

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. ANDREW AULT V. SHAINA AULT

25FL0137

On February 9, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 12, 2026, and a review hearing was set for the present date. The RFO was served on February 24th along with a document identified as “mediation questionnaire.” There is no Proof of Service for the CCRC referral, the Notice of Tentative Ruling and the blank FL-320.

Despite the defect in service, Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 5, 2026.

The parties attended CCRC as scheduled and were able to reach some agreements. A report containing those agreements, along with additional recommendations, was prepared on April 20, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on April 21st.

Respondent filed her RFO but failed to make any requests therein. The court is proceeding with the RFO on the merits despite Respondent’s failure to fully complete the RFO only because the parties both appeared at and participated in CCRC. That said, Respondent is admonished that if she files another blank RFO in the future it will be dropped from calendar.

After reviewing the CCRC report, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained therein to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 20, 2026 CCRC REPORT ARE FOUND TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. CHEYENE BONARI V. JOHN HARTSOUGH

24FL0767

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 6, 2026, seeking a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had attended within the prior six months. Respondent was served with only the RFO on February 6, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services was served.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on March 19, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 23 and again on March 24th. The court granted the ex parte request in part on March 24, 2026 and referred the parties to an emergency set CCRC appointment on April 7, 2026 and a review hearing set for May 7, 2026. Respondent was served on March 24, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing the Department of Child Support Services was served.

Both parties attended CCRC on April 7, 2026. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on April 28, 2026, and mailed to the parties on April 29th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 29, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it. Additionally, the court finds this to be late filed. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) 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 April 24th the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON

23FL0077

On January 5, 2026, the court held an evidentiary hearing regarding whether Respondent had rebutted the Family Code § 3044 presumption. The court found Respondent had failed to demonstrate the presumption had been overcome. The court then made orders regarding conjoint counseling and parenting time and set a review hearing on May 7, 2026 to determine Respondent's progress in conjoint therapy as well as supervised parenting time.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on April 24, 2026. Respondent and Minors' Counsel were served on April 22, 2026. Petitioner outlines the lack of progress since the January 5, 2026 hearing. Respondent continues to miss visits on a regular basis. Respondent continues to interrogate the minors about the court proceedings. Respondent's concerning behaviors with inundating Petitioner with messages on the co-parenting application has continued as well. Petitioner requests the parenting time be reduced to every other week as Respondent has only attended five out of the 15 scheduled visits. Petitioner further requests an additional drug testing protocol, due to concerns with Respondent's testing anomalies. Petitioner arranged for the minors to participate in conjoint therapy. The therapist determined that it is not appropriate at this time, due to the minors' unwillingness to engage with Respondent.

Respondent has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

Minors' Counsel has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court makes the following modifications to the current orders, as the modifications are in the best interests of the minors. Conjoint therapy shall not commence until Respondent demonstrates a minimum of four consecutive months of consistent parenting time with no missed or cancelled visits. Further conjoint therapy shall not commence until the minors' individual therapist as well as conjoint therapist believe it is appropriate. The minors shall continue in individual therapy at a frequency and duration as directed by the therapist not to exceed one year. The therapist shall determine the goals and objectives of therapy. Respondent shall not discuss any aspects of the court case, custody, or parenting time with the minors under any circumstances except under the supervision and direction of a therapist. Respondent shall continue to have professionally supervised parenting time at a frequency of one time every other week for a period of two hours. Respondent shall submit to random urine drug testing through U-Verify drug testing with DNA verification. Testing

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

shall occur three times per month. The first test shall occur within three weeks of this order. Petitioner shall direct Respondent to test by 10:00 AM and Respondent shall complete the test the same day. Requests to test must be made at least seven days apart. Results shall be sent to Petitioner and Minors' Counsel directly by the testing center. The initial swab and/or test shall be coordinated with Minors' Counsel to ensure compliance. Respondent shall continue to participate in individual counseling at a frequency and duration as set by the therapist to address issues related to aggression, emotional regulation, and substance use disorder. Respondent shall follow all recommendations of the therapist. Therapy shall not exceed one year in duration.

