

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**1 & 11. AMANDA ALESSANDRO V. JEREMY ALESSANDRO**

**PFL20200677**

*This matter was originally set on the morning and afternoon calendars. The hearing on the afternoon calendar is being advanced to join with the 8:30am hearing.*

On March 24, 2026, Respondent filed two FL-300 Request for Order (RFO) forms; one seeking joinder and the other seeking attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is a Proof of Service for the attorney's fees RFO showing it was served on May 27<sup>th</sup>. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO regarding joinder.

Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration and her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 30<sup>th</sup>. There is no Proof of Service for these documents.

On May 27, 2026, Respondent filed and served a Notice of Motion and Declaration for Joinder. Respondent attached copies of Petitioner's Income and Expense Declaration and her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order to his Declaration for Joinder therefore the court finds that he has actual knowledge of the contents thereof and he has effectively waived any defect in service.

On June 4<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Motion for Joinder.

On June 11<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed and served two MC-030 declarations.

Respondent is requesting the following: (1) Order Petitioner to pay Respondent's attorney fees in the amount of \$20,000 or whatever amount the court deems just and reasonable under the circumstances; (2) Consider joining Kathy Krjci to contribute to the attorney fee award; (3) Sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271; (4) Petitioner to produce her tax returns for all years since separation and to provide a full accounting of child tax deductions claimed; and (5) Joinder of Thomas Krejci and Kathy B. Krejci, individually and as trustees of the Krejci Family Trust dated September 14, 2017.

Regarding the request for joinder, "[t]he court may order that a person be joined as a party to the proceeding if the court finds that it would be appropriate to determine the particular issue in the proceeding and that the person to be joined as a party is either indispensable for the court to make an order about that issue or is necessary to the enforcement of any judgment rendered on that issue." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.24(e)(2). Importantly,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

joinder of a third-party owner is permissive, not mandatory, for purposes of adjudicating the spouses' rights amongst themselves. See *Long v. Long*, 88 Cal. App. 2d 544 (1948).

Respondent relies on the doctrine of a constructive trust which is created where one party pays the purchase price for property but title is taken in another's name. However, he does not provide any documentation that the parties paid the purchase price, including the down payment or taking out the mortgage in their names. Instead, he admits that Thomas Krejci and Kathy B. Krejci actually purchased and owned the property. Petitioner and Respondent simply resided there in exchange for making monthly payments which went toward the mortgage, tax, and insurance. Respondent argues that the understanding between the parties was that the home would eventually be transferred to the couple. To support this claim he cites a document "previously filed as Exhibit B to Respondent's Supplemental Declaration," though he does not provide the court clarity as to which supplemental declaration. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to provide further argument regarding the joinder.

The request to join Kathy Krjci in her individual capacity to pay Respondent's attorney fees is denied.

The request for Section 271 sanctions is denied. An award for attorney's fees and sanctions may be made pursuant to Family Code section 271 which states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys." Fam. Code § 271(a). However, where a party did not incur attorney's fees, such as is the case with a pro se litigant, that party cannot collect sanctions pursuant to Section 271. *In Re Marriage of Erndt & Terhorst*, 59 Cal. App. 5<sup>th</sup> 898 (2021). Because Respondent is pro per, an award of sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 is improper and therefore the request is denied.

Turning to the request for Petitioner's tax returns and an accounting of the child tax deductions, it appears Respondent is putting the cart before the horse as he has filed what is essentially a motion to compel without first sending discovery requests. As such, the request is denied. However, in family law matters, "...each party has a *continuing duty* to immediately, fully, and accurately update and augment..." his or her financial disclosures with all material information. Fam. Code § 2100(c). Failure to do so is a violation of that party's fiduciary duty and may subject that party to sanctions pursuant to Family Code §

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1101. Petitioner is admonished to ensure she is providing full, complete, and accurate financial disclosures in accordance with her fiduciary duty to Respondent.

Finally, turning to the issue of attorney's fees, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on this issue.

