

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**1. EDC DCSS V. BENJAMIN DAVID WOOD (OTHER PARENT: SYDNEY GANN) 23FL1216**

On October 9, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody, property control, and a change of venue. The matter came before the court for hearing on March 19, 2026 at which time the court made orders on all issues with the exception of the issue of custody. Instead, the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date. In the interim, the parties were ordered to meet and confer on the issue of school choice. The parties were ordered to file any supplemental declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing.

On April 9, 2026, Other Parent filed a declaration, however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it.

The parties attended CCRC on April 16, 2026 and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on May 26, 2026.

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

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: AFTER REVIEWING THE APRIL 9, 2026 CCRC REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

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

**NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**2. JARROD ANDREASEN V. BRANDI ANDREASEN**

**25FL0567**

On March 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel Respondent's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) and sanctions. All required documents were served on March 12<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, her Income and Expense Declaration, and her Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure on May 19<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner seeks an order compelling Respondent's PDD and sanctions in the amount of \$2,500 pursuant to Family Code § 2107. Respondent opposes the requests and cites administrative issues as the cause of the delay in completing the PDDs.

The court finds the motion to compel is moot as Respondent has already served her PDD.

Regarding the request for sanctions, the request is denied as it does not appear that Respondent acted in bad faith in her delay of completing and serving her PDD.

While Respondent's actions were not intentional, it still did result in the filing of the present RFO. For that reason, the court does believe it would be fair to direct to Respondent to prepare the FOAH instead of Petitioner despite the fact that he is the moving party. As such, 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 #2: THE COURT FINDS THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS MOOT AS RESPONDENT HAS ALREADY SERVED HER PDD.**

**REGARDING THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS, THE REQUEST IS DENIED AS IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT RESPONDENT ACTED IN BAD FAITH IN HER DELAY OF COMPLETING AND SERVING HER PDD.**

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

**NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**3. DEREK BYRNE V. CHRISTINA BYRNE**

**22FL0036**

On March 10, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order seeking child support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on March 27, 2026.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed its Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 1<sup>st</sup>. It was served on March 30<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served his updated Income and Expense Declaration on May 21<sup>st</sup>.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on May 27<sup>th</sup> however there is no Proof of Service for either document therefore the court cannot consider them.

Because DCSS is providing child support enforcement services in this matter, the issue of child support is continued to the DCSS calendar in Department 10 on Monday, August 10<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 AM to be heard by the child support commissioner in accordance with Family Code § 4251.

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: BECAUSE DCSS IS PROVIDING CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SERVICES IN THIS MATTER, THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT IS CONTINUED TO THE DCSS CALENDAR IN DEPARTMENT 10 ON MONDAY AUGUST 10<sup>TH</sup> AT 8:30 AM TO BE HEARD BY THE CHILD SUPPORT COMMISSIONER IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAMILY CODE § 4251.**

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**4. JILL CURTIS V. FRANCIS CURTIS**

**24FL0704**

On March 11, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as child and spousal support. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on March 13<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 10, 2026 and were able to reach agreements on some issues. A report codifying those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, her Income and Expense Declaration and her Declaration of Petitioner Jill Curtis on May 29<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served his reply declaration on June 4<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent is requesting joint legal custody, though he asks that he be awarded primary physical custody. He proposes the child have visits with Petitioner at the child's discretion. He further requests guideline child support and guideline spousal support back to the date of filing the Petition in accordance with his Exhibit A proposed Xspouse report. He also asks the court to order the parties to equally split any out-of-pocket medical costs for the minor pursuant to FL-192.