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 HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS TO THE CURRENT ORDERS, AS THE MODIFICATIONS ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. CONJOINT THERAPY SHALL NOT COMMENCE UNTIL RESPONDENT DEMONSTRATES A MINIMUM OF FOUR CONSECUTIVE MONTHS OF CONSISTENT PARENTING TIME WITH NO MISSED OR CANCELLED VISITS. FURTHER CONJOINT THERAPY SHALL NOT COMMENCE UNTIL THE MINORS' INDIVIDUAL THERAPIST AS WELL AS CONJOINT THERAPIST BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIATE. THE MINORS SHALL CONTINUE IN INDIVIDUAL THERAPY AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS DIRECTED BY THE THERAPIST NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR. THE THERAPIST SHALL DETERMINE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THERAPY. RESPONDENT SHALL NOT DISCUSS ANY ASPECTS OF THE COURT CASE, CUSTODY, OR PARENTING TIME WITH THE MINORS UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES EXCEPT UNDER THE SUPERVISION AND DIRECTION OF A THERAPIST. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED PARENTING TIME AT A FREQUENCY OF ONE TIME EVERY OTHER WEEK FOR A PERIOD OF TWO HOURS. RESPONDENT SHALL SUBMIT TO RANDOM URINE DRUG TESTING THROUGH U-VERIFY DRUG TESTING WITH DNA VERIFICATION. TESTING SHALL OCCUR THREE TIMES PER MONTH. THE FIRST TEST SHALL OCCUR WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF THIS ORDER. PETITIONER SHALL DIRECT RESPONDENT TO TEST BY 10:00 AM AND RESPONDENT SHALL COMPLETE THE TEST THE SAME DAY. REQUESTS TO TEST MUST BE MADE AT LEAST SEVEN DAYS APART. RESULTS SHALL BE SENT TO PETITIONER AND MINORS' COUNSEL DIRECTLY BY THE TESTING CENTER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

THE INITIAL SWAB AND/OR TEST SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH MINORS' COUNSEL TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS SET BY THE THERAPIST TO ADDRESS ISSUES RELATED TO AGGRESSION, EMOTIONAL REGULATION, AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER. RESPONDENT SHALL FOLLOW ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THERAPIST. THERAPY SHALL NOT EXCEED ONE YEAR IN DURATION.

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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. MARY CROWDER V. JEFFREY CROWDER

PFL20120584

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 26, 2026, seeking a termination of permanent spousal support as well as termination of insurance payments for the parties' adult daughter. Petitioner was personally served in accordance with Family Code § 215 on March 5, 2026. Respondent filed and served an Income and Expense Declaration on February 17, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration on April 22, 2026, along with her Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner objects to the termination of permanent spousal support and requests an increase in spousal support. Petitioner also seeks Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner does not address the issue of health insurance.

The court finds this is a post-judgment request to modify spousal support and as such, the court must take testimony on the Family Code section 4320 factors. Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to select mandatory settlement conference and trial dates.

The court finds that the issue of payment of the parties' adult daughter's medical insurance requires testimony. Parties are ordered to appear to appear for the hearing to select mandatory settlement conference and trial dates.

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 there is a disparity in income between the parties. The court finds Respondent does have the ability to pay some of Petitioner's attorney's fees. The court therefore grants the request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees in the amount of \$1,500. Payment may be made in one lump sum, or in monthly payments of \$150 with the first payment due on May 15, 2026, directly to Petitioner's counsel. Further payments are due on the 15th of each month until paid in full. If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 #4: THE COURT FINDS THIS IS A POST-JUDGMENT REQUEST TO MODIFY SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND AS SUCH, THE COURT MUST TAKE TESTIMONY ON THE FAMILY CODE SECTION 4320 FACTORS. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

THE COURT FINDS THAT THE ISSUE OF PAYMENT OF THE PARTIES' ADULT DAUGHTER'S MEDICAL INSURANCE REQUIRES TESTIMONY. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES.

