

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

1. CO. OF EL DORADO V. DEVON MATHIS (OTHER PARENT: AUBREY MATHIS)

PFS20210070

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 27, 2026, requesting modification of the current child custody, parenting time, and child support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 1, 2026, and a review hearing on May 28, 2026. Other Parent and Petitioner were personally served on March 5th and 6, 2026, respectively. However, Other Parent was not served with a copy of the referral to CCRC. Petitioner was only served with the RFO and Income and Expense Declaration.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed a Responsive Declaration on March 10, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent and Other Parent were served on March 11, 2026. DCSS requests the court set the child support portion of the RFO for a hearing in Department 10 to be heard by the Child Support Commissioner pursuant to Family Code section 4251. DCSS does not raise the issue of the lack of proper service, therefore, the court deems it to have been waived.

Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 12, 2026. Petitioner was served on March 19, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was served. As such, the court cannot consider this document.

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on April 8, 2026. Other Parent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 13th. The court denied the request on April 14, 2026, due to the lack of proper service on Petitioner as well as there being no exigent circumstances.

Respondent filed an RFO on April 14, 2026, seeking the same orders as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows mail service on Other Parent only on May 19, 2026. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states: "Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California..." This would have made April 30th the last day for mail service.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment on April 1, 2026. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on May 14, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

The court drops both the February 27th and April 14th filed RFOs from calendar due to the lack of proper service. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE COURT DROPS BOTH THE FEBRUARY 27TH AND APRIL 14TH FILED RFOS FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

3. MEGAN BLEDSOE V. GRANT BLEDSOE

26FL0012

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 25, 2026, requesting the court make child and temporary spousal support orders as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served by first class mail on February 27th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on May 14, 2026. Petitioner was served on the same day.

Petitioner is seeking guideline child support as well as temporary spousal support. Petitioner request the parties share equally in the cost of childcare and extracurricular activities as well as any unreimbursed medical expenses. Petitioner is also seeking \$10,000 in Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

Respondent submits on the request for guideline child support, however, he requests the court utilize his proposed X-Spouse calculation. Respondent objects to temporary guideline spousal support, as he asserts Petitioner failed to include an FL-157 in her pleadings. If the court is not inclined to deny temporary guideline spousal support, Respondent requests the court utilize his proposed calculations. Respondent also states he has been providing voluntary support in the amount of \$5,000 per month. Last, Respondent objects to the court ordering Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees, as he asserts Petitioner has sufficient access to funds to pay for her own counsel.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. First, the court finds Petitioner is not required to file an FL-157, as this is an initial request for temporary guideline spousal support and the FL-157 is only required for a post-judgment change in support.

Utilizing the figures from the parties' Income and Expense Declarations with a 50% timeshare to each party, the court finds guideline child support to be \$3,418 per month (see attached X-Spouse) payable from Respondent to Petitioner. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$3,418 as and for guideline child support effective March 1, 2026, and payable on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

The court finds temporary guideline spousal support to be \$1,895 per the Alameda Formula, payable from Respondent to Petitioner. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$1,895 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support effective March 1, 2026, with payments due on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds the total amount of support based on the above orders to be \$5,313. The court finds this results in an arrears balance of \$939, when crediting Respondent for the monthly voluntary payments of \$5,000. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner \$939 in full on June 15, 2026, or in monthly payments of \$313 with the first payment due on June 15, 2026, and further payments due on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately three months). If any payment is missed or late the full amount shall become immediately due and owing.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In re Marriage of Keech, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. 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).

The court finds that while there is a disparity in income between the parties, that Petitioner has access to funds to pay her counsel. Specifically, Petitioner identifies cash as well as stocks, bonds, other assets she could easily sell that are available to pay attorney's fees. As such, Petitioner's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees is denied without prejudice.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$3,418 PER MONTH (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE) PAYABLE FROM RESPONDENT TO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

PETITIONER. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$3,418 AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2026, AND PAYABLE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

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

THE COURT FINDS TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO BE \$1895 PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA, PAYABLE FROM RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,895 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2026, WITH PAYMENTS DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SUPPORT BASED ON THE ABOVE ORDERS TO BE \$5,313. THE COURT FINDS THIS RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$939, WHEN CREDITING RESPONDENT FOR THE MONTHLY VOLUNTARY PAYMENT OF \$5,000. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER \$939 IN FULL ON JUNE 15, 2026, OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$313 WITH THE FIRST PAYMENT DUE ON JUNE 15, 2026, AND FURTHER PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY THREE MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE FULL AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND OWING.