Petitioner asks the court to adopt the agreements in the CCRC report. She further asks the court to deny Respondent's requests for retroactive child and spousal support. She does not oppose guideline child support orders but she asks that Respondent be ordered to provide documentation detailing his business expenses for the year 2024 and 2025.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the agreements contained in the April 10, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

The court is adopting the Xspouse report attached as Exhibit A to the RFO. Utilizing the same figures as outlined therein, the court finds that child support is \$1,497 per month and spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$293 per month. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent a total of \$1,789 per month as and for child support and temporary spousal support, payable on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month until further order of the court or legal termination.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

The order of support is effective as of March 15, 2026. Respondent requests support back to the filing of the Petition or, alternatively, to the filing of the Response to the Petition. However, Respondent has made no showing that Petitioner was on notice of Respondent's request for support during that time. In fact, the Response filed on September 29, 2025 simply asks the court to reserve on support. Furthermore, the Response puts the parties on notice that child support will be ordered upon request and the filing of the proper financial forms by the requesting party. Even then, Respondent waited an additional six months before making such a request. So, while the court concedes it has legal authority to award support back to the filing of the Petition, the court sees no grounds to do so here.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$5,367 through and including May 15, 2026. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$178.90 on the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month commencing on July 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 30 months). If any payment is late or missed the entire remaining balance shall become immediately due in full, with legal interest, within five (5) days.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the minor. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures set forth in the attached FL-192.

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: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT DOES FIND THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 10, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE XSPOUSE REPORT ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A TO THE RFO. UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED THEREIN, THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$1,497 PER MONTH AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$293 PER MONTH. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT A TOTAL OF \$1,789 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THE ORDER OF SUPPORT IS EFFECTIVE AS OF MARCH 15, 2026.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,367 THROUGH AND INCLUDING MAY 15, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$178.90 ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON JULY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 30 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE ENTIRE REMAINING BALANCE SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.**

**IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING MONTHLY SUPPORT PAYMENTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SHARE IN ANY UNINSURED MEDICAL CARE COSTS FOR THE MINOR. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES AS SET FORTH IN THE ATTACHED FL-192.**

**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.**

# 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](http://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](http://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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm).

Print this form

Save this form

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**5. MICKEY VINCENT DE MARTINI V. JESSICA RENEE ISABEL ELIJAH KANE THOMAS**

**26FL0003**

On January 2, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to establish paternity, set aside the Voluntary Declaration of Paternity (VDOP), birth certificate amendment, and visitation orders. Concurrently therewith he filed a Request for Hearing and Application to Cancel (Set Aside) Voluntary Declaration of Parentage or Paternity. All required documents were personally served on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

On March 6<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed an RFO seeking to quash the request to set aside the VDOP and for sanctions. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of her RFO. Both documents were served on March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served a Request for Judicial Notice on March 27<sup>th</sup>, though she is listed as the Petitioner on the pleading.

Petitioner filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 29<sup>th</sup>. It was served on May 28<sup>th</sup>. He filed a supplemental declaration in support of his RFO on June 1<sup>st</sup>. Respondent objects to the supplemental declaration as untimely. The objection is sustained and the court has not read or considered the supplemental declaration.

Petitioner is requesting the following orders: (1) Establish his parentage of the child Shiloh by way of DNA testing; (2) Set aside the VDOP signed by Elijah Kane Thomas; (3) Add Petitioner to the minor's birth certificate; (4) Establish a parenting plan through a referral to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC); (5) Change the minor's name to "Shiloh Daniel De Martini;" and (6) Toll the statute of limitations due to Petitioner's incarceration.

Respondent opposes the requests and asks the court to quash the RFO seeking to set aside the VDOP as it was filed outside of the two year statute of limitations and there is no basis for the court to exercise its discretion to toll the statute of limitations. She asks that the court take judicial notice of documents attached as exhibits 1 – 7 to the Request for Judicial Notice each of which is found as part of the El Dorado County Superior Court Case # 21CR0364. Finally, she requests sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Judicial notice is a mechanism which allows the court to take into consideration matters which are presumed to be indisputably true. California Evidence Code Sections 451, 452, and 453 govern the circumstances in which judicial notice of a matter may be taken. While Section 451 provides a comprehensive list of matters that must be judicially noticed, Section 452 sets forth matters which *may* be judicially noticed, including

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

“[r]ecords of (1) any court of this state or (2) any court of record of the United States or of any state of the United States.”