THE COURT FINDS THERE IS A DISPARITY IN INCOME BETWEEN THE PARTIES. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT DOES HAVE THE ABILITY TO PAY SOME OF PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S FEES. THE COURT THEREFORE GRANTS THE REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,500. PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM, OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$150 WITH THE FIRST PAYMENT DUE ON MAY 15, 2026, DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL. FURTHER PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL. IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. MICHAELA JOHNSON V. MATTHEW JOHNSON

22FL0137

On February 18, 2026, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). It was personally served on Respondent on March 5, 2026.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. SARAH LESTER V. JASON LESTER

23FL1169

On February 17, 2026, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging 51 counts of contempt for failure to pay court ordered child support. It was personally served on February 21st.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERD TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. SAMANTHA MANN V. ARJUN SINGH MANN

25FL0539

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 6, 2026, seeking a court order for genetic testing to determine biological parentage of the minor child. Petitioner was served by mail with some, but not all, of the required documents.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 22, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document. As such, the court cannot consider it.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to determine whether there is a waiver of the defects in service.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. JUSTIN SIMARRO V. YAJAIRA SIMARRO

PFL20200099

On February 3, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It was served on February 1, 2026.

On March 6, 2026, Respondent filed a declaration for the mediator. It was served on March 6th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 12, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on April 14, 2026.

Respondent filed another declaration on April 23rd, it was served on April 24th.

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

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations in the April 14, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor with the exception of the Parenting Time section and the section titled Alcohol or Substance Abuse. The court is not adopting those two sections; the remaining sections are adopted as the orders of the court. The parties are to continue the visitation schedule that they are currently practicing – Petitioner to have the minor every other Monday at 6:00 pm to Wednesday at 12:00 pm and Friday at 6:00 pm to Sunday at 12:00 pm.

The court is declining to go to a week on/week off schedule as the court is concerned with Petitioner's clear manipulation of the child and his discussions of the court proceedings with the child. Additionally, regarding the knife, while the court understands that the minor has been taught to use it as a tool while working on Petitioner's property, the problem is that Petitioner has now allowed the minor to have access to the knife twice while unsupervised. The lack of supervision over the minor which resulted in him bringing the knife to school once and to an extracurricular event the second time is concerning. Whether or not the minor should be allowed to use the knife for projects at home is a difference in parenting styles. Allowing the minor to bring the knife to school and sporting events while unsupervised is a safety concern. Whether Petitioner allowed the minor to take the knife unsupervised, or if the minor took the knife from Petitioner's truck without Petitioner knowing, the fact remains that Petitioner was not sufficiently supervising the minor to ensure that he did not have access to an item that poses a risk to his safety. As

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

such, the court cannot find that an increase in Petitioner's parenting time would be in the best interest the minor at this time.

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 #8: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE APRIL 14, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PARENTING TIME SECTION AND THE SECTION TITLED ALCOHOL OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THOSE TWO SECTIONS, THE REMAINING SECTIONS ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE PARTIES ARE TO CONTINUE THE VISITATION SCHEDULE THAT THEY ARE CURRENTLY PRACTICING – PETITIONER TO HAVE THE MINOR EVERY OTHER MONDAY AT 6:00PM TO WEDNESDAY AT 12:00 PM AND FRIDAY AT 6:00PM TO SUNDAY AT 12:00 PM.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. TODD STANLEY V. HANNAH COLE

24FL0221

Respondent filed an RFO on February 2nd seeking to have Petitioner deemed a vexatious litigant. The RFO and all other required documents were served on February 4th.

While Respondent concedes that a party represented by counsel cannot be deemed a vexatious litigant and she notes her belief that Petitioner was represented by counsel as of March 13th she is still seeking to have the court issue the vexatious litigant designation.

Parties appeared for the hearing on March 26, 2026. Petitioner requested the matter be continued to allow additional briefing on the request. The court set a briefing schedule and stayed its tentative ruling on the vexatious litigant portion of the ruling only. The court set a review hearing for May 7, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Brief on April 24, 2026. It was served on Respondent and Minors' Counsel the same day. Petitioner objects to the vexatious litigant designation and argues that Petitioner's filings do not come within any of the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 391.

Respondent filed a Responsive Brief on April 27, 2026. It was served on Petitioner the same day. The court does not have a Proof of Service showing Minors' Counsel was properly served. As such, the court cannot consider the Responsive Brief.

Minors' Counsel has not filed a Brief on the issue of vexatious litigant.

