

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

1. JASON GILLESPIE V. BARBARA GILLESPIE

24FL0722

On February 20, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and school orders for the children. All required documents were served on February 24th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 26th, though it is unclear why as she is the one who filed the moving papers. There was an RFO lodged with the court by Petitioner on February 23rd however, according to the court's file that RFO was not filed and it is therefore, not pending before the court.

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

Only Respondent appeared at the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on March 27th, therefore a report without recommendations was prepared and filed with the court.

The parties filed a request to be re-referred to CCRC which was granted and a new appointment was set for April 14th. Both parties attended the rescheduled CCRC appointment, however the CCRC counselor was once again unable to make any recommendations as Respondent refused to allow the children to speak with CCRC.

On May 12th, Respondent filed and served Respondent's Reply Declaration to CCRC Report.

After reviewing the filings, the court finds it necessary for CCRC to interview the children prior to making any changes in custody or visitation. The parties are re-referred to CCRC with an appointment on Tuesday, June 16th at 1:00 PM. The parties are ordered to make the children available to speak with the CCRC counselor. Neither party shall interfere with the counselor's interview of the children nor attempt to coach the children for their interview. Failure to abide by this order may result in sanctions. A review hearing is set to join with the already scheduled court trial on July 14, 2026. Parties are to include any supplemental information in their Statement of Issues and Contentions which is to be filed prior to trial in accordance with local rules.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES ARE RE-REFERRED TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON TUESDAY JUNE 16TH AT 1:00 PM. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MAKE THE CHILDREN AVAILABLE TO SPEAK WITH THE CCRC COUNSELOR. NEITHER PARTY SHALL INTERFERE WITH THE COUNSELOR'S INTERVIEW OF THE CHILDREN NOR ATTEMPT TO COACH THE CHILDREN FOR THEIR INTERVIEW. FAILURE TO ABIDE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

BY THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET TO JOIN WITH THE ALREADY SCHEDULED COURT TRIAL ON JULY 14, 2026. PARTIES ARE TO INCLUDE ANY SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION IN THEIR STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND CONTENTIONS WHICH IS TO BE FILED PRIOR TO TRIAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL RULES.

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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

2. FRANK B. LAROSA V. MARIANNA LAROSA

PFL20180720

On February 25, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting termination of spousal support and division of the proceeds of the sale of the community residence. All required documents were served electronically on February 26th, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore, service was required to comply with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed and served Points and Authorities Re: Waiver of Reimbursement Rights on March 12, 2026.

On May 8th, Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, thereby waiving any defect in service. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration, her Declaration in Support of Respondent's Request for Attorney's Fees, and her Memorandum of Points and Authorities concurrently therewith. All documents were served on May 8th.

Petitioner filed and served his Reply Declaration of Attorney on May 15th. Respondent thereafter filed an Objection to Petitioner's Reply Declaration and Request to Strike Pleadings. She objects to the reply as untimely and she objects to the RFO on the basis that Petitioner failed to comply with California Rule of Court 5.92 by failing to file his Income and Expense Declaration with the RFO. Respondent asks the court to strike both pleadings.

Respondent's objection is sustained in part. The objection to the reply declaration is sustained and the motion to strike is granted. The objection to the RFO is sustained with regard to the request to modify spousal support only. Petitioner failed to file his Income and Expense Declaration at the time of filing his RFO therefore the court drops the support request from calendar. The remainder of the RFO may be reached on the merits.

Petitioner filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration on May 19th.

Petitioner asks the court to divide the sale proceeds of the community property residence equally after reimbursing him for his separate property contribution in the amount of \$274,529.52.

Respondent requests support arrears in the amount of \$56,100 plus \$8,886 in interest for a total amount due of \$64,986. She agrees to a payment of arrears from Petitioner's portion of the net proceeds of the sale of the residence but she opposes Petitioner's request for reimbursement of his alleged separate property contribution. Additionally, Respondent asks the court to appoint Stephanie Hailey as the listing agent for

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

the family residence and order that the property be listed at the fair market value as determined by Ms. Hailey. She further asks that Petitioner be ordered to pay one-half of the repair costs needed to prepare the home for sale, this includes the retention of landscaping services and monthly landscape maintenance. She asks that she be allowed to continue residing in the residence until it is sold. Finally, Respondent requests \$11,727.56 in attorney's fees pursuant to Section XV.C of the Marital Settlement Agreement.