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 & 11: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO PROVIDE ARGUMENT REGARDING THE JOINDER AND THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES.**

**THE REQUEST TO JOIN KATHY KRJCI IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY TO PAY RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY FEES IS DENIED.**

**THE REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 SANCTIONS IS DENIED.**

**THE REQUEST FOR PETITIONER'S TAX RETURNS AND AN ACCOUNTING OF THE CHILD TAX DEDUCTIONS IS DENIED. PETITIONER IS ADMONISHED TO ENSURE SHE IS PROVIDING FULL, COMPLETE, AND ACCURATE FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES IN ACCORDANCE WITH HER FIDUCIARY DUTY TO RESPONDENT.**

**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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**2. CARLEY BAGATELOS V. THEODORE BAGATELOS**

**25FL1006**

On March 23, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to stay proceedings. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

Petitioner filed an RFO on May 29, 2026, seeking child support orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration on May 28<sup>th</sup>.

Because this was originally filed as part of an Order Shortening Time (OST), Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on May 29<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served a supplemental declaration on June 4<sup>th</sup>.

On June 12<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed and served a supplemental declaration and Respondent's Declaration Re: Good Cause to Consider Supplemental Declaration.

Petitioner filed an objection to the supplemental declaration. She objects to the supplemental declaration as untimely pursuant to Local Rule 8.05.04 and Civil Procedure § 1010. The objection is sustained. The court has read and considered Respondent's declaration regarding good cause and the court does not find that the facts contained therein constitute good cause to consider the late filed supplemental declaration. As such, Respondent's June 12, 2026 Supplemental Declaration has not been read or considered.

Petitioner is requesting guideline child support for each of the children. She asks that Respondent be imputed with income in the amount of \$7,800 and she asks that support be retroactive back to the date of filing the RFO.

Respondent stipulates to the imputation of income in the amount of \$7,800. He states that he has visits with the children twice per week at two hours per visit.

Utilizing the same figures as outlined above, the court finds that child support is \$2,413 per month. See attached Xspouse report. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$2,413 per month as and for child support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order for child support is effective June 1, 2026.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$2,413 through and including June 1, 2026. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$201.08 on the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 12 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable 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.

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: RESPONDENT'S MARCH 23, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. PETITIONER'S OBJECTION TO RESPONDENT'S JUNE 12, 2026 SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION IS SUSTAINED. THE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION HAS NOT BEEN READ OR CONSIDERED.**

**UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THAT CHILD SUPPORT IS \$2,413 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$2,413 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER FOR CHILD SUPPORT IS EFFECTIVE AS OF JUNE 1, 2026.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,413 THROUGH AND INCLUDING JUNE 1, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$201.08 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE 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) 621-6725 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.**

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly figures		Cash Flow		Guideline	Proposed
#of children	0	3	2026					
% time with NCP	2.00 %	0.00 %	GUIDELINE		Comb. net spendable		12116	12116
Filing status	MFS->	<-MFS	Nets(adjusted)		Percent change		0%	0%
# exemptions	1 *	4 *			Father			
Wages+salary	0	8872	Father	5530	Payment cost/benefit		-2413	-2413
Self-employed income	7800	0	Mother	6586	Net spendable income		3117	3117
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	12116	Change from guideline		0	0
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable		26%	26%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline		0%	0%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	-2413	Total taxes		2270	2270
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Alameda SS	0	Dep. exemption value		0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	-2413	# withholding allowances		0w	0w
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		Net wage paycheck		0	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Mother			
Health insurance	0	0			Payment cost/benefit		2413	2413
Other medical expense	0	0			Net spendable income		8999	8999
Property tax expense	0	0	Proposed		Change from guideline		0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0	Tactic 9		% of combined spendable		74%	74%
Charitable contributions	0	0	CS	-2413	% of saving over guideline		0%	0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	SS	0	Total taxes		1575	1575
Qual bus income ded	0	0	Total	-2413	Dep. exemption value		0	0
Required union dues	0	0	Saving		# withholding allowances		0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	711	Releases		Net wage paycheck		6172	6172
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *						
Other GDL deductions	0	0						
Child care expenses	0	0						

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
All children	1 - 99	0	0	0	Father	2413	Father	2413	Father
	2 - 98	0	0	0	Father	461	Father	461	Father
	2 - 98	0	0	0	Father	718	Father	718	Father
	2 - 98	0	0	0	Father	1234	Father	1234	Father

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**3. KAYLA BURGESS V. KYLE BURGESS**

**23FL0919**

On December 26, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on January 20, 2026.