The purpose of the vexatious litigant statute is to curb the misuse of the judicial process by self-represented litigants who repeatedly file unmeritorious litigation, or motions, or who repeatedly attempt to relitigate issues that have already been decided by the court. Shalant v. Girardi, 51 Cal. App. 4th 1164 (2011). To be declared a vexatious litigant the self-represented party must meet at least one of four statutory definitions. These definitions include an individual who "...repeatedly relitigates or attempts to relitigate, in propria persona, either (1) the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or (ii) the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined;" or one who "repeatedly files unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conducts unnecessary discovery, or engages in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 391(b)(2) & (b)(3). A finding of as few as three motions on the same issue has been upheld as grounds for a

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

vexatious litigant ruling. Goodrich v. Sierra Vista Reg'l Med. Ctr., 246 Cal. App. 4th 1260 (2016).

After re-reviewing the court's file, the court finds the following. Since March of 2024, Petitioner has filed six RFOs and a Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). One RFO was filed by his attorney, therefore, the court is not considering that RFO in its vexatious litigant analysis.

Regarding the remaining filings, the court has reviewed each and they quite frankly do walk the line over whether they were filed with the intent to harass Respondent (who is a protected party under the DVRO) or to cause delay and litigate or relitigate issues that were finally determined by the court. That said, the court does recognize that the majority of the RFOs at issue were filed immediately following the move-away hearing during the brief period of time that he was pro per. Recognizing that, the court notes that Petitioner is now represented by counsel. Accordingly, the court is hopeful that the repeated filings on the same issues and without legal basis will subside, therefore, the court is not granting the request to deem Petitioner a vexatious litigant at this time.

Petitioner is admonished, for the second time, to refrain from filings that do not have sound basis in law or are intended solely to harass Respondent or delay proceedings. The request for vexatious litigant status is being denied without prejudice. As such, Petitioner is cautioned that he may be deemed a vexatious litigant in the future if the issue comes before the court again.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on April 20, 2026. Petitioner and Respondent were served the same day.

Petitioner filed a Declaration in Rebuttal to the Family Code section 3044 Presumption on April 27, 2026. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service regarding this document. Therefore, it has not been considered.

Respondent filed an Updating Declaration on April 27, 2026 along with an Updating Declaration of Counsel. These documents were not served on Minors' Counsel. As such, they have not been read or considered.

The court notes, there is no current review hearing regarding custody or parenting time, nor is there a pending motion to modify the court's current orders regarding custody, parenting time, or the Family Code section 3044 presumption. Those matters were all ruled on at the March 26, 2026 hearing, where the court adopted its tentative ruling as set forth.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 #9: THE REQUEST TO DEEM PETITIONER A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT 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.

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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. JENNIFER STILWELL V. STEPHEN CICCARELLI

PFL20180525

This matter is before the court for hearing of the Request for Order (RFO) filed by the Petitioner on February 10, 2026, to (1) set child custody and visitation, (2) confirm and enforce its continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over this matter, (3) stay all proceedings in the Tribal Court (Pechanga Tribal Court, Case No. ICW-035-25) pending further order of this court; and (4) prohibit the parties from initiating, participating in, or seeking orders from any other court regarding the parties' minor children. The filing of the RFO prompted the court to refer the parties to a CCRC session set for March 12, 2026.

Proof of service filed February 10, 2026, shows the RFO was electronically served upon Respondent on February 09, 2026.

Respondent filed no Responsive Declaration.

The court is in receipt of a CCRC report indicating that neither parent appeared for the appointment as scheduled.

Due to the Petitioner's failure to appear at the scheduled CCRC session, the court drops the matter from the calendar without prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: DUE TO THE PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT THE SCHEDULED CCRC SESSION, THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM THE CALENDAR WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6275 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO 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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. DEENA UTLEY V. KENNETH UTLEY

24FL0820

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 19, 2026, seeking an order for Petitioner to undergo a vocational evaluation. Respondent requests the court order Petitioner to bear the cost of the evaluation solely. Petitioner was served by mail on February 24, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 15, 2026. Respondent was served electronically on April 15, 2026. Petitioner objects to the request to undergo a vocational evaluation at her own expense. Petitioner asserts, and has included exhibits documenting, that she has been found by the Social Security Administration to be permanently disabled. Further, Petitioner is 62 years old and in poor health. As such, Petitioner asserts it would be inappropriate and wasteful for the court to order a vocational evaluation.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on April 28, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent reiterates his request for a vocational evaluation and brings an additional request for a Defense Medical Examination under Code of Civil Procedure section 2032.320. Respondent has included exhibits as attachments, which include unredacted bank statements.

