMPLY WITH ALL COURT ORDERS INCLUDING PRIOR CUSTODY ORDERS. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CONTEMPT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

5. DUSTY SIMMONS V. ERIN SIMMONS

23FL0201

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on November 16, 2023, alleging three counts of contempt for Respondent's failure to pay support. Respondent was personally served on November 28, 2023.

The matter was set to be heard on January 18, 2024 but the parties stipulated to continue it to February 14th. At the February hearing the court appointed Respondent a Public Defender and the matter was once again continued.

The parties are ordered to appear for arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR ARRAIGNMENT.

6. EMILY SILVA V. JARED SILVA

PFL20170157

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 7, 2023, requesting a modification of the current orders for parenting time. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail. The court notes this is a post-judgement request for modification, and therefore, requires compliance with Family Code section 215. Service by mail is not compliant, however, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 7th reaching the merits of the RFO and therefore, the court finds good cause to proceed.

The matter came before the court for hearing on February 29, 2024 at which time the court referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

On March 5th, Petitioner filed a Declaration of Emily Croswaithe, it was mail served on Respondent the same day.

Petitioner filed her RFO requesting the court drop its no contact order between the minor and the maternal grandfather Robert Crosthwaite. Petitioner also requests the court appoint Minor's Counsel for the child.

The parties attended CCRC on March 22, 2024 and were able to reach agreements on all matters. A report codifying those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties the same day.

After CCRC, the parties implemented the agreed upon visitation schedule which, among other things, allows Petitioner to have parenting time on Wednesdays from 5:00 pm to Thursday at 7:00 pm. Respondent states the Wednesday visits have not been going well. He requests the court order Petitioner to have parenting time on Saturdays and Sundays from 9:00 am to 6:00 pm with no overnights. He asks that he have the minor for one weekend per month and he requests a court order directing Petitioner to attend one parenting counseling session.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and finds the agreements reached by the parties to be in the best interests of the minor therefore, the agreements stated in the March 22, 2024 CCRC report are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS STATED IN THE MARCH 22, 2024 CCRC REPORT AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER 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

TELEPHONE 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 TELEPHONE 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.

7. HOLLY CHARLES V. JOSEPH CHARLES

23FL0516

On February 29, 2024, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel Respondent's compliance with his disclosure obligations. The RFO and all other required documents were served on March 6th. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner brings her RFO requesting a waiver of receipt of Respondent's preliminary and final declarations of disclosure and evidentiary sanctions precluding evidence of any and all topics covered by the disclosures. In the alternative, Petitioner is asking for an order compelling Respondent to provide his preliminary and final declarations of disclosure within 30 days of the date of the order and a return hearing to ensure compliance with the court's order. Finally, she requests \$3,000 in attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 271 and 2107(C).

Family Code sections 2104 and 2105 impose on each party the obligation of making preliminary and final disclosures of assets within the specified timeframes. Where a party fails to comply with their disclosure requirements, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel disclosures or a motion for evidentiary and issue sanctions and a waiver of the disclosures. The moving party may also seek monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). In fact, "...the court shall...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and shall include reasonable attorney's fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust." Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Here, Petitioner has established her compliance with her disclosure obligations under Sections 2104 and 2105. She has also established Respondent's failure to comply. Therefore, the court does find an order compelling Respondent's disclosures is warranted under the circumstances. Respondent is ordered to serve full and complete preliminary and final declarations of disclosures no later than June 13, 2024. The court reserves on Petitioner's requests for evidentiary sanctions and a waiver of the disclosures. The request for monetary sanctions, however, is granted in part.

Petitioner is requesting \$3,000 in attorney's fees and costs. While the court is to award reasonable attorney's fees and costs, Petitioner has failed to establish that the entirety of the \$3,000 was incurred as a result of Respondent's non-compliance and that the amount is reasonable. It is unclear how much her attorney charges per hour and what work done resulted in \$3,000 worth of attorney's fees. In other words, why that amount is reasonable. The motion is relatively short and straightforward and therefore, the court finds an award of \$1,500 to be

reasonable. Respondent is ordered to pay \$1,500 directly to Petitioner's counsel no later than June 13, 2024.