There is no Proof of Service for the RFO or the CCRC referral and only Petitioner attended the scheduled CCRC appointment.

On February 2, 2026, Respondent filed Respondent's Supplemental Declaration Re: Child Custody Recommending Counseling. It was served on January 28<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 9<sup>th</sup>. It was served on March 6<sup>th</sup>.

After reviewing the filings by Respondent, it does appear that he has actual knowledge of the RFO and the CCRC referral and he is not objecting to service, therefore, the court finds any potential defect in service was waived and the matter may be reached on the merits.

The matter came before the court on March 26<sup>th</sup> at which time the parties were re-referred to CCRC and a review hearing was set for the present date.

On April 23, 2026, only Respondent appeared for the CCRC appointment. The RFO is dropped from calendar due to the failure of the moving party, Petitioner, to attend the CCRC appointment.

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE OF THE MOVING PARTY, PETITIONER, TO ATTEND THE CCRC APPOINTMENT.**

**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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**4. AMY KNIERIEM V. BEAU MICHAEL LEMIRE**

**24FL0133**

On March 11, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees and a vocational evaluation. The RFO and a blank FL-320 were served on March 16<sup>th</sup>, however Respondent failed to serve the Notice of Tentative Ruling as required.

Respondent filed his Income and Expense Declaration on April 1, 2026. It was served on March 31<sup>st</sup>.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, a Declaration of Callie B. Cambridge, and her Income and Expense Declaration on June 2, 2026.

On June 15<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed a Declaration of Christie B. Mitchell in Opposition to Petitioner's Request for Affirmative Relief. The court deems this to be a reply declaration, and as such, it is late filed. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all reply papers are to be filed at least five 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 June 11<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing the reply, therefore it is late filed and has not been read or considered by the court.

Respondent is requesting child support orders but prior to making such orders, he asks that Petitioner be ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation with Patrick Sullivan. He asks the court to reserve jurisdiction on support until completion of the evaluation. He also requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$4,250 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Petitioner agrees to submit to a vocational evaluation at Respondent's sole expense so long as Respondent proposes three providers and Petitioner be permitted to choose one. She further requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$1,500.

The request for a vocational evaluation is granted. Respondent shall propose the names of three evaluators to Petitioner no later than June 25<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner shall choose one of the three and inform Respondent of her choice no later than July 2<sup>nd</sup>. If Petitioner does not make her choice by that day, then Respondent shall have sole discretion to choose the evaluator. Respondent is to pay the cost of the evaluation, subject to reallocation at trial.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

The request to reserve jurisdiction over child support is denied as the parties are already pending trial on the issue of child support which is set to commence on July 13<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent's request for attorney's fees is denied. Section 271 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). Respondent has failed to establish how Petitioner's actions frustrated the policy of the law where Respondent did not meet and confer with Petitioner on the issue of a vocational evaluation prior to filing the RFO. Given his failure to establish grounds for the requested attorney's fees, the request is denied.

The court reserves jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for Section 271 attorney's fees until the time of trial on the final division of assets.

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 REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT SHALL PROPOSE THE NAMES OF THREE EVALUATORS TO PETITIONER NO LATER THAN JUNE 25<sup>TH</sup>, PETITIONER SHALL CHOOSE ONE OF THE THREE AND INFORM RESPONDENT OF HER CHOICE NO LATER THAN JULY 2<sup>ND</sup>. IF PETITIONER DOES NOT MAKE HER CHOICE BY THAT DAY, THEN RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE SOLE DISCRETION TO CHOOSE THE EVALUATOR. RESPONDENT IS TO PAY THE COST OF THE EVALUATION, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION AT TRIAL.**

**THE REQUEST TO RESERVE JURISDICTION OVER CHILD SUPPORT IS DENIED AS THE PARTIES ARE ALREADY PENDING TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT WHICH IS SET TO COMMENCE ON JULY 13<sup>TH</sup>.**

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED.**

**THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SECTION 271 ATTORNEY'S FEES UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL ON THE FINAL DIVISION OF ASSETS.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 18, 2026

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

**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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**5. ALEX KRUMWIEDE V. HANNAH KRUMWIEDE**

**23FL1044**

On April 6, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking the release of trust funds and entry of the Judgment. The RFO was originally heard on an ex parte basis. The court granted the request regarding the trust funds but declined to enter judgment on an ex parte basis.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and an additional supporting declaration on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. Both documents were served the same day as filing.