The request to place the home up for sale with Stephanie Hailey is granted. The marital residence shall be listed at the fair market value as determined by Ms. Hailey. Respondent shall continue to reside in the home until the close of escrow. The parties are ordered to comply with the terms of the Marital Settlement Agreement regarding payment of Respondent's moving expenses.

Regarding payment for the repairs and upkeep of the house, payment of Respondent's attorney's fees, Petitioner's request for reimbursement of separate property contributions and Respondent's request for spousal support arrears, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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: RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED IN PART. THE OBJECTION TO THE REPLY DECLARATION IS SUSTAINED AND THE MOTION TO STRIKE IS GRANTED. THE OBJECTION TO THE RFO IS SUSTAINED WITH REGARD TO THE REQUEST TO MODIFY SPOUSAL SUPPORT. PETITIONER FAILED TO FILE HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AT THE TIME OF FILING HIS RFO THEREFORE THE COURT DROPS THE SUPPORT REQUEST FROM CALENDAR. THE REMAINDER OF THE RFO MAY BE REACHED ON THE MERITS.

THE REQUEST TO PLACE THE HOME UP FOR SALE WITH STEPHANIE HAILEY IS GRANTED. THE MARITAL RESIDENCE SHALL BE LISTED AT THE FAIR MARKET VALUE AS DETERMINED BY MS. HAILEY. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO RESIDE IN THE HOME UNTIL THE CLOSE OF ESCROW. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THE MARITAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT REGARDING PAYMENT OF RESPONDENT'S MOVING EXPENSES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

REGARDING PAYMENT FOR THE REPAIRS AND UPKEEP OF THE HOUSE, PAYMENT OF RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY'S FEES, PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF SEPARATE PROPERTY CONTRIBUTIONS AND RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT ARREARS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

3. TAMARA MOORE V. STEVEN BUTRICK, JR.

24FL0458

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, as well as attorney's fees and child support. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on December 12, 2025.

Neither party appeared for the scheduled CCRC appointment.

The parties attended a hearing on the RFO on February 19, 2026 and noted faulty service of the moving papers. They stipulated to be re-referred to CCRC and continue the matter to the present date. The court adopted the stipulation and reserved jurisdiction over support back to the date of filing the RFO.

All required documents were properly served on February 13, 2026, and the parties attended the re-set CCRC appointment on March 27, 2026. They were able to reach agreements on the issues of custody and visitation. A report with those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 27, 2026.

Respondent is requesting joint legal and physical custody of the minor child. He further requests a modification of child support or, alternatively, the issue of child support to be set for an evidentiary hearing. He requests an order for Respondent to serve updated financial disclosures with an order that failure to comply will result in adoption of Respondent's estimated income of Petitioner. He asks that Respondent be ordered to pay Petitioner's attorney's fees and sanctions against Respondent though since Respondent is the moving party, the court presumes that these requests are made with regard to Petitioner.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order or his Income and Expense Declaration. And Respondent has not filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration since the original filing of the RFO.

"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. "Current" means the form has been completed within the past three months providing no facts have changed." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(3).

The request to modify child support is denied due to Respondent's failure to file an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Respondent's request for attorney's fees is likewise denied. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2). In order for the court to make such findings, the court is in need of Respondent's updated Income and Expense Declaration. Without that, the court cannot make the requisite findings and the request for attorney's fees is therefore, denied.

The court reserves on Respondent's request for Section 271 sanctions until the time of trial.

Regarding custody, the court finds the agreements contained in the March 27, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Finally, turning to the request for updated financial information, Respondent asks that Petitioner be compelled to serve the following: (1) a completed and signed Income and Expense Declaration; (2) copies of all pay stubs for the last two months showing year-to-date income; (3) most recent federal and state tax returns with all schedules and attachments; (4) a profit and loss statement for the last 12 months covering any self-employment; and (5) documentation of any other income sources (e.g., 1099s, rental income, bonuses), including monthly statements from January 2025 to the present from Venmo, PayPal, Cash App, bank records, sponsorship agreements, and business records from Gold Rush Gymkhana, C3 Ranch, and the like. Respondent is essentially filing a motion to compel without having served formal discovery requests. Accordingly, the request to compel updated financial disclosures is denied without prejudice as Respondent has not served Petitioner with formal discovery requesting the above. That said, Petitioner is reminded of her "...*continuing duty* to immediately, fully, and accurately update and augment..." her disclosures with all material information. Fam. Code § 2100(c). Failure to do so is a violation of that party's fiduciary duty and may subject that party to sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 1101.