Petitioner filed an Objection on April 29, 2026. Respondent was served the same day. Petitioner objects to the court considering Respondent's request for a medical examination, as it is beyond the scope of the original RFO. Further, Petitioner requests the unredacted bank statements contained in Respondent's exhibit be placed under seal.

Respondent filed an Amended Reply on April 30, 2026 along with a Request to Seal the original Reply, due to the unredacted bank statements. The Amended Reply includes the statements with the appropriate redactions.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court grants the request to seal the original Reply Declaration filed on April 28th due to the unreacted bank statements. The court grants the request for the vocational evaluation. Petitioner shall participate in a vocational evaluation as requested by Respondent. Respondent is directed to pay for the evaluation, subject to reallocation.

The court denies Respondent's request for a Medical Examination pursuant to Code Civil Procedure section 2032.320. The court finds the request to be beyond the scope of the original RFO and therefore, it is being denied without prejudice.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 #11: THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST TO SEAL THE ORIGINAL REPLY DECLARATION FILED ON APRIL 28TH DUE TO THE UNREACTED BANK STATEMENTS. THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST FOR THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION. PETITIONER SHALL PARTICIPATE IN A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AS REQUESTED BY RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PAY FOR THE EVALUATION, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION. THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A MEDICAL EXAMINATION PURSUANT TO CODE CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 2032.320. THE COURT FINDS THE REQUEST TO BE BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO THEREFORE THE REQUEST IS BEING DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. RACHAEL WORKMAN V. MATTHEW WORKMAN

23FL0947

This matter is before the court for a CCRC review and the issue of child support, as requested in Petitioner's Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) filed May 22, 2025.

The parties attended CCRC on March 19, 2026. The court is in receipt of a CCRC report dated April 23, 2026, a copy of which was mailed to both parties on April 27, 2026, per the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing filed that day.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration to the CCRC report on April 30, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent objects to the recommendations in the April 23rd CCRC report and requests the court order unsupervised visitation and the schedule as set forth in the report. Respondent agrees to continue to use Soberlink testing, if the court grants unsupervised parenting time. Respondent objects to a further substance abuse assessment.

Petitioner's Reply Declaration Regarding 4/23/2026 CCRC Report was filed on May 1, 2026. It was served on April 30th. She is requesting sole legal custody and primary physical custody. She asks that Respondent have four hours of non-professionally supervised visits twice per week on mutually agreed upon dates and times. She asks that Jared True and/or his wife serve as non-professional supervisors and the visits be restricted to El Dorado, Placer and Sacramento counties. She asks the court to order Respondent not to drive the children during visits. Finally, she asks the court to uphold the prior Soberlink testing as follows: Respondent to continue to test two times per day and 10 minutes prior to visits. If Respondent tests positive or misses a test in the week prior to visitation, Petitioner has the authority to cancel the visit.

Regarding custody and visitation, the court finds the recommendations in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the following modifications. Respondent's visits shall be non-professionally supervised by either Jared True, Mr. True's wife, or Respondent's mother. Prior to any supervision taking place, the non-professional supervisor shall complete and file an FL-324(NP). Respondent's visits shall be restricted to El Dorado, Placer, or Sacramento county. Respondent shall not drive the children during his visits. The non-professional supervisor may drive the children during the visit if necessary. Respondent shall continue to use Soberlink to test twice per day and 10 minutes prior to visitation. If

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

Respondent tests positive or misses a test in the day prior to, or the day of, the visit, Petitioner may cancel the visit and the visit will be forfeited.

Turning to the issue of support, in a stipulation filed with the court on February 17, 2026, the parties agreed to address Petitioner's request for child support during the instant CCRC review hearing.

The February 17, 2026, stipulation also provides that (1) the agreement will remain in place through December 31, 2026, at midnight unless terminated earlier by subsequent written agreement of the parties adopted by the court or court order, and (2) the custody and visitation orders entered October 08, 2025, remain in effect. The October 08, 2025, orders provide that Petitioner shall have temporary sole physical custody and Respondent's visits shall be professionally supervised. Therefore, for the purposes of determining child support, Respondent's custody timeshare is zero.