Petitioner asks the court to enter judgment which is attached as Exhibit E to the RFO.

It appears the RFO and ex parte orders were not personally served. The parties are ordered to appear to address the defect in service.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO ADDRESS THE DEFECT IN SERVICE.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**6. JESSE MORGAN V. BAILEY MORGAN**

**25FL0876**

On March 23, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore this matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

**TENTATIVE RULING# 6: 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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**7. KRISTEN REIMAN V. SCOTT REIMAN**

**25FL0453**

On May 4, 2026, Minor's Counsel filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 4<sup>th</sup>.

The request was originally ruled on ex parte, at which time the court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment and set a review hearing for the present date. Pending the review hearing, the court granted Petitioner temporary sole legal and physical custody of the minor, Helena. Respondent was ordered to have no contact with the minor except at the direction, and under the supervision, of the minor's therapist.

The RFO, ex parte orders, and all other required documents were served on May 4<sup>th</sup>.

On May 8<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed a Declaration Re: Proof of Completion. It was served on May 6<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 5, 2026.

The parties attended CCRC on May 19, 2026 and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on June 5, 2026.

Minor's Counsel filed and served her reply declaration on June 8<sup>th</sup>. Petitioner filed and served an updating declaration the same day.

Petitioner filed and served a reply to the CCRC report on June 12<sup>th</sup>.

Minor's Counsel asks that Petitioner be given temporary sole legal and sole physical custody. She asks that there be a no contact order between the minor and Respondent pending further order of the court.

Petitioner is in agreement with the requests made by Minor's Counsel.

Respondent opposes the requests and "object[s] to hearsay on all statements received by the Petitioner, the Petitioner's counsel and the Minor's Counsel."

The objection is overruled. "Grounds of objection to admission of evidence must be stated with reasonable certainty, and objection must specify particular evidence which is sought to be excluded." *People ex Rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Alexander*, 212 Cal. App. 2d

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

84 (1963). Blanket objections such as “all statements received” are improper and thus will not be sustained.

Regarding custody and visitation, the court is concerned with the findings in the CCRC report and is not willing to make such drastic orders without further information. The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing.

**TENATIVE RULING #7: RESPONDENT’S OBJECTION IS OVERRULED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**8. CAROLYN P. RENTSCH V. TODD W. RENTSCH**

**PFL20130845**

On March 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an interspousal transfer deed. This is a post-judgment request and as such all required documents were personally served on April 17, 2026.

Respondent filed a declaration on May 27<sup>th</sup>, however there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served. Petitioner was aware of the requests therein and chose not to file an opposition. As such, the court deems her failure to do so as an admission that the requests in the RFO have merit.

According to the RFO, Respondent is seeking a judgment to have Petitioner’s name removed from the Lake County property located at APN 050-480-10-00 and Mendicino County APN 011-005-091-000 per the divorce agreement.

After reviewing the filings and the documents submitted by Respondent, the court does find grounds to grant the requests pending before it. Petitioner is ordered to sign grant deeds transferring her interests in the Lake County property (APN 050-480-10-00) and the Mendicino County property (APN 011-005-091-000) to Respondent.

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: PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO SIGN GRANT DEEDS TRANSFERRING HER INTERESTS IN THE LAKE COUNTY PROPERTY (APN 050-480-10-00) AND THE MENDICINO COUNTY PROPERTY (APN 011-005-091-000) TO RESPONDENT.**

**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 18, 2026

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

**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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**9. RENTACHINTALA SAHITHI V. PAVAN SRIKONDA**

**PFL20190068**

On March 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding the child's passport and a travel bond waiver. This is a post-judgment RFO and as such, personal service of the moving papers would generally be required. However, on April 10<sup>th</sup> the court made an ex parte order authorizing electronic service. In accordance with that order, the RFO was electronically served on April 17, 2026, however Petitioner failed to serve a blank Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: 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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**10. ARTHUR VOGTLIN V. GINA BRAY**

**PFL20170751**

On March 12, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on April 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 4<sup>th</sup> along with a declaration of Charmaine Magale, and her Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner filed his reply declaration on June 9<sup>th</sup>, it was served on June 10<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner seeks to terminate spousal support.