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: RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND ATTORNEY'S FEES ARE DENIED DUE TO FAILURE TO FILE A CURRENT INCOME AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

EXPENSE DECLARATION. THE COURT RESERVES ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE REQUEST TO COMPEL UPDATED FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS RESPONDENT HAS NOT FIRST SERVED PETITIONER WITH FORMAL DISCOVERY REQUESTING THE ABOVE. THAT SAID, PETITIONER IS REMINDED OF HER "...CONTINUING DUTY TO IMMEDIATELY, FULLY, AND ACCURATELY UPDATE AND AUGMENT..." HER DISCLOSURES WITH ALL MATERIAL INFORMATION. FAM. CODE § 2100(C). FAILURE TO DO SO IS A VIOLATION OF THAT PARTY'S FIDUCIARY DUTY AND MAY SUBJECT THAT PARTY TO SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 1101.

REGARDING CUSTODY, THE COURT DOES FIND THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 27, 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 THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

4. LISA PURVES V. SCOTT PURVES

PFL20010383

On November 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking division of the pension plan. Given that this is a post-judgment request, the RFO and all other required documents were personally served on December 26th, however, the original Proof of Service states that service was on December 26, 2026, not December 26, 2025. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Petitioner was ordered to correct the Proof of Service and the matter was continued to the present date.

A corrected Proof of Service was filed on March 10, 2026, indicating personal service of all required documents on December 16, 2025.

On May 12, 2025, Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration and a Declaration of Callie B. Cambridge in Support of Petitioner's Request for Attorney Fees and Costs. Both documents were mail served on May 12th.

Petitioner is requesting equal division of community interest in Respondent's Operating Engineers Pension Plan (OE3) at shared costs. She further requests attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code § 2556, 2032, and Civil Procedure § 128.5.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 15, 2026. It was not served until May 18th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine 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 May 8th the last day for filing of the responsive declaration therefore, it is late filed and has not been read or considered by the court.

A joinder for the pension plan has been filed but it does not appear that the Summons and joinder documents have been served.

Petitioner's request for equal division of the OE3 pension plan is granted. The parties are ordered to equally share in the costs of preparing the QDRO. Respondent is ordered to provide all necessary information to facilitate the preparation of the QDRO no later than June 21, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Petitioner's request for attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2032 is denied due to her failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs under Family Code § 2030 and 2032, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2). Without the filing of an Income and Expense Declaration by the moving party the court is unable to make the requisite findings and therefore the request is denied.

The request for sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure § 128.5 is likewise denied as it is procedurally improper. A motion for sanctions under § 128.5 "...shall be made separately from other motions or requests and shall describe the specific alleged action or tactic, made in bad faith, that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 128.5(f)(1)(A).

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'S REQUEST FOR EQUAL DIVISION OF THE OE3 PENSION PLAN IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SHARE IN THE COSTS OF PREPARING THE QDRO. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE ALL NECESSARY INFORMATION TO FACILITATE THE PREPARATION OF THE QDRO NO LATER THAN JUNE 21, 2026. THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO CIVIL PROCEDURE § 128.5 IS LIKEWISE DENIED AS IT IS PROCEDURALLY IMPROPER.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2032 IS DENIED DUE TO HER FAILURE TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

5. LISA RENNER V. CHRISTOPHER RENNER

PFL20210613

On February 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody and school orders. The RFO was mail served on March 2nd. Because this is a post-judgment request, Petitioner filed a Declaration Regarding Address Verification as required by Family Code § 215. It appears Respondent failed to serve the Notice of Tentative Ruling and the blank FL-320.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 18th. It was personally served on April 10th.