On March 03, 2026, Respondent filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration (I&E), which was electronically served upon Petitioner on February 26, 2026, according to the proof of service filed March 03, 2026. Respondent's I&E indicates he started a new job on January 12, 2026. Attached to his I&E are paystubs from his previous employer (Biolase MG LLC), covering the period of November 16, 2025, through November 30, 2025, and his current employer (Medical Graphics), covering the period of January 11, 2026, through February 07, 2026. Respondent's current gross monthly income is \$7,750.00, rounded down to the nearest dollar (four week's pay = \$7,153.86; $\$7,153.86 \times 13 = \$93,000.18$ annual pay (52 weeks); $\$93,000.18 / 12$ months = \$7,750.02 per month).

On April 07, 2026, Petitioner filed an updated I&E, which was electronically served upon Respondent that same day according to the Proof of Service, also filed April 07, 2026. Attached to Petitioner's I&E are two paystubs from her employer: (1) the first paystub covers the period of December 25, 2025, through January 26, 2026; and (2) the second paystub covers the period of February 26, 2026, through March 26, 2026. Both paystubs show the same monthly gross pay of \$8,778.60, and the same monthly deductions for retirement (\$661.25), medical insurance (\$661), and union dues (\$79.00).

Based on the above calculations, the court finds guideline child support to be \$2,570 payable from Respondent to Petitioner (see attached X-Spouse). The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$2,570 as and for child support effective November 1, 2025 and payable 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 7, 2026

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

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$15,420 for the months of November through May inclusive. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$642.50 per month as and for arrears effective May 15, 2026. All future payments are due on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If there is any missed or late payment the full amount is due and owing with legal interest.

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 #13: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. RESPONDENT'S VISITS SHALL BE NON-PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED BY EITHER JARED TRUE, MR. TRUE'S WIFE, OR RESPONDENT'S MOTHER. PRIOR TO ANY SUPERVISION TAKING PLACE, THE NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR SHALL COMPLETE AND FILE AN FL-324(NP). RESPONDENT'S VISITS SHALL BE RESTRICTED TO EL DORADO, PLACER, OR SACRAMENTO COUNTY. RESPONDENT SHALL NOT DRIVE THE CHILDREN DURING HIS VISITS. THE NON-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISOR MAY DRIVE THE CHILDREN DURING THE VISIT IF NECESSARY. RESPONDENT SHALL CONTINUE TO USE SOBERLINK TO TEST TWICE PER DAY AND 10 MINUTES PRIOR TO VISITATION. IF RESPONDENT TESTS POSITIVE OR MISSES A TEST IN THE DAY PRIOR TO, OR THE DAY OF, THE VISIT, PETITIONER MAY CANCEL THE VISIT AND THE VISIT WILL BE FORFEITED.

THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$2,570 PAYABLE FROM RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,570 AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1, 2025, AND PAYABLE 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 7, 2026

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

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$15,420 FOR THE MONTHS OF NOVEMBER THROUGH MAY INCLUSIVE. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$642.50 PER MONTH AS AND FOR ARREARS EFFECTIVE MAY 15, 2026. ALL FUTURE PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF THERE IS ANY MISSED OR LATE PAYMENT THE FULL AMOUNT IS DUE AND OWING WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

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

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6275 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO 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		12066
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	0.00%			Father		
Filing status	MFSIN HH/MLA		Nets (adjusted)				
Number of exemptions	1	4	Father	5732	Payment cost/benefit		-2570
Wages and salary	7750	8779	Mother	6334	Net spendable income		3161
Self employed income	0	0	Total	12066	Federal income tax		969
Other taxable income	0	0	Support		Federal employment tax		593
TANF CS received	0	0	Addons	0	State income tax		356
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Guideln CS	-2570	State employment tax		101
New spouse income	0	0	Alameda SS	-0	Total taxes		2018
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Total	-2570	Federal filing status		MFSIN
Adjustments to income	0	0			State filing status		MFSIN
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			Mother		
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Payment cost/benefit		2570
Health insurance	0	661			Net spendable income		8905
Other medical expenses	0	0			Federal income tax		202
Property tax expenses	629	423			Federal employment tax		672
Ded interest expense	469	0			State income tax		57
Contribution deduction	0	0			State employment tax		114
Misc tax deductions	0	0			Total taxes		1044
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			Federal filing status		HH/MLA
Required union dues	0	79			State filing status		HH/MLA
Mandatory retirement	0	661					
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		0 - 100	0	0	0 Father	2,570 Father	2,570 Father
	0000-00-00	0 - 100	0	0	0 Father	493 Father	493 Father
	0000-00-00	0 - 100	0	0	0 Father	765 Father	765 Father
	0000-00-00	0 - 100	0	0	0 Father	1,313 Father	1,313 Father