THE COURT FINDS THAT WHILE THERE IS A DISPARITY IN INCOME BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THAT PETITIONER HAS ACCESS TO FUNDS TO PAY HER COUNSEL. SPECIFICALLY, PETITIONER IDENTIFIES CASH AS WELL AS STOCKS, BONDS, OTHER ASSETS SHE COULD EASILY SELL THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO PAY ATTORNEY'S FEES. AS SUCH, PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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		Cash Flow
Number of children	0	3	2026		Combined net spendable
Percent time with NCP	49.99%	0.00%			
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN	Nets (adjusted)		Father
Number of exemptions	2	3	Father	15787	Payment cost/benefit
Wages and salary	15000	5184	Mother	3324	Net spendable income
Self employed income	0	0	Total	19111	Federal income tax
Other taxable income	7000	0	Support		Federal employment tax
TANF CS received	0	0	Addons	0	State income tax
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Guideln CS	3418	State employment tax
New spouse income	0	0	Alameda SS	1895	Total taxes
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Total	5313	Federal filing status
Adjustments to income	0	0			State filing status
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Mother
Health insurance	706	0			Payment cost/benefit
Other medical expenses	0	0			Net spendable income
Property tax expenses	944	0			Federal income tax
Ded interest expense	1456	0			Federal employment tax
Contribution deduction	0	0			State income tax
Misc tax deductions	0	0			State employment tax
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			Total taxes
Required union dues	0	0			Federal filing status
Mandatory retirement	0	415			State filing status
Hardship deduction	0	0			
Other GDL deductions	0	0			
Child care expenses	0	0			

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		50 - 50	0	0	0 Father	3,418 Father	3,418 Father
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	684 Father	684 Father
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	1,025 Father	1,025 Father
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	1,709 Father	1,709 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

4. SHAUNA COX V. MICHAEL BRYANT II

22FL0270

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 23, 2026, seeking orders adjudicating property that the court had reserved jurisdiction over, as well as clean up and access to the real property. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner, Minors' Counsel, or the Department of Child Support Services were properly served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 15, 2026. It was served on April 15, 2026, to Respondent, Minors' Counsel, and the Department of Child Support Services. Petitioner does not raise the issue of the defect in service, and as such, the court deems she has waived the issue.

The court finds the defect in service is waived as to Petitioner only.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the failure to properly serve the RFO on all required parties.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

5. DAWNDEREE HARRISON V. BLAKE HARRISON

25FL1121

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 26, 2026, seeking spousal support, property control, and Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served on March 4, 2026; however, the service was missing the Notice of Tentative Ruling as well as the Remote Appearance Request forms.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, as well as Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Luke Gary, and an Income and Expense Declaration on May 13, 2026. All were served on May 13, 2026.

Petitioner is seeking guideline spousal support, exclusive use and control of "La Jolla, CA", and attorney's fees in the amount of \$30,000. Respondent opposes the requests as there is currently a temporary Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) in place and parties are pending trial on the request for a more permanent DVRO. Respondent requests the matter be continued until after the DVRO trial.

The court finds good cause to continue the RFO to join with the currently pending trial, set to commence June 10, 2026, at 8:30 AM in Department 8. Additionally, the court notes there are current orders restricting Petitioner's access to the San Diego property in the temporary DVRO. The court reserves jurisdiction to retroactively award support to the date of the filing of the RFO. The court reserves on the request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Petition 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 GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE RFO TO JOIN WITH THE CURRENTLY PENDING TRIAL, SET TO COMMENCE JUNE 10, 2026, AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 8. ADDITIONALLY, THE COURT NOTES THERE ARE CURRENT ORDERS RESTRICTING PETITIONER'S ACCESS TO THE SAN DIEGO PROPERTY IN THE TEMPORARY DVRO. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY AWARD SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THE RFO. THE COURT RESERVES ON THE REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

6. ASHLYN HIGAREDA V. ISACC HIGAREDA

25FL0250

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO), on February 26, 2026, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders as well as various other parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 30, 2026, and a review hearing on May 28, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served by mail on February 26th.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment on March 30, 2026. The parties were able to reach several agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as further recommendations was filed with the court on May 11, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 13, 2026.

Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on May 14, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner requests the visits be from 10:30 AM until 6:30 PM rather than what is proposed in the CCRC report. Further, Petitioner requests the step-up plan not commence until Respondent has returned from deployment or until it is confirmed he will not deploy. Last Petitioner requests that the visits do not occur until Respondent is no longer residing with his sister.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements of the parties to be in the best interest of the minor, with the following modification. Step 1: Respondent's parenting time shall be the 1st and 3rd Saturdays and Sundays from 10:00 AM until 6:30 PM. On the 2nd and 4th weeks of the month Respondent shall have parenting time mid-week on a day agreed to by the parties from 3:00 PM to 6:30 PM. If the parties are unable to agree to a day, Respondent's parenting time shall be on Wednesdays.

The court is adopting the recommendations with the following modifications. Step 2: After Respondent has had parenting time consistently, with no missed or shortened time for the 1st and 3rd weekends in June and July, Respondent shall progress to overnight parenting time. Respondent's parenting time shall continue to be the 1st and 3rd weekend of the month with parenting time from 10:00 AM Saturday to 10:00 AM Sunday. Respondent shall continue to have mid-week parenting time as set forth above.

Step 3: After Respondent has had parenting time consistently, with no missed or shortened parenting time, for overnight for the 1st and 3rd weekends in August and September, Respondent shall progress to weekend parenting time on the 1st and 3rd

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

weekend. Respondent's parenting time will start on Saturday at 10:00 AM until Sunday at 6:00 PM. Respondent shall continue to have mid-week parenting time as set forth above.

In the event Respondent is deployed, his parenting time will revert to the prior step for a period of 60 days upon his return from deployment.

The court modifies the prior order regarding Respondent's sister to not be present during Respondent's parenting time to adopt the recommendation that Respondent's sister shall not be left unattended with the minor.

The court notes that the CCRC report does not have recommendations addressing Respondent's request for a holiday schedule or vacation time. The court is reserving on those requests. The court sets a review hearing for October 15, 2026, at 8:30 in Department 5 to address Respondent's progress in the step-up plan as well as to make additional orders on a holiday schedule and vacation time. Pending the review hearing, the court is making the following orders regarding holidays. The court notes that Father's Day, the Fourth of July, and Labor Day are the holidays pending the review hearing. The court notes the holidays coincide with the 1st and 3rd weekends of the month, except for Labor Day. Respondent shall have his regularly scheduled parenting time for Father's Day and the fourth of July. As to Labor Day, that will remain Petitioner's parenting time.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR, WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION. STEP 1: RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME SHALL BE THE 1ST AND 3RD SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS FROM 10:00 AM UNTIL 6:30 PM. ON THE 2ND AND 4TH WEEKS OF THE MONTH RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME MID-WEEK ON A DAY AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES FROM 3:00 PM TO 6:30 PM. IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO AGREE TO A DAY, RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME SHALL BE ON WEDNESDAYS.

THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. STEP 2: AFTER RESPONDENT HAS HAD PARENTING TIME CONSISTENTLY, WITH NO MISSED OR SHORTENED TIME FOR THE 1ST AND 3RD WEEKENDS IN JUNE AND JULY, RESPONDENT SHALL PROGRESS TO OVERNIGHT PARENTING TIME. RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME SHALL CONTINUE TO BE THE 1ST

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

AND 3RD WEEKEND OF THE MONTH WITH PARENTING TIME FROM 10:00 AM SATURDAY TO 10:00 AM SUNDAY. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE MID-WEEK PARENTING TIME AS SET FORTH ABOVE.

STEP 3: AFTER RESPONDENT HAS HAD PARENTING TIME CONSISTENTLY, WITH NO MISSED OR SHORTENED PARENTING TIME, FOR OVERNIGHT FOR THE 1ST AND 3RD WEEKENDS IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, RESPONDENT SHALL PROGRESS TO WEEKEND PARENTING TIME ON THE 1ST AND 3RD WEEKEND. RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME WILL START ON SATURDAY AT 10:00 AM UNTIL SUNDAY AT 6:00 PM. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE MID-WEEK PARENTING TIME AS SET FORTH ABOVE.

IN THE EVENT RESPONDENT IS DEPLOYED, HIS PARENTING TIME WILL REVERT TO THE PRIOR STEP FOR A PERIOD OF 60 DAYS UPON HIS RETURN FROM DEPLOYMENT.

THE COURT MODIFIES THE PRIOR ORDER REGARDING RESPONDENT'S SISTER TO NOT BE PRESENT DURING RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME TO ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATION THAT RESPONDENT'S SISTER SHALL NOT BE LEFT UNATTENDED WITH THE MINOR.