Respondent also filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, though it unclear why as he is the moving party. The court deems this to be a reply declaration. It was served on April 2nd.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 26, 2026. They were able to reach one agreement. A report containing that agreement and additional recommendations was prepared; it was mailed to the parties on April 3, 2026.

On May 11th, Petitioner filed a reply declaration. The court deems this to be a supplemental declaration in response to the CCRC report. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore, the court has not read or considered it.

On May 14th, Respondent filed and served another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. The court deems this to be a supplemental declaration in response to the CCRC report.

Respondent is requesting the following orders: (1) Neither parent shall enroll or transfer either minor child to a different school without the mutual written consent of the other parent; (2) The minor Caide to remain enrolled in Lakeview Elementary School pending further order of the court; (3) The court shall determine middle school placement for Jace for the 2026-2027 academic year; and (4) All existing custody and parenting time orders to remain in full force and effect.

Petitioner asks the court to determine the middle school placement for Jace only.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the April 3, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 3, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND 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 THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

6. SCOTT RONNINGEN V. ANGELINA RONNINGEN

23FL0127

On November 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking sanctions and further sentencing for Petitioner's noncompliance with court orders. The RFO was served by mail on January 13, 2026. It appears the Notice of Posting Tentative Ruling was not served with the RFO.

The parties appeared for the hearing on February 26, 2026 at which time the court found improper service of the RFO. Because the RFO deals with failure to comply with an Order to Show Cause (OSC), the RFO must be personally served as would an OSC. The court granted Respondent's request to continue to allow for proper service.

The RFO and the February 26th Minute Order were personally served on Petitioner on March 24, 2026.

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

Respondent is seeking the following: (1) Petitioner to be found in noncompliance with his sentence issued at the March 12, 2025 hearing; (2) Petitioner to be found in violation of his probation; (3) further sentencing; and (4) Family Code § 271 sanctions. Of note, Respondent seems to be referencing Petitioner as "Respondent" in her moving papers.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

7. DAVID SLAY V. KRYSTAL SLAY

23FL0827

On February 25, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order regarding community debts. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were electronically served the same day as filing.

Petitioner filed another RFO on March 27, 2026 seeking sanctions. All required documents were mail served on April 6th.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on May 11th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine 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 May 8th the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. As such, the declaration is late and the court has not read or considered it.

Petitioner is requesting an order directing Respondent to pay \$18,120.75 to cover her portion of community debt. He states this is pursuant to the Marital Settlement Agreement of the parties. He further seeks \$3,500 in Family Code § 271 sanctions.

After reviewing the moving papers as well as the stipulation of the parties filed with the court on November 24, 2025, it does appear that Respondent agreed to pay a portion of the community debt in the amount of \$18,608.25. However, it is unclear from the MSA if Respondent is to pay that amount directly to Petitioner for Petitioner to pay the debts or if Respondent is to pay the debts directly. The MSA expressly retains the court’s jurisdiction over the issues. In light of the foregoing, Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$18,608.25. Petitioner is ordered to use these funds to pay of the community debts referenced in the MSA, if they have not already been paid. Respondent may pay Petitioner in one lump sum or in monthly payments in an amount agreed upon by the parties.

Petitioner has requested sanctions 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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.*

Here, while it does appear that Respondent’s actions did cause Petitioner to incur unnecessary attorney’s fees, the court is concerned that imposing sanctions would be an unreasonable financial burden on Respondent. As such, the request for sanctions is denied. Respondent is admonished to ensure that she is communicating with opposing counsel and acting in good faith to resolve any disputes that may arise prior to filing an RFO. Failure to do so may result in monetary sanctions in the future.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$18,608.25. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO USE THESE FUNDS TO PAY OF THE COMMUNITY DEBTS REFERENCED IN THE MSA, IF THEY HAVE NOT ALREADY BEEN PAID. RESPONDENT MAY PAY PETITIONER IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS IN AN AMOUNT AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES.

THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS DENIED. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED TO ENSURE THAT SHE IS COMMUNICATING WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL AND ACTING IN GOOD FAITH TO RESOLVE ANY DISPUTES THAT MAY ARISE PRIOR TO FILING AN RFO. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS IN THE FUTURE.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

8. JESSICA STEPHENS V. DUSTIN CARELL-STEPHENS

PFL20170100

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 25, 2026. All required documents were served by mail on February 26, 2026 and again on March 26, 2026.