Respondent opposes the request, asks the court to maintain the current support orders. She further asks the court to “reserve the power” to order Petitioner to pay Respondent’s attorney’s fees. Additionally, she is requesting Petitioner be ordered to “account for his interest in Pragmanage LLC and any income it produces” and take judicial notice of the parties’ December 17, 2019 stipulation.

This is a post-judgment request for spousal support orders and as such, the court is required take evidence and make findings on the Family Code § 4320 factors. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to select trial and mandatory settlement conference dates.

**TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING TO SELECT TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**11. NIKI WILLIAMSON V. MICHAEL WILLIAMSON**

**24FL0835**

On March 24, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees and sanctions. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail served on March 26<sup>th</sup>. She filed an amended RFO on April 7<sup>th</sup>, which was served on May 14<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on June 3<sup>rd</sup> along with a declaration in support thereof and a supplemental declaration, however both of these documents contain the caption for Candelaria Purcell v. Dane Purcell therefore the court has not read or considered them.

Petitioner filed and served another supplemental declaration on June 5<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the moving papers were properly served on Respondent and he chose not to oppose the requests made therein. The court therefore treats his failure to do so as an admission that the requests made by Petitioner have merit.

Petitioner is requesting spousal support orders and attorney's fees in the amount of \$5,000. She further requests sanctions pursuant to Family Code §§ 271, 2040, and 245 for failure to comply with the court's February 27, 2025 order and violation of the ATROS. She does not specify how much she is seeking in sanctions. She asks that Respondent be ordered to produce his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) within 30 days of the court's order. Finally, she asks that Respondent be ordered to transfer title to the Audi to Petitioner's name.

In her supplemental declaration, Petitioner also asks that Respondent be ordered to provide all documents necessary to evaluate the residence, including current mortgage statements, loan information, and documents showing the current loan balance. She requests Respondent provide a full accounting of any 401(k), retirement, stock, savings, and other asset withdrawals. And she asks the court to order appropriate relief regarding the health insurance. The court declines to rule on each of the aforementioned requests as they were raised in the supplemental declaration and are outside the scop of the RFO. Therefore they are not properly before the court and cannot be ruled on.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Regarding the request to compel the PDD, Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). “[...]he court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney’s fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust.” Fam. Code § 2107(c).

According to the file, Petitioner has complied with her disclosure requirements and there is no Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure filed by Respondent. As such, the request to compel Respondent’s PDD is granted. Respondent is ordered to serve his full and complete Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure no later than July 18, 2026.

Respondent is sanctioned \$1,000 as and for attorney’s fees pursuant to Family Code § 2107. This amount is to be paid directly to Petitioner’s attorney and may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$100 commencing on July 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month thereafter until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

The request for sanctions under Family Code § 2040 is denied as Petitioner has failed to establish a basis for sanctions under this section. Likewise, Section 245 is regarding continuances and therefore the request for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 245 is denied.

Petitioner’s request for sanctions under Family Code § 271 is granted. Family Code section 271 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

impose a sanction that would create an “unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed.” *Id.*

According to Petitioner’s moving papers, Respondent has failed to comply with court orders and has violated the ATROS by removing her from his health insurance and has withdrawing funds from his 401k. Both of which are violations of the ATROS. As such, the court finds that his actions have frustrated the policy of the law to promote settlement and reduce the costs of litigation. Respondent is sanctioned in the amount of \$1,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271. This amount is to be paid directly to Petitioner’s attorney and may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$100 commencing on July 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month thereafter until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

Regarding the request to transfer title to the Audi, Respondent is ordered to cooperate with Petitioner and her counsel to immediately execute all documents and take all steps necessary to transfer title to the 2015 Audi A3 VIN WAUACGFF0F1002170 to Petitioner.