THE COURT NOTES THAT THE CCRC REPORT DOES NOT HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSING RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A HOLIDAY SCHEDULE OR VACATION TIME. THE COURT IS RESERVING ON THOSE REQUESTS. THE COURT SETS A REVIEW HEARING FOR OCTOBER 15, 2026, AT 8:30 IN DEPARTMENT 5 TO ADDRESS RESPONDENT'S PROGRESS IN THE STEP-UP PLAN AS WELL AS TO MAKE ADDITIONAL ORDERS ON A HOLIDAY SCHEDULE AND VACATION TIME. PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING, THE COURT IS MAKING THE FOLLOWING ORDERS REGARDING HOLIDAYS. THE COURT NOTES THAT FATHER'S DAY, THE FOURTH OF JULY, AND LABOR DAY ARE THE HOLIDAYS PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING. THE COURT NOTES THE HOLIDAYS COINCIDE WITH THE 1ST AND 3RD WEEKENDS OF THE MONTH, EXCEPT FOR LABOR DAY. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE HIS REGULARLY SCHEDULED PARENTING TIME FOR FATHER'S DAY AND THE FOURTH OF JULY. AS TO LABOR DAY, THAT WILL REMAIN PETITIONER'S PARENTING TIME.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

7. JOHN HUSSEY V. SHARON ZALEZNAK

24FL1195

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 15, 2025, seeking spousal support as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration and Declaration of Counsel in support or attorney's fees. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served electronically on December 17, 2025. However, Petitioner was not served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling or Remote Appearance forms.

On February 27, 2026, parties stipulated to continue the hearing to May 28, 2026, at 8:30 AM in Department 5.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration, Declaration of Brian Boon, Declaration of Respondent, and an Income and Expense Declaration on May 14, 2026. All documents were electronically served on May 14th. Petitioner does not raise the issue regarding the defect in service, as such, the court finds it to have been waived.

On May 20th, Respondent filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration, a Declaration of Dominic Porrino in Support of Respondent's Request for Attorney Fees and Costs, and Respondent's Reply Declaration to Petitioner's Responsive Declaration.

Respondent is seeking \$15,000 a month in temporary support. Respondent is also seeking \$50,000 in Family Code section 2030 attorneys' fees. Petitioner agrees with providing temporary guideline spousal support and has provided a proposed X-Spouse calculation. Petitioner is also in agreement with providing Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees in the amount of \$50,000.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court adopts the proposed X-Spouse calculation as set forth in Petitioner's Exhibit 1 to the Responsive Declaration. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$5,432 as and for temporary guideline spousal support effective June 1, 2026, and payable on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In re Marriage of Keech, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties.” Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. “In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party’s case adequately.” *Id.* at (b). Financial resources are only one factor to be considered though. *Id.* In addition to the parties’ financial resources, the court may consider the parties’ trial tactics. In Re Marriage of Falcone & Fyke, 203 Cal. App. 4th 964; 975 (2012).

The court finds there is a disparity in access to funds and that Petitioner can pay for both his and Respondent’s attorney’s fees. The court grants the request for Family Code section 2030 attorney’s fees in the amount of \$30,000. The payment is to be made directly to Respondent’s counsel in one lump sum or in monthly payments of \$2,500 with the first payment due on June 15, 2026, and future payments due on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and owing.

Parties are reminded of the public policy of Family Code section 271. “Section 271 provides that a family court may impose an award of attorney fees and costs ‘in the nature of a sanction’ where the conduct of a party or attorney ‘frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation between the parties and attorneys.’ (§ 271, subd. (a).)” In re Marriage of Tharp 188 Cal.App.4th 1295, 1316 (2010). “Expressed another way, section 271 vests family law courts with an additional means with which to enforce this state’s public policy of promoting settlement of family law litigation, while reducing its costs through mutual cooperation of clients and their counsel.” (*Id.* at 1318.)