Petitioner filed a declaration with the court on May 5, 2026 however, while there is no Proof of Service for this document, as it pertains to the service of the RFO, the court has read and considered it.

It does not appear service has been effectuated. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

9. CRYSTAL RENEE STUCK V. DUSTIN ELLIOT STUCK

25FL0708

On February 25, 2026, the parties appeared before the court in Department 8 for hearing on the Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order filed by Petitioner. The parties stipulated to a two year restraining order with Respondent and the minor as protected parties. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for custody and visitation orders and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on May 7th, it was served on May 6th.

The parties attended CCRC on April 2, 2026. The parties were unable to reach any agreements, therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on May 6, 2026, and another on May 12, 2026, it was mailed to the parties on May 13th.

On May 14th, Respondent filed an Objection to Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Signed 5/13/26. It was served on the 14th.

Petitioner filed an objection to the CCRC report on May 18th. It was served on the 17th.

The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

10. JENNIFER WEISSENSEE V. DAVID KRUEGER

22FLL0584

On December 19, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were served on December 23rd, however there was no Notice of Tentative Ruling served.

Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 13, 2026, it was served on February 12th.

On February 20th, Respondent filed an Objection to Petitioner's Response and Reply. However, the parties filed a Stipulation Re: CCRC and Child Visitation and Order on February 23rd wherein Respondent waived his objection and the parties stipulated to be re-referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC).

The court adopted the stipulation of the parties, re-referred them to CCRC and set a review hearing for the present date. Supplemental declarations were due to be filed and served no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The parties attended CCRC on March 26th. A report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on May 7th.

Respondent and Petitioner each filed and served a supplemental declaration on May 7th.

Respondent is requesting joint physical custody of the minor children with increased visitation time. He further asks that the parties be ordered to refrain from interrogating the children on their time with the other parent and any co-parenting issues to be brought to the attention of the other party by way of the Talking Parents app.

Petitioner asks the court to maintain the custody and visitation orders set forth in the February 23rd stipulation of the parties. She asks that the minors participate in individual therapy and Respondent to do the same. She further requests an order for the parties to attend co-parenting classes, an order precluding Respondent from consuming alcohol during his parenting time, and an order that no third party be present during Respondent's parenting time with the minors.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the May 7, 2026 CCRC are in the best interests of the minors. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 7, 2026 CCRC ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. 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 THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

11. DAVID BELL V. MEGAN GUERRERO

24FL0556

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on November 13, 2025. The court denied the ex parte application on November 17, 2025. The parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on December 9, 2025, with a review hearing scheduled for January 8, 2026. On November 17th Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and parenting plan orders, as well as a finding that Family Code section 3044 has been rebutted. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on November 25, 2025.

Both parties attended the CCRC appointment on December 9, 2025. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on December 31, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Parties appeared for the hearing on January 8, 2026. The court inquired of the parties as to the status of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order Request by Respondent in San Joaquin County as well as the pending criminal charges against Petitioner in San Joaquin County. The court made parenting plan orders and set a review hearing for February 26, 2026. The court directed parties to file and serve Supplemental Declarations at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on February 10, 2026. It was mail served the same day. Respondent asserts the current parenting plan is working well and requests additional parenting time. Respondent seeks clarification as to communication between the parties.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on February 13, 2026. The court deems this to be a Supplemental Declaration. Petitioner seeks an immediate termination of overnight parenting time with Respondent.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on May 7, 2026. The court deems this to be a Supplemental Declaration. Respondent was mail served on May 7, 2026.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on May 7, 2026. It was served on Petitioner on May 7, 2026.