Turning to the issue of support, utilizing the same figures as outlined in the attached Xspouse report, the court finds that spousal support per the Alameda formula is \$4,120 per month. See attached Xspouse report. The court adopts the attached Xspouse report and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$4,120 per month as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. The court orders the temporary spousal support order effective April 1, 2026.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$12,360 through and including June 1, 2026. The court orders Respondent pay Petitioner \$515 on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If a payment is late or missed the remaining balance is due in full with legal interest within five (5) days.

Finally, turning to the issue of need-based 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. 4<sup>th</sup> 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party’s rights. It “is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party,” but rather “parity.” Alan S. v. Sup. Ct., 172 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 238, 251(2009). In the face of

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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).

Here, the court does find there to be a disparity in income, even after the sanctions and support orders awarded herein. As such, the request for attorney's fees is granted. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner's attorney \$5,000. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$500 with payments commencing on July 15, 2026 and continuing 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 DECLINES TO RULE ON THE REQUESTS MADE IN PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION WHICH ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE RFO AND ARE THEREFORE NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT.**

**THE REQUEST TO COMPEL RESPONDENT'S PDD IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE HIS FULL AND COMPLETE PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE NO LATER THAN JULY 18, 2026.**

**RESPONDENT IS SANCTIONED \$1,000 AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2107. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY AND MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$100 COMMENCING ON JULY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF EACH MONTH THEREAFTER UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.**

**THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNDER FAMILY CODE § 2040 IS DENIED AS PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH A BASIS FOR SANCTIONS UNDER THIS SECTION. LIKewise, SECTION 245 IS REGARDING CONTINUANCES AND THEREFORE THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 245 IS DENIED.**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNDER FAMILY CODE § 271 IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS SANCTIONED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1000 PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 18, 2026

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

**ATTORNEY AND MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$100 COMMENCING ON JULY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF EACH MONTH THEREAFTER UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.**

**REGARDING THE REQUEST TO TRANSFER TITLE TO THE AUDI, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO COOPERATE WITH PETITIONER AND HER COUNSEL TO IMMEDIATELY EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS AND TAKE ALL STEPS NECESSARY TO TRANSFER TITLE TO THE 2015 AUDI A3 VIN WAUACGFF0F1002170 TO PETITIONER.**

**TURNING TO THE ISSUE OF SUPPORT, UTILIZING THE SAME FIGURES AS OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA IS \$4,120 PER MONTH. SEE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT. THE COURT ADOPTS THE ATTACHED XSPOUSE REPORT AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$4,120 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THE COURT ORDERS THE TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDER EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2026.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,360 THROUGH AND INCLUDING JUNE 1, 2026. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT PAY PETITIONER \$515 ON THE 15<sup>TH</sup> OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF A PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE REMAINING BALANCE IS DUE IN FULL WITH LEGAL INTEREST WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS.**

**THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY \$5,000. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$500 WITH PAYMENTS COMMENCING ON JULY 15, 2026 AND CONTINUING 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.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 18, 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.**

Fixed Shares	Husband	Wife	Monthly figures	Cash Flow	Guideline	Proposed
#of children	0	0	2026			
% time with NCP	0.00 %	0.00 %		Comb. net spendable	12866	12866
Filing status	MFJ->	<-MFJ	<b>GUIDELINE</b>	Percent change	0%	0%
# exemptions	1 *	1 *	<b>Nets(adjusted)</b>	<b>Husband</b>		
Wages+salary	16153	0	Husband	11725		
Self-employed income	0	0	Wife	1141	-4120	-4120
Other taxable income	0	1404	Total	12866	7606	7606
TANF+CS received	0	0	<b>Support</b>		0	0
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of combined spendable	59%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	0	% of saving over guideline	0%
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Alameda SS	4120	Total taxes	4428
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	4120	Dep. exemption value	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-		# withholding allowances	0w
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	<b>Settings changed</b>		Net wage paycheck	11486
Health insurance	0	0			<b>Wife</b>	
Other medical expense	0	0			Payment cost/benefit	4120
Property tax expense	0	0			Net spendable income	5260
Ded interest expense	0	0	<b>Proposed</b>		Change from guideline	0
Charitable contributions	0	0	<b>Tactic 9</b>		% of combined spendable	41%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	0	% of saving over guideline	0%
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	4120	Total taxes	263
Required union dues	0	0	Total	4120	Dep. exemption value	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			# withholding allowances	0w
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving	0	Net wage paycheck	0
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	0		
Child care expenses	0	0				

Husband pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12. DCSS V. TYLER GODMAN (OTHER PARENT: MALINDA SNYDER) PFS20140344**

Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 27, 2026, following the court's denial of her ex parte request for emergency orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 14, 2026, and a review hearing on June 18, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing either Petitioner or Respondent were properly served.