Petitioner's request for a review hearing is granted. The court sets the matter for a review hearing to determine whether Respondent has complied with the order, and if not whether to waive the disclosure and/or impose further sanctions. The court sets a review hearing for July 18, 2024 at 8:30 in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the hearing. Failure to file and serve a Supplemental Declaration may result in the matter being dropped from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE FULL AND COMPLETE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSURES NO LATER THAN JUNE 13, 2024. THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUESTS FOR EVIDENTIARY SANCTIONS AND A WAIVER OF THE DISCLOSURES. THE REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS IS GRANTED IN PART. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY \$1,500 DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL NO LATER THAN JUNE 13, 2024. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A REVIEW HEARING IS GRANTED. THE COURT SETS THE MATTER FOR A REVIEW HEARING TO DETERMINE WHETHER RESPONDENT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE ORDER, AND IF NOT WHETHER TO WAIVE THE DISCLOSURE AND/OR IMPOSE FURTHER SANCTIONS. THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING FOR JULY 18, 2024 AT 8:30 IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING. FAILURE TO FILE AND SERVE A SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION MAY RESULT IN THE MATTER BEING DROPPED FROM CALENDAR.

9. SHANE COLE V. SUZETTE COLE

22FL1203

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 28, 2024 seeking a variety of orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Both documents, along with all other required documents, were served on March 5th.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on May 1st. They were served on April 30th.

Petitioner filed his RFO seeking the following orders: (1) Section 271 sanctions in the amount of \$5,000; (2) Allow Petitioner to enter the former marital residence to collect the agreed-upon belongings/enforce the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into by the parties; (3) Order Respondent to pay the late equalization payment, with interest; and (4) Enforce the MOU as it relates to the boat/trailer; and (5) any other remedies the court deems just and equitable.

According to Respondent, the equalization payment is current, and she has turned over all property that she was required to turn over under the MOU and that she was able to locate. She also states that she has already provided Petitioner with proof of payment for the debt owed to the IRS. Regarding the sale of the boat, Respondent states she did find a buyer for the boat and gave the buyer's name and contact information to Petitioner but Petitioner never responded. Finally, she asks that the court deny Respondent's request for Section 271 sanctions.

While Respondent's declaration indicates that a number of the issues have been resolved, Petitioner has not filed a Reply declaration to address whether or not he is in agreement with these assertions. It is therefore, unclear whether or not the equalization payments are actually up to date and whether Respondent did in fact give Petitioner the name and contact information for a potential buyer of the boat. The parties are ordered to appear at the hearing to address all issues.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR AT THE HEARING TO ADDRESS ALL ISSUES.

10. ALLYSON CLINK V. GEOGE CLINK

PFL20200799

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court modify the current child custody and parenting plan orders On February 29, 2024. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 25, 2024, and a review hearing on May 16, 2024. Upon review of the file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO and referral to CCRC.

Only Petitioner appeared for CCRC on March 25th. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on March 25, 2024. 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 #10: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

11. ASHELY GOEHRING V. COLBY STANWOOD

24FL0155

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on February 20, 2024. A summons was issued. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 18, 2024, and a review hearing on May 16, 2024. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service of the Summons, nor of the RFO and referral to CCRC.

Nevertheless, Respondent filed a Response on February 27, 2024, wherein he acknowledges he is the parent of the minor, signed the Declaration of Paternity, and appears on the minor's birth certificate. The Response was served on Petitioner via personal service on February 27th.

Respondent also filed a Responsive Declaration on February 27th. It was personally served on Petitioner the same day. Respondent is requesting joint legal and physical custody with a 2-2-3 parenting plan, as well as a proposed holiday schedule, and additional provisions as set forth in the FL-341(D).

The court, therefore, finds it has jurisdiction in this matter and finds Respondent to be the parent of the minor.

Both parties attended CCRC on March 18th and were able to reach many agreements. A report codifying the parties' agreements and containing additional recommendations was filed with the court on March 21, 2024. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court finds the parties' agreements and recommendations as set forth in the March 21st CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth.