The court finds it must take testimony as to the Family Code section 3044 presumption. As such, the parties are ordered to appear to select Mandatory Settlement Conference and trial dates.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

TENTATIVE RULING #11: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

12. NICOLE CRADDOCK V. NATHAN CRADDOCK

24FL0996

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 7, 2026, seeking child and spousal support orders. 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.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: 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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

13. CARLA FORREST V. GARY FORREST

PFL20180899

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

Both parties appeared at the hearing on April 2, 2026. Petitioner requested the matter be continued to allow time to properly served Respondent. The court granted the request to continue and set the matter for a further review hearing on May 21, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service on April 24, 2026, showing that Respondent was personally served with all the required documents on April 23, 2026. Petitioner requests the court allow the minor to determine whether she attends parenting time with Respondent.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 11, 2026. The court finds this to be late filed. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine 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 May 8th the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court. Further there is no Proof of Service for this document, and therefore the court cannot consider it on those grounds as well.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds Petitioner’s request to be akin to a motion for reconsideration, as it was filed approximately 14 days after the court’s January 16, 2026 hearing. All the information before the court currently is the same information the court had when tendering its January 16, 2026 decision. Petitioner has failed to set forth any new or different facts or law that were not available to her at the January 16th hearing. Therefore, the court finds Petitioner has failed to set forth any grounds for reconsideration. As such, all prior orders remain in full force and effect.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 FINDS PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SET FORTH ANY GROUNDS FOR RECONSIDERATION. AS SUCH, 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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

14. RACHEL GESSNER V. MATTHEW GESSNER

25FL1097

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 23, 2026, requesting visitation as well as child support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on April 30, 2026, and a review hearing on May 21st. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with all the required documents on April 8, 2026.

Both parties appeared at CCRC on April 30th and reached a full agreement. A report with a copy of the parties agreements was filed with the court on May 8, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 8, 2026. It was served on Petitioner electronically on May 8, 2026. Respondent requests the same orders parties agreed to in CCRC. Additionally, Respondent has proposed a holiday schedule. Respondent also requests Petitioner be imputed with income for 40 hours per week, rather than the 32 hours she is currently working. Respondent requests the court credit any arrears with the minors' private school tuition he currently pays at a rate of \$2,105 per month.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements of the parties as set forth in the May 8th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the agreements with the following additions; the court adopts the holiday scheduled as set forth in Respondent's declaration.

As to child support, the court denies Respondent's request to impute Petitioner with income at 40 hours per week. Respondent has not established that Petitioner has the ability or opportunity to work the additional eight hours. Therefore, the court will utilize Petitioner's income at \$65 per hour for 32 hours per week.

Utilizing the figures as set forth in the parties' Income and Expense Declarations, the court finds guideline child support to be \$2,253 payable from Respondent to Petitioner (see attached X-Spouse). The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$2,253 as and for guideline child support effective March 1, 2026, with future payments 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 \$6,759 for the months of March through May inclusive. The court deducts the amount of school tuition from the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

arrears leaving a total arrears balance of \$444. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$444 as and for arrears on or before June 15, 2026.

The court further finds Respondent routinely earns overtime. The court is directing counsel for Respondent to prepare an overtime table based on the court's calculations. Respondent is to true up any overtime earned on a monthly basis, with payment due on the 15th of each month. Respondent is directed to provide Petitioner with his paystubs by no later than the 10th of each month.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children, childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment, and agreed upon extracurricular activities. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures as set forth in the attached FL-192.

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 FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 8TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONS; THE COURT ADOPTS THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULED AS SET FORTH IN RESPONDENT'S DECLARATION.

AS TO CHILD SUPPORT, THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO IMPUTE PETITIONER WITH INCOME AT 40 HOURS PER WEEK. RESPONDENT HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT PETITIONER HAS THE ABILITY OR OPPORTUNITY TO WORK THE ADDITIONAL EIGHT HOURS. THEREFORE, THE COURT WILL UTILIZE PETITIONER'S INCOME AT \$65 PER HOUR FOR 32 HOURS PER WEEK.

UTILIZING THE FIGURES AS SET FORTH IN THE PARTIES' INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS, THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$2,253 PAYABLE FROM RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,253 AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2026, WITH FUTURE PAYMENTS ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$6,759 FOR THE MONTHS OF MARCH THROUGH MAY INCLUSIVE. THE COURT DEDUCTS THE AMOUNT OF SCHOOL TUITION FROM THE ARREARS LEAVING A TOTAL ARREARS BALANCE OF \$444. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$444 AS AND FOR ARREARS ON OR BEFORE JUNE 15, 2026.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS RESPONDENT ROUTINELY EARNS OVERTIME. THE COURT IS DIRECTING COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT TO PREPARE AN OVERTIME TABLE BASED ON THE COURT'S CALCULATIONS. RESPONDENT IS TO TRUE UP ANY OVERTIME EARNED ON A MONTHLY BASIS, WITH PAYMENT DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH HIS PAYSTUBS BY NO LATER THAN THE 10TH OF EACH MONTH.