Section 452 provides that the court “may” take judicial notice of the matters listed therein, while Section 453 provides a caveat that the court “shall” take judicial notice of any matter “specified in Section 452 if a party requests it and: (a) Gives each adverse party sufficient notice of the request...to enable such adverse party to prepare to meet the request; and (b) Furnishes the court with sufficient information to enable it to take judicial notice of the matter.” Cal. Evid. Code § 453.

Here, Respondent has given all parties sufficient notice of her requests and provided copies of the documents she is referencing. As such, the court finds that she has satisfied the requirements of Evidence Code § 453 and therefore the request for judicial notice is granted.

Pursuant to Family Code § 7577, any action to set aside a VDOP “...shall be filed not later than two years after the effective date of the declaration.” Fam. Code § 7577(d). Here, the VDOP in question was signed on November 25, 2022. The request to set aside the VDOP was not filed until more than three years later on January 2, 2026. Therefore, the request to set aside the VDOP is denied as untimely.

Because the request to set aside the VDOP is denied, so too are the remaining requests in Petitioner’s RFO.

The request for Section 271 sanctions is denied as the court does not find that Petitioner’s requests frustrated the policy of the law to encourage cooperation and reduce the cost of litigation.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: RESPONDENT’S OBJECTION TO THE JUNE 1, 2026 SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION IS SUSTAINED. THE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION HAS NOT BEEN READ OR CONSIDERED.**

**RESPONDENT’S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF EXHIBITS 1-7 IS GRANTED.**

**THE REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE VDOP IS DENIED AS UNTIMELY.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**BECAUSE THE REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE VDOP IS DENIED SO TOO ARE THE REMAINING REQUESTS IN PETITIONER'S RFO.**

**THE REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED AS THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THAT PETITIONER'S REQUESTS FRUSTRATED THE POLICY OF THE LAW TO ENCOURAGE COOPERATION AND REDUCE THE COST OF LITIGATION.**

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**6. TERRY HEISLER V. GINGER HEISLER**

**23FL0387**

On March 13, 2026, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). It was personally served on Petitioner on March 28, 2026.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**7. DUNIA LANDAVERDE V. ANGEL LANDAVERDE**

**23FL0394**

On April 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order regarding property control orders. All required documents were served by mail on April 27<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. However, this RFO reiterates requests that were originally filed ex parte. She did file an opposition to the ex parte on April 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Respondent asks the court to award him the property located at 3301 Ahwahnee Way in Cool, California. Alternatively, he requests exclusive use and possession of the property within two weeks of the court's order.

The request for sole use and possession of the home is denied. However, the court previously ordered the sale of the subject property. The basis for Respondent's request is that Petitioner is interfering with the ability to sale the home. In furtherance of the court's prior order, the parties are ordered to take no action which would delay, hinder, or otherwise prevent the sale, including actions which would prevent cleaning, repairs, and maintenance or showing of the home. By no later than July 15, 2026, the parties are ordered to list the home for sale and to place a for sale sign in front of the home. Failure to do so will result in daily sanctions for each day the order is not complied with. The selected real estate professional shall choose the listing price, including any amendments thereto, and the parties are to comply with the real estate professional's decision. The parties are ordered to cooperate with the real estate professional to make the home available for showings and to communicate with the real estate professional as needed. The parties are ordered to accept any reasonable offer for the purchase of the home if one is received. The parties are to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner. The court reserves jurisdiction over all aspects of the sale and distribution of the net proceeds of the sale, including, but not limited to, the court's authority to direct the clerk to act as elisor for Petitioner's signature if necessary.