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT ADOPTS THE PROPOSED X-SPOUSE CALCULATION AS SET FORTH IN PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT 1 TO THE RESPONSIVE DECLARATION. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$5,432 AS AND FOR TEMPORARY

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2026, AND PAYABLE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THERE IS A DISPARITY IN ACCESS TO FUNDS AND THAT PETITIONER HAS THE ABILITY TO PAY FOR BOTH HIS AND RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY'S FEES. THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$30,000. THE PAYMENT IS TO BE MADE DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$2,500 WITH THE FIRST PAYMENT DUE ON JUNE 15, 2026 AND FUTURE PAYMENTS DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND OWING.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

8. BRITTANY KEE-KOC V. JIMMY FERREL KEE, JR.

26FL0097

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 25, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 2, 2026, and a review hearing on May 28, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served by mail on March 2, 2026. However, Respondent was not served with all the required documents, namely he was not served with the Notice of Tentative Ruling and the Remote Appearance Request forms.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and were able to reach a full agreement. A report memorializing the parties' agreement was filed with the court on May 12, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 13, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

The court has read and considered the May 12th CCRC report with the parties' agreement. The court finds good cause to proceed, despite the defect in service, as the parties attended CCRC and reached an agreement. The court finds the agreement to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the agreement as set forth.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED, DESPITE THE DEFECT IN SERVICE, AS THE PARTIES ATTENDED CCRC AND REACHED AN AGREEMENT. THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENT AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

9. MILENA ROBBINS V. RYAN ROBBINS

PFL20140570

Parties appeared for the hearing on February 19, 2026. The court made orders regarding homeschool, a parenting plan, and medication for the minor. The court set a 90-day review hearing for May 28, 2026, at 8:30 AM in Department 5, to review the parenting plan, homeschool, as well as medication compliance. The court directed parties to file and serve supplemental declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on May 7, 2026. It was served on May 7, 2026.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration on May 11, 2026. The court has no Proof of Service for this document. The Proof of Service filed on May 11, 2026, reflects service on February 4, 2026, which predates the original hearing in this matter.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

10. SCOTT RUSSELL V. OLIVIA RUSSELL

23FL0133

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 26, 2026, to clarify the court's January 8, 2026 orders. Respondent was properly served on March 2, 2026. Petitioner is seeking an order clarifying the exchange days and times for the minors.

Respondent filed a responsive declaration on April 2, 2026. It was served on April 1, 2026. Respondent insists Petitioner's parenting time is Wednesday through Sunday on the 5-day portion of the 2-2-5 schedule.

Respondent filed a further responsive declaration on May 13, 2026. It was served on Petitioner on May 13, 2026.

Petitioner filed a reply declaration on May 14, 2026. It was served on May 14, 2026.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. To clarify, the parties are to use a 2-2-5-5 schedule. Respondent has physical custody of the minors on Monday and Tuesday. Petitioner has physical custody of the minors Wednesday and Thursday. The parties then rotate Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. All exchanges are at school. That includes the transition between Sunday to Monday, Respondent's parenting time begins with the drop off at school. If there is no school, the exchanges are at 11:00 AM at a location agreed upon by the parties.

There is no need for make-up time to be provided. Respondent has received the proper parenting time. The court denies Respondent's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions. The court finds this does not come within the provisions of Family Code section 271. Further, Respondent is not represented by counsel, as such an award of sanctions in the form attorney's fees is improper.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: TO CLARIFY THE COURT'S JANUARY 8, 2026 ORDER - THE PARTIES ARE TO USE A 2-2-5-5 SCHEDULE. RESPONDENT HAS PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY. PETITIONER HAS PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY. THE PARTIES THEN ROTATE FRIDAY, SATURDAY, AND SUNDAY. ALL EXCHANGES ARE AT SCHOOL. THAT INCLUDES THE TRANSITION BETWEEN SUNDAY TO MONDAY, RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

BEGINS WITH THE DROP OFF AT SCHOOL. IF THERE IS NO SCHOOL, THE EXCHANGES ARE AT 11:00 AM AT A LOCATION AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES.

THERE IS NO NEED FOR MAKE-UP TIME TO BE PROVIDED. RESPONDENT HAS RECEIVED THE PROPER PARENTING TIME. THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS.

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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

12. NATHANIEL DEPEE V. CHERYL COVINGTON

23FL0491

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on October 17, 2025. Respondent was personally served on November 1, 2025.

Parties appeared on March 19, 2026. The court advised Respondent of their constitutional rights and appointed the office of the Public Defender. The court continued the hearing for further arraignment.

Parties are ordered to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

13. CATHERINE GARAVITO V. FRANK GARAVITO

24FL1127

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 1, 2026, seeking leave to amend the Petition for Legal Separation, to a Petition for Dissolution. Respondent was personally served on April 15, 2026. It is unclear whether Respondent was served with a blank FL-320.

Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

The parties are ordered to appear to address the potential defect in service.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

14. KELLI JEANCOQ V. RAYMOND LONERGAN

PFL20190708

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 17, 2026, seeking child custody, parenting time, and child support orders. Respondent did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC), as there had been a referral within the prior six months. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail-served on March 27, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a responsive declaration.

The court denies Respondent's request to modify the current orders. The court notes there is a Domestic Violence Restraining Order in place, which protects the minor. Respondent has failed to set forth how the Family Code section 3044 presumption has been overcome. Further, Respondent has failed to set forth how the requested modifications would be in the minor's best interest.

As to the request to modify child support, "[f]or all hearings involving child, spousal, or domestic partner support, both parties must complete, file, and serve a current Income and Expense Declaration." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(1); See *also* Cal. Fam. Code §2100. The party requesting support shall file and serve his or her Income and Expense Declaration with the initial moving papers. El Dorado Sup. Ct. Rule 8.03.01. Respondent has failed to file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration. As such, the request to modify child support is denied.

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 #14: THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CURRENT ORDERS. THE COURT NOTES THERE IS A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER IN PLACE, WHICH PROTECTS THE MINOR. RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO SET FORTH HOW THE FAMILY CODE SECTION 3044 PRESUMPTION HAS BEEN OVERCOME. FURTHER, RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO SET FORTH HOW THE REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS WOULD BE IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST.

AS TO THE REQUEST TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT, THE REQUEST IS DENIED DUE TO RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 28, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

15. DCSS V. ANTWON LILES (OTHER PARENT: CASSANDRA THORP) PFS20170306

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 24, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 2, 2026, and a review hearing on May 28, 2026. Proof of Service shows Other Parent was served at an address in Cameron Park. The address verification shows the verified address in El Dorado. There is no Proof of Service showing DCSS was served.

Neither party appeared for CCRC.

Neither Petitioner nor Other Parent have filed a responsive declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as Respondent's failure to appear at CCRC.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC.

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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

16. NORMA LUA V. JOSE LUA

PFL20140968

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 19, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

18. KATRINA NEILSEN V. MORGAN HOLLIS

24FL0907

On March 19, 2026, parties appeared for the hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO). The court adopted its tentative ruling and set the matter for trial and a review hearing. The court ordered Petitioner to participate in an Evidence Code section 730 evaluation. The court directed that supplemental declarations be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the May 28th review hearing.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on May 18, 2026. It was served on Petitioner on May 17, 2026. Respondent requests the current orders remain in full force and effect.

The court has not received a supplemental declaration from Petitioner, although Respondent references it in his declaration.

The court finds the current orders remain in the minor's best interest. The court notes parties are pending an evidentiary hearing on August 3, 2026, at 8:30 AM in Department 5.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

19. AND 20. NADIA STAMOS V. PETER STAMOS

25FL0600 AND 25FL0604

On February 24, 2026, the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 25, 2026 and a review hearing on May 21, 2026.

On May 12, 2026, parties submitted a stipulation to consolidate the review hearing set for May 21st with the review hearing set for May 28th. The court signed and adopted the stipulation as its order.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and fully participated. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 7, 2026 and mailed to the parties on May 8, 2026.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on May 8, 2026. It was served electronically the same day. Respondent is requesting shared custody. Respondent is requesting therapy for the minors and co-parenting education for Petitioner.

The court has read and considered the May 7th CCRC report and the filings as outlined above and finds the recommendations to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the May 7th CCRC report.

Respondent filed an ex parte application for the enforcement of the court's prior orders on March 23, 2026. Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on March 23rd. The court granted the ex parte in part and denied the ex parte in part on March 24, 2026. The court reiterated that all prior orders remained in full force and effect, including the order for Petitioner to vacate the former marital residence. The court reserved on Respondent's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions. The court likewise reserved on Petitioner's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Respondent filed an RFO on March 24, 2026, which seeks the same orders requested in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on March 25, 2026. Petitioner was also electronically served on March 24th.

There have been no additional filings related to the pending RFO. Therefore, the court presumes Petitioner has vacated the residence.

All prior orders regarding the former marital residence remain in full force and effect.

The court continues to reserve on Respondent's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions, until the time of trial.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

As to Petitioner's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees, that request is denied without prejudice. Petitioner failed to file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration with her request for attorney's fees. Likewise, Petitioner did not complete the required FL-158. Therefore, Petitioner's request is denied without prejudice.