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

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.

New Case

2026 Guideline Summary Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly Figures 2026		Cash Flow	
Number of children	0	2			Combined net spendable 16864	
Percent time with NCP	27.00%	0.00%			Father	
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN			Payment cost/benefit -2253	
Number of exemptions	1	3	Nets (adjusted)		Net spendable income 8100	
Wages and salary	14590	9013	Father	10353	Federal income tax 1957	
Self employed income	0	0	Mother	6511	Federal employment tax 1116	
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	16864	State income tax 788	
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		State employment tax 190	
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	Total taxes 4050	
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	2253	Federal filing status MFJIN	
Employee 401-k contribution	1167	0	Alameda SS	0	State filing status MFJIN	
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	2253	Mother	
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			Payment cost/benefit 2253	
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Net spendable income 8764	
Health insurance	187	0			Federal income tax 1209	
Other medical expenses	0	0			Federal employment tax 690	
Property tax expenses	775	0			State income tax 487	
Ded interest expense	0	0			State employment tax 117	
Contribution deduction	0	0			Total taxes 2502	
Misc tax deductions	0	0			Federal filing status MFJIN	
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			State filing status MFJIN	
Required union dues	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

All children	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
		27 - 73	0	0	0 Father	2,253 Father	2,253 Father
	0000-00-00	27 - 73	0	0	0 Father	857 Father	857 Father
	0000-00-00	27 - 73	0	0	0 Father	1,396 Father	1,396 Father

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

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

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

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

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

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

Online Self-Help Guide

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

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

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

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

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

Examples

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

How to Change a Child Support Order

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

What forms do I need?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Need help?

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

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

15. JUDY MARCUM V. ZACHARY NUGENT

21FL0051

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 20, 2026, seeking a modification of the current parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on March 23, 2026, and a review hearing on May 21, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was only served with the FL-300.

Petitioner filed an RFO on March 23, 2026, seeking a modification of the current parenting plan orders. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC as such a single parent report was filed on May 7, 2026, with no recommendations. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 8th.

The court drops Respondent's RFO from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Petitioner as well as for Respondent's failure to appear at CCRC which was set at his request.

The court drops Petitioner's RFO from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Respondent.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT DROPS RESPONDENT'S RFO FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE PETITIONER AS WELL AS FOR RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC WHICH WAS SET AT HIS REQUEST.

THE COURT DROPS PETITIONER'S RFO FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

16. SIERRA OLSON V. JUAN CHAVEZ

PFL20140209

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 6, 2026, along with a declaration regarding address verification, a declaration under the UCCJEA, and a declaration regarding visitation and records. There is no Proof of Service for these documents.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on May 6, 2026, which does not object to service, therefore, the court deems the issue to be waived. Petitioner objects to Respondent's requests for custody and parenting plan orders.

Respondent filed a Declaration on May 12, 2026. It was mail served on May 12, 2026.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court notes the parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC), as they had previously been referred in the prior six months. Petitioner did not attend CCRC as she was not properly served. The court finds good cause to refer the parties to CCRC at this time. Parties are to attend CCRC on Thursday, July 2nd at 9:00 AM with Michaela Murphy and return for a review hearing on Thursday August 13th at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO REFER THE PARTIES TO CCRC AT THIS TIME. PARTIES ARE TO ATTEND CCRC ON THURSDAY, JULY 2ND AT 9:00 AM WITH MICHAELA MURPHY AND RETURN FOR A REVIEW HEARING ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5 PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING, ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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*

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

17. ANGELA SCHULER V. MARTIN SCHULER

23FL0273

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO), on January 29, 2026, seeking an order setting aside the default entered on August 1, 2024. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on January 29, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Petitioner filed a RFO on March 3, 2026, requesting an order to have Petitioner's name removed from Respondent's home title and mortgage. Respondent was served on March 13, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Request to Reschedule on March 11, 2026. The court granted the request on March 12, 2026, and the hearings on both RFO was rescheduled for May 21, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Petitioner's RFO.