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 REQUEST FOR SOLE USE AND POSSESSION OF THE HOME IS DENIED. HOWEVER, THE COURT PREVIOUSLY ORDERED THE SALE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. THE BASIS FOR RESPONDENT'S REQUEST IS THAT PETITIONER IS INTERFERING WITH THE ABILITY TO SALE THE HOME. IN FURTHERANCE OF THE**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**COURT'S PRIOR ORDER, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD DELAY, HINDER, OR OTHERWISE PREVENT THE SALE, INCLUDING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD PREVENT CLEANING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OR SHOWING OF THE HOME. BY NO LATER THAN JULY 15, 2026, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO LIST THE HOME FOR SALE AND TO PLACE A FOR SALE SIGN IN FRONT OF THE HOME. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN DAILY SANCTIONS FOR EACH DAY THE ORDER IS NOT COMPLIED WITH. THE SELECTED REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL SHALL CHOOSE THE LISTING PRICE, INCLUDING ANY AMENDMENTS THERETO, AND THE PARTIES ARE TO COMPLY WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL'S DECISION. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL TO MAKE THE HOME AVAILABLE FOR SHOWINGS AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONAL AS NEEDED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ACCEPT ANY REASONABLE OFFER FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HOME IF ONE IS RECEIVED. THE PARTIES ARE TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE NET PROCEEDS OF THE SALE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE COURT'S AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO ACT AS ELISOR FOR PETITIONER'S SIGNATURE IF NECESSARY.**

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**8. JESSIE LUDDY V. LOGAN LUDDY**

**25FL0275**

On March 3, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for hearing on competing requests for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) filed by each party against the other. The parties reached agreements on the terms of the order and were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for custody and visitation orders. A review hearing was set for the present date.

Respondent filed two declarations on March 19, 2026. They were personally served on March 29<sup>th</sup>.

The parties attended CCRC on April 6, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on May 21, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on May 22, 2026.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the recommendations contained in the May 21, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with one modification. The Parenting Time section of the report is amended to state as follows: "Father shall have temporary sole physical custody of the child. Mother shall have professionally supervised visits twice a week for two (2) hours per visit. Unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties, visits shall be supervised by Family Time Visitation Center, located at 3300 Coach Lane, Suite B-112, Cameron Park, CA 95682."

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: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 21, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH ONE MODIFICATION. THE PARENTING TIME SECTION OF THE REPORT IS AMENDED TO STATE AS FOLLOWS: "FATHER SHALL HAVE TEMPORARY SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE CHILD. MOTHER SHALL HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED VISITS TWICE A WEEK FOR TWO (2) HOURS PER VISIT. UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES, VISITS SHALL BE SUPERVISED BY FAMILY TIME VISITATION CENTER, LOCATED AT 3300 COACH LANE, SUITE B-112, CAMERON PARK, CA 95682."**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**9. JOANNE LYNN RUGGERI V. CHRISTOPHER P. RUGGERI**

**24FL1183**

On March 11, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for a long cause trial. The parties reached agreements on all issues and agreed to set a review hearing for the present date.

Neither party has filed a supplemental declaration therefore, the court surmises there are no issues to bring before it and the review hearing is no longer needed.

The matter is dropped from calendar. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS NO SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS HAVE BEEN FILED. 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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**10. CORAL STRICLER V. SCOTT STRICLER**

**25FL1201**

On March 6, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to set aside his default and requesting leave to file his Response to the Petition. He filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities concurrently therewith. All required documents, with the exception of an FL-320 were served on March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 15, 2026.

The Reply Declaration of Attorney Homami was filed and served on June 3, 2026.

Respondent asks the court to set aside his default entered on January 28, 2026 and grant him leave to file his Response to the Petition for Dissolution of Marriage. He states that he was of the belief that the parties were negotiating the terms of the divorce and would potentially be filing a stipulated agreement for an uncontested Judgment. When the parties were unable to reach an agreement, Petitioner filed for his default. The proposed Response to the Petition is attached as Exhibit B to the RFO.

Petitioner opposes the motion and argues that the parties were not working towards a resolution and Respondent has no reason to believe he was not required to file a timely Response. She argues that granting the set aside would subject her to “unnecessary delay” and “additional burden” but she does not elaborate or provide any factual basis for these claims.

“The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 473(b). To obtain relief under Section 473(b), the moving party must do so within a reasonable time, but in no case exceeding 6 months after the date of the judgment and must provide a copy of the pleading proposed to be filed. *Id.*

Where, as here, alleged mistake and excusable neglect gives rise to the default, the court must determine whether a mistake or negligence is grounds to set aside a default judgment under Section 473(b). Generally, a pro per is held to the same standard as a practicing attorney. Goodson v. Bogerts, Inc., 252 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40 (1967) While the court is not to give deference to a party simply because that party was acting in pro per, the court is to resolve any doubts as to a showing of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect in favor of the moving party. Elston v. City of Turlock, 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233 (1985)

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

(overruled on other grounds). This is especially so when there has been no showing of substantial prejudice to the opposing party should the motion be granted. *Id.* at 235.