Petitioner shall prepare the Parentage Judgement as well as the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS SET FORTH ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 21ST CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE THE PARENTAGE JUDGEMENT AS WELL AS THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

12. DCSS V. NEILL STRONBERG (OTHER PARENT: AMANDA PARDO)

PFS20210095

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 15, 2023, requesting the court modify the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 4, 2024, and a review hearing on February 22, 2024. Petitioner and Respondent were served by mail on December 29, 2023. Other Parent is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor. Other Parent has not requested any specified parenting time for Respondent.

Neither Petitioner nor Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration.

Only Other Parent appeared for the CCRC appointment on January 4, 2024. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations or agreements was filed with the court on January 4, 2024. Copies were mailed to the parties on the same day.

At the hearing on February 22, 2024, the court noted its concerns that Respondent did not timely receive the CCRC referral therefore the court rereferred the parties to CCRC and set a further review hearing for the present date.

Despite Respondent being provided with the CCRC referral from the clerk of the court on February 27th, Respondent failed to request accommodations to appear for the CCRC appointment. Therefore, once again, Other Parent was the only participant at the appointment. Once again a single parent report was filed with the court on April 4, 2024. Copies were mailed to the parties.

Neither Petitioner nor Respondent has filed a Responsive Declaration or Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court finds Other Parent's requested orders as set forth in the November 15, 2023 RFO are in the minor's best interest. The court grants Other Parent sole legal and physical custody. The court orders no contact between Respondent and the minor pending Respondent's release from incarceration. Upon Respondent's release, he may file a RFO to request to reinstate parenting time.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Other Parent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT FINDS OTHER PARENT'S REQUESTED ORDERS AS SET FORTH IN THE NOVEMBER 15, 2023 RFO ARE IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. THE COURT GRANTS OTHER PARENT SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY. THE COURT ORDERS NO CONTACT BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND THE MINOR PENDING RESPONDENT'S RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION. UPON RESPONDENT'S RELEASE, HE MAY FILE A RFO TO REQUEST TO

REINSTATE PARENTING TIME. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. OTHER PARENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

13. HOLLY CALDWELL V. DARIN CALDWELL

23FL1133

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 27, 2024, requesting the court make orders as to child custody and parenting time, as well as child support. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 28, 2024, and a review hearing on May 16, 2024. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO, the referral to CCRC, or Income and Expense Declaration.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared to the CCRC appointment and reached a full agreement. Parties submitted a Stipulation which the court adopted as its order on March 28, 2024.

Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on February 1, 2024. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it. Further, even if the court could consider it, it is outdated.

As there is no Proof of Service of the RFO or the Income and Expense Declaration filed by Petitioner and no Proof of Service of the Income and Expense Declaration filed by Respondent, the court drops the request for child support from calendar. The court affirms the prior orders as to custody and parenting time.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: AS THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE RFO OR THE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION FILED BY PETITIONER AND NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION FILED BY RESPONDENT, THE COURT DROPS THE REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT FROM CALENDAR. THE COURT AFFIRMS THE PRIOR ORDERS AS TO CUSTODY AND PARENTING TIME.

14. JOSE DE JESUS REYES V. VERONICA ROBLES RODRIGUEZ

24FL0232

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship and a Request for Order (RFO) requesting child custody and parenting time orders on March 12, 2024. A Summons was issued. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service of the Summons or of the RFO. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO FAILURE TO SERVE THE SUMMONS AND RFO.

15. MELISSA RASCON V. JERMONE FIMBRES

PFL20190242

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 1, 2024, requesting a modification to the current child custody and parenting time orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 28, 2024 and a review hearing on May 16, 2024. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO or the referral to CCRC.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on March 28th. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on March 28, 2024, and mailed to the parties on the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 2, 2024. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Respondent filed an additional Declaration on May 6, 2024. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

16. TERESA CARILLA V. KEATEN PETROVICH

24FL0177

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on February 27, 2024. A Summons was issued. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make child custody and parenting time orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as parentage had not been established.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service of Summons on March 21, 2024, showing Respondent was personally served with the Summons, as well as the RFO. However, the Proof of Service is signed by Petitioner, and is therefore, defective.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on April 19, 2024, with the minor's birth certificate attached. There is no Proof of Service for this document, and therefore, the court cannot consider it.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE DEFECT IN SERVICE.