"The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 473(b). Family Code section 2122 also vests the court with the authority to set aside a judgment in matters of actual fraud or perjury. Fam. Code § 2122. In either case, the burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for relief. Austin v. L.A. Unified School Dist., 244 Cal. App. 4th 918 (2016); See *also* Fam. Code § 2121 ("Before granting relief, the court shall find that the facts alleged as the grounds for relief materially affected the original outcome and that the moving party would materially benefit from the granting of the relief.") The moving party is tasked with not only establishing that grounds for relief exist but also establishing that the error was *excusable* on the part of the moving party. *Austin* at 929; See *also Huh v. Wang*, 158 Cal. App. 4th 1406, 1419 (2007).

In addition to establishing grounds for relief, the moving party must make its motion within the legally specified time frames. In matters of actual fraud or perjury, the motion shall be brought within one year of the date the moving party either discovered or should have discovered the fraud or perjury; and in instances of mental incapacity, the motion is to be brought within two years. Fam. Code § 2122 (a), (b) & (d).

In the matter at hand, Respondent fails to meet his burden of establishing grounds for relief or set aside. The court finds Respondent has failed to bring the action within the statutory time frame. The court finds Respondent was aware of the divorce proceedings

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

and the default was entered on August 1, 2024. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with the notice of default on August 2, 2024. As such, Respondent's request is denied.

Turning next to Petitioner's request, the court finds Respondent 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 Petitioner's request. Respondent is ordered to refinance the home located at 5287 Loch Leven Dr. Pollock Pines CA 95762, for the purpose of removing Petitioners' name for the mortgage within 60 days of this order. If Respondent is unable to refinance the residence, he is ordered to place the home for sale on the 61st day with a neutral real estate professional agreed upon by the parties and provide proof of the homes listing to Petitioner's counsel. The court reserves on Petitioner's request under Family Code section 271 for sanctions.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO MEET HIS BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING GROUNDS FOR RELIEF OR SET ASIDE. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO BRING THE ACTION WITHIN THE STATUTORY TIME FRAME. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT WAS AWARE OF THE DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS AND THE DEFAULT WAS ENTERED ON AUGUST 1, 2024. PROOF OF SERVICE SHOWS RESPONDENT WAS SERVED WITH THE NOTICE OF DEFAULT ON AUGUST 2, 2024. AS SUCH, RESPONDENT'S REQUEST IS DENIED.

THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO REFINANCE THE HOME LOCATED AT 5287 LOCH LEVEN DR. POLLOCK PINES CA 95762, FOR THE PURPOSE OF REMOVING PETITIONERS' NAME FOR THE MORTGAGE WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THIS ORDER. IF RESPONDENT IS UNABLE TO REFINANCE THE RESIDENCE, HE IS ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOME FOR SALE ON THE 61ST DAY WITH A NEUTRAL REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES AND PROVIDE PROOF OF THE HOMES LISTING TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL. THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST UNDER FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 FOR SANCTIONS.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 21, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

18. Esperanza Woolever v. Christopher Woolever

PFL20180325

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) and Order Shortening Time (OST) on May 14, 2026. On May 15th, the court granted the OST and set the RFO for a hearing on May 21, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court directed Respondent to served Petitioner on May 15, 2026. The court directed Petitioner to file a Responsive Declaration on or before May 19, 2026.

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

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on May 19, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner does not raise the issue of service therefore, the court deems it to have been waived.

Respondent requests the court issue an order awarding the entirety of the CalSTRS account to Respondent as his sole and separate property in order to facilitate the court's prior orders awarding the child support arrears owed to Respondent by Petitioner to be paid from that account. Petitioner objects to the requested orders.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court denies Respondent's request for the reasons outlined in Petitioner's Responsive Declaration. The orders requested are incongruent with the prior orders made by the court reserving on the final characterization of the funds as the parties dispute the date of separation.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR THE REASONS OUTLINED IN PETITIONER'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATION. THE ORDERS REQUESTED ARE INCONGRUENT WITH THE PRIOR ORDERS MADE BY THE COURT RESERVING ON THE FINAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE FUNDS AS THE PARTIES DISPUTE THE DATE OF SEPARATION.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 21, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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