Here, it is arguable whether Respondent has established grounds to set aside the default where he claims he believed the parties were negotiating and would be filing a stipulation yet Petitioner denies that claim. Nevertheless, aside from Petitioner's conclusory statements that she would suffer additional delay and burden by setting aside the default, she has not provided any factual basis for these conclusory statements and she has made no showing that such delay and burden would be substantial. As such, erring on the side of state policy to resolve matters on the merits, the request to set aside the default is granted. Respondent shall file and serve his response within 14 days of the date of this order.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE REQUEST TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT SHALL FILE AND SERVE HIS RESPONSE WITHIN 14 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS ORDER.**

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**11. ANTHONY TATUM V. PETRINA TATUM**

**23FL1230**

On March 12, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child custody orders. The RFO was served on May 11<sup>th</sup> however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served nor was the required blank FL-320.

Minor's Counsel filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 14<sup>th</sup>.

On May 22<sup>nd</sup>, Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, an Income and Expense Declaration, and Attorney Amanda D. Yasbek's Declaration.

Respondent is requesting immediate implementation of a phased plan progressing toward equal shared custody. She further requests a holiday and vacation schedule, removal of the no-contact order, reunification therapy and/or co-counseling, and "father to be held accountable for non-compliance with prior orders."

Minor's Counsel asks the court to maintain the prior orders as there has been no showing of a substantial change in circumstances that would warrant the requested changes. She expressly requests the court's continued suspension of all visits between Respondent and the minor and all forms of communication between Respondent and the minor. She further asks the court to re-affirm its prior order that Respondent submit reliable documentation of her compliance with the court's prior orders prior to filing any future request to change custody.

Petitioner also asks the court to deny the RFO in its entirety. He further requests \$2,000 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 and \$3,000 in attorney fees pursuant to Family Code § 2032. Finally, he asks that the court admonish Respondent that continued harassment and misuse of the litigation process may result in additional sanctions or further remedial action by the court.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds that its orders of March 12, 2026 remain in the minor's best interests. All prior orders remain in full force and effect. This includes, but is not limited to, the following orders: "[t]he court does find it to be in the best interests of the minor to suspend the visits between her and Respondent. Respondent is ordered to enroll in, attend, and fully engage in parenting coaching sessions with a licensed, skilled, and experienced mental health professional, either Joel Walton, MFT or Josh Collver, LCSW. She is further ordered to complete and engage in anger management and individual therapy. Respondent is ordered to provide Petitioner, his attorney, and

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Minor's Counsel with written documentation of her compliance with this order." Tent. Ruling, March 12, 2026. Such documentation must be reliable professional documentation including, but not limited to, therapist reports, treatment progress updates, or signed notes from the provider. Respondent is admonished that continued harassment, misuse of the litigation process, and noncompliance with court orders may result in additional sanctions, or a finding of contempt with related contempt penalties.

Turning to the requests for attorney's fees and sanctions, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In Re Marriage of Keech, 75 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. Alan S. v Superior Court, 172 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 238,251(2009). 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).

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. 4<sup>th</sup> 964; 975 (2012).

Trial tactics of a party are also to be considered in ruling on a request for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 which states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a). While the purpose of Section 271 is to impose a punitive sanction, the court is not to impose a sanction that would create an "unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed." *Id.*

Here, the court has reviewed Petitioner's Income and Expense Declaration, Petitioner's estimate of Respondent's monthly income and Respondent's most recently filed Income and Expense Declaration dated January 16, 2025. While there is a significant

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

disparity in income, the court is concerned with Respondent's ability to pay the entirety of the requested \$5,000 given her significant monthly debt payments amounting to over \$8,000 per month. For that reason, an award of attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2032 is denied. That said, the court is ordering Respondent to pay Petitioner's counsel \$2,500 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. The court finds this to be a reasonable amount to cover attorney's fees related solely to the present RFO and does not find the amount to be unduly burdensome. The amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$250 commencing on June 15<sup>th</sup> and continuing on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