Superior Court of California
County of El Dorado

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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. COUNTY OF EL DORADO V. DEVON MATHIS (OTHER PARENT: AUBREY HASKILL)
PFS20210070**

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 12, 2026, requesting the court quash the RFO filed by Respondent on February 27, 2026. Proof of Service shows the Department of Child Support Services was served on March 19, 2026. Upon review of the 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 #14: 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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. AIMEE ELSE V. DANIEL ELSE

PFL20190360

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 3, 2026, requesting a modification of visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 19, 2026 and a review hearing set for May 7, 2026. Proof of Service shows the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was personally served on February 9, 2026. Respondent was served by certified mail, with a return receipt showing Respondent signed for the mail on February 13, 2026.

Petitioner is seeking orders that the minors not have parenting time with Respondent until the issues of the sanitary conditions in the home have been resolved. Petitioner is seeking proof of a clean and safe environment for the minors prior to their travel to Arkansas.

Only Petitioner appeared for CCRC. As such a single parent report was filed with the court on March 19, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 25th.

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. The minors are not to travel to Arkansas for Respondent's parenting time until Respondent provides Petitioner with proof that the home is in a clean and sanitary condition. The prior orders regarding proof of fumigation remain in full force and effect.

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 #15: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST. THE MINORS ARE NOT TO TRAVEL TO ARKANSAS FOR RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME UNTIL RESPONDENT PROVIDES PETITIONER WITH PROOF THAT THE HOME IS IN A CLEAN AND SANITARY CONDITION. THE PRIOR ORDERS REGARDING PROOF OF FUMIGATION REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

May 7, 2026

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

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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. RYAN HAYNES V. SONYA LOSSIUS

PFL20210153

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 26, 2026, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they had participated in CCRC within the prior six months. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served by mail and electronically on March 26, 2026.

On April 14, 2026, the court in Department 8 referred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on April 27, 2026. The court ordered the CCRC report to be prepared on an expedited basis. However, a further review hearing was set in the event the report was not able to be prepared in a timely manner.

The court finds that the CCRC report was not able to be prepared in time for the hearing. As such, the court finds good cause to continue the review hearing to June 18, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Any supplemental declarations are due at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW HEARING TO JUNE 18, 2026 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
May 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. BROHEM MONTES DE OCA V. LINDA MEDINA

25FL1142

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 9, 2026, requesting child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 13, 2026, and a review hearing on May 7, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on March 13, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 16th.

The court denies Petitioner's request for modification due to his failure to appear at the CCRC appointment.

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 #17: THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION DUE TO HIS FAILURE TO APPEAR AT THE CCRC APPOINTMENT. 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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. CLARIS PALAFOX V. EDWIN GUZMAN

25FL0462

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 9, 2026, seeking child support orders. Petitioner did not file an Income and Expense Declaration as required. Respondent was served some of the documents on March 5, 2026. Respondent was served again on March 6, 2026. The court finds the service to have occurred prior to the filing of the RFO. Further, not all the required documents were served.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service and failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AND FAILURE TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. JEFFREY SHASKY V. KATHARINE SHASKY

PFL20210259

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 16, 2026, requesting transfer of venue to Sacramento County. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was only served with the FL-300.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #20: 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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

22. DANIEL STEVENSON V. MAUDENA STEVENSON

24FL0166

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 12, 2026, seeking a motion to compel. Upon review of the Proof of Service, Respondent was mail served some, but not all the required documents.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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 7, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

23. COURTNEY WOLFE V. DANIEL WOLFE

24FL1245

On November 6, 2025, parties appeared for a hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO). The parties reached a full agreement, which included setting a review hearing for May 7, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court advised the parties that failure to file a supplemental declaration at least 10 days prior to the hearing, would result in the review hearing being dropped from calendar.

Neither party has filed a supplemental declaration.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE OF BOTH PARTIES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS. 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.