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 RULINGS #19 AND #20: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE MAY 7TH CCRC REPORT AND FILING AS OUTLINED ABOVE AND FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 7TH CCRC REPORT.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS REGARDING THE FORMER MARITAL RESIDENCE REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271, UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

AS TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES, THAT REQUEST IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO FILE THE PROPER PAPERWORK.

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 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 28, 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

21. DEBRA STANLEY V. ROBERT STANLEY

PFL20210202

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

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

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

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

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

The parties and Minors' Counsel appeared for the hearing on April 30, 2026. The parties reached agreements which included the court staying its tentative ruling as to the child custody and parenting plan issues and continued the review hearing to May 28, 2026 at 1:30 PM. All other portions of the tentative ruling were adopted as the court's orders. The court directed that any supplemental declarations were to be filed and served by no later than May 18th.

Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on May 18, 2026. The court deems this to be a supplemental declaration. Proof of Service shows both Respondent and Minors' Counsel were served on May 18th. Petitioner raises concerns about the parenting time with Respondent as well as the lack of follow through on prior orders. Additionally, Petitioner is concerned with the pick-up location for Respondent's parenting time.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on May 18, 2026. Parties were served the same day.

Neither Respondent filed not filed a supplemental declaration.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

TENTATIVE RULING #21: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

22. CHRISTINA STEELE V. JOSHUA WALLER

PFL20160057

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 13, 2026, requesting modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 13, 2026, and a review hearing on April 9, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was only served with the RFO and a blank CCRC questionnaire.

Both parties appeared for CCRC and fully participated. The minor participated as well. A report with agreements and recommendations was filed with the court on March 2, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 4th.

On March 27, 2026, Petitioner filed a request to reschedule the hearing due to not being properly served. On April 1, 2026, the court granted the request to continue the hearing to May 28, 2026 and directed Respondent to properly serve Petitioner. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner properly served Respondent with the order rescheduling the hearing.

There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served, nor is there a Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services, who is a party to the case, was properly served.

Petitioner filed an RFO on March 20, 2026, requesting modification of custody and parenting plan orders. It is set to be heard June 18, 2026. It was served on Respondent March 23, 2026. Respondent filed a responsive declaration to Petitioner's March 20th RFO on April 2, 2026. It was served on April 2, 2026. Neither party has served the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS).

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed with Respondent's RFO, despite the lack of proper service. The court finds each party is fully aware of the requested orders and fully participated in CCRC. Neither party is requesting a modification of child support and as such the court finds good cause to proceed, despite the lack of service on DCSS. Additionally, the court is advancing the June 18, 2026 hearing to May 28, 2026, as it is duplicative of the January 13th RFO. The court deems Petitioner's March 20th RFO to be a responsive declaration to Respondent's January 13th RFO. The court vacates the June 18th hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

The court finds the agreements and recommendations set forth in the March 2nd CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth as its orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH RESPONDENT'S RFO, DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. THE COURT FINDS EACH PARTY IS FULLY AWARE OF THE REQUESTED ORDERS AND FULLY PARTICIPATED IN CCRC. NEITHER PARTY IS REQUESTING A MODIFICATION OF CHILD SUPPORT AND AS SUCH THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED, DESPITE THE LACK OF SERVICE ON DCSS. ADDITIONALLY, THE COURT IS ADVANCING THE JUNE 18, 2026 HEARING TO MAY 28, 2026, AS IT IS DUPLICATIVE OF THE JANUARY 13TH RFO. THE COURT DEEMS PETITIONER'S MARCH 20TH RFO TO BE A RESPONSIVE DECLARATION TO RESPONDENT'S JANUARY 13TH RFO. THE COURT VACATES THE JUNE 18TH HEARING.

THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 2ND CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH AS ITS ORDERS.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR 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 28, 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 28, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

23. AMANDA TAPIA V. JOHN DIVINE

26FL0182

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on February 27, 2026. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 1, 2026, and a review hearing on May 28, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the Petition, Summons, or RFO and other necessary documents.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on May 14, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 14th.

The court drops the matter from calendar as the court does not have jurisdiction over the parties since the Petition and Summons have not been served. The court further drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service of the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #23: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR AS THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER THE PARTIES SINCE THE PETITION AND SUMMONS HAVE NOT BEEN SERVED. THE COURT FURTHER DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE OF THE RFO.

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.