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 #11: THE COURT FINDS THAT ITS ORDERS OF MARCH 12, 2026 REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTERESTS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THIS INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, THE FOLLOWING ORDERS: "[T]HE COURT DOES FIND IT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR TO SUSPEND THE VISITS BETWEEN HER AND RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO ENROLL IN, ATTEND, AND FULLY ENGAGE IN PARENTING COACHING SESSIONS WITH A LICENSED, SKILLED, AND EXPERIENCED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL, EITHER JOEL WALTON, MFT OR JOSH COLLVER, LCSW. SHE IS FURTHER ORDERED TO COMPLETE AND ENGAGE IN ANGER MANAGEMENT AND INDIVIDUAL THERAPY. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE PETITIONER, HIS ATTORNEY, AND MINOR'S COUNSEL WITH WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION OF HER COMPLIANCE WITH THIS ORDER." TENT. RULING, MARCH 12, 2026. SUCH DOCUMENTATION MUST BE RELIABLE PROFESSIONAL DOCUMENTATION INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THERAPIST REPORTS, TREATMENT PROGRESS UPDATES, OR SIGNED NOTES FROM THE PROVIDER. RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED THAT CONTINUED HARASSMENT, MISUSE OF THE LITIGATION PROCESS, AND NONCOMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDERS MAY RESULT IN ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS, OR A FINDING OF CONTEMPT WITH RELATED CONTEMPT PENALTIES.**

**AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2032 IS DENIED. THAT SAID, THE COURT IS ORDERING RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER'S COUNSEL \$2,500 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THE AMOUNT MAY**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$250 COMMENCING ON JUNE 15<sup>TH</sup> AND CONTINUING ON THE 15<sup>TH</sup> OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.**

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**12. JACINTA LASHAE BADELITA V. BOGDANEL BADELITA**

**22FL0797**

On January 22, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders to travel to Romania. It was served the same day; however, Respondent did not serve the requisite blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling as required.

Parties appeared for the hearing on April 9, 2026, at which time Respondent requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to perfect service.

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

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #12: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO 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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**13. QUINN CRAYTHORN V. DALTON CRAYTHORN**

**26FL0248**

Petitioner filed a Petition for Custody and Support on March 17, 2026. A Summons was issued the same day. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent has been properly served.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on March 17, 2026. On March 20, 2026, the court granted the ex parte request, granting Petitioner temporary sole physical custody of the minors. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 17, 2026, and a review hearing on June 11, 2026. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 20, 2026, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served the required documents, except the Blank FL-320.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment on April 17, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 13, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day. Respondent's copy has been returned to the court as undeliverable.

Upon review of the court file, the court finds that it has not obtained jurisdiction over the parties, as the Petition and Summons have not been properly served. Therefore, the court vacates the ex parte orders. The court drops this matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service of the RFO.

All prior orders are vacated. 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 THAT IT HAS NOT OBTAINED JURISDICTION OVER THE PARTIES, AS THE PETITION AND SUMMONS HAVE NOT BEEN PROPERLY SERVED. THEREFORE, THE COURT VACATES THE EX PARTE ORDERS. THE COURT DROPS THIS MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE OF THE RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS ARE VACATED. 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**14. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON**

**23FL0077**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 17, 2026, requesting a 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 16, 2026, and a review hearing on June 11, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner and Minors' Counsel were properly served.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was filed with the court on April 20, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE MATTER IS DROPPED 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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**15. DCSS V. DAVID HARTSOCK III (OTHER PARENT: SYNDALEE VILLAFUERTE)**

**PFS20140004**

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on December 22, 2025, seeking a modification of child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 21, 2026, and a review hearing on March 19, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with only the FL-300 and RA-010 and 0202. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Only Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such a single parent report was filed with the court on March 3, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 4<sup>th</sup>.

On March 19, 2026, Other Parent appeared for the hearing and requested the matter be continued to allow time to perfect service. The court granted the request and rereferred the parties to CCRC.

Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on March 30, 2026 and May 15, 2026. There is no Proof of Service Showing DCSS was properly served.

Once again, only Other Parent appeared at the CCRC appointment. Once again, a single parent report was filed with the court, on May 20<sup>th</sup>. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 26, 2026.

There have been no Responsive Declarations filed by either Petitioner or Respondent.

The court drops the matter from calendar for failure to properly serve Petitioner.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE PETITIONER. 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**16. SONIA JOHNSON V. THOMAS JOHNSON**

**PFL20190519**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 25, 2026, following the court's denial of her ex parte application. Petitioner seeks an order from the court to place the proceeds of the sale of the former marital residence into a constructive trust. Petitioner further seeks Family Code section 271 sanctions in the amount of \$2,500. Upon reviewing the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing the RFO was served on Respondent.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on April 23, 2026, and requested the matter be continued to allow her to perfect service. The court granted the request and continued the matter to June 11, 2026.

Proof of service shows Respondent was served on May 11, 2026.

Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on May 28, 2026. It was served to Respondent on May 28<sup>th</sup>.

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 the request of Petitioner to place the proceeds of the sale of the home in a constructive trust account provided by Petitioner.

Petitioner's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions is denied. Petitioner is not represented by counsel, and as such, sanctions in the form of attorney's fees is not appropriate.

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 #16: THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST OF PETITIONER TO PLACE THE PROCEEDS OF THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST ACCOUNT PROVIDED BY PETITIONER. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**17. KYRA MCAFFEE V. MAXWELL MCAFFEE (JOINED PARTY: BRIAN AND CORRINE BUNCH) PFL20210499**

Joined Parties filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt on January 12, 2026. Petitioner and Respondent were properly served. Parties appeared on March 19, 2026 for the initial arraignment. The court appointed the office of the Public Defender to Petitioner, subject to their review and determination of eligibility.

Parties are ordered to appear for further arraignment.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**18. JUSTIN NEFF V. KAYLA LATTIMER**

**22FL0990**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 9, 2026, seeking a change in venue to Sacramento County. Upon review of the court file, 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.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE MATTER IS DROPPED 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.4<sup>TH</sup> 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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**19. JANELL PALMER V. RAFF PALMER**

**24FL1174**

On April 9, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. She did not file an Income and Expense Declaration as required. The RFO and Notice of Tentative Ruling were served on May 11<sup>th</sup>, however she did not serve the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) who is a party to the case

On May 29<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. He submits on the request and requests the court consider his Income and Expense Declaration filed and served on March 26<sup>th</sup>.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on May 12, 2026. DCSS does not raise the issue of the defect in service and as such, the court finds it to be waived. DCSS requests the matter be heard in Department 10 pursuant to Family Code section 4251.

The court finds good cause to continue the matter to Monday, August 10<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 AM in Department 10. Parties are directed to file and serve update Income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

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 #19: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE MATTER TO MONDAY AUGUST 10<sup>TH</sup> AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 10. PARTIES ARE DIRECTED TO FILE AND SERVE UPDATE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING. 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 11, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**20. BRANDON TUCK V. KODIE MONTOYA**

**25FL0382**

Parties appeared in Department 8 for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order hearing on March 12, 2026. The court referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 8, 2026, and a review hearing on June 11, 2026, in Department 5.

Both parties attended CCRC on April 8<sup>th</sup> and reached a full agreement. A report memorializing the parties' agreement was filed with the court on May 20, 2026, and mailed to the parties on May 21<sup>st</sup>.

The court has read and considered the parties' agreement and finds it to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the agreement as set forth in the May 20<sup>th</sup> CCRC report.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order 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 #20: THE COURT ADOPTS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENT AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 20<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER 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  
June 11, 2026  
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

**21. JENNIE VICTORIANO V. DANIEL VICTORIANO**

**PFL20200111**

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on April 1, 2026, alleging six counts of contempt by Respondent. Respondent was personally served on May 16, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for arraignment.

**TENTATIVE RULING #21: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR ARRAIGNMENT.**