Other Parent filed a Declaration on April 20, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 14, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 26, 2026.

Neither Petitioner nor Respondent has filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the May 14<sup>th</sup> CCRC report. The court finds good cause to proceed, despite the lack of proper service. The court finds the recommendation to maintain all current orders in full force and effect and for Respondent and Other Parent to participate in a co-parenting course online to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Other Parent 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 #12: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED, DESPITE THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATION TO MAINTAIN ALL CURRENT ORDERS IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT AND FOR RESPONDENT AND OTHER PARENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A CO-PARENTING COURSE ONLINE TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. OTHER PARENT 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

June 18, 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  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**13. KRISTA HARDWICK V. CHRISTOPHER HARDWICK**

**24FL0251**

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders to reinstate health insurance on April 9, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration the same day. On April 10, 2026, the court granted the ex parte request, ordering Respondent to reinstate Petitioner's health insurance or pay for the equivalent insurance. The court reserved on the request for sanctions. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 10, 2026, seeking the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Respondent was electronically served on April 13, 2026, which does not comply with the court's order of April 10<sup>th</sup> that the orders must be personally served.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on June 4, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Respondent. All prior orders remain in full force and effect. The court continues to reserve on the request for reimbursement and sanctions until the time of trial.

**TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE ON THE REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT AND SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.**

**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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. 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.

On May 7, 2026, the court continued the matter to the present date due to the lack of a CCRC report.

Both parties attended CCRC and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 7, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 8<sup>th</sup>.

The court has read and considered the May 7<sup>th</sup> CCRC report. The court finds Petitioner has not overcome the presumptions of Family Code section 3044. The court maintains the present orders regarding legal and physical custody of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth in the May 7<sup>th</sup> CCRC report.

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 #14: THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER HAS NOT OVERCOME THE PRESUMPTIONS OF FAMILY CODE SECTION 3044. THE COURT MAINTAINS THE CURRENT ORDERS FOR LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 7<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT.**

**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.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 18, 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  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**15. TIFFANY HENDERSON V. SAMUEL HENDERSON**

**24FL1253**

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on March 27, 2026. Respondent filed an opposition on March 27, 2026. The court denied the request on an ex parte basis on March 30, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 30, 2026, seeking modification of child custody orders. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration, Declaration of Theodore Henderson, and an Objection and Request to Strike on June 4, 2026. Proof of Service shows those were served on June 4, 2026.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration as well as a Declaration of Thomas Price on June 8, 2026. Both were served the same day.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration as well as a Declaration of Counsel on June 8, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court has not considered them.

The court finds Respondent has waived any defect in service of the March 30<sup>th</sup> RFO, as he has filed a Responsive Declaration as well as Objections to its content.

The court sustains Respondent's Objections to Petitioner March 30<sup>th</sup> Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #15: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**16. AMANDA KIRKLAND V. CRYSTAL SANDY-KIRKLAND**

**24FL1287**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 7, 2026, requesting modification of spousal support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served on April 7, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on May 11, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court cannot consider them.

Parties filed a stipulation and order with the court regarding termination of spousal support, which the court adopted as its order on June 8, 2026.

On June 9, 2026, parties filed a second stipulation and order, which also addressed the spousal support issue. The court signed and adopted the stipulation as its order on June 9<sup>th</sup>.

The court finds the parties' stipulations have rendered the RFO moot. As such, the court drops the RFO from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' STIPULATIONS HAVE RENDERED THE RFO MOOT. AS SUCH, THE COURT DROPS THE RFO FROM CALENDAR. 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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**17. BRAD POPEJOY V. ANNETTE POPEJOY**

**26FL0240**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 13, 2026, seeking child support and temporary guideline spousal support orders. She concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was personally served on April 20, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration or an Income and Expense Declaration.

In her request, Respondent states that the parties continue to cohabit. As such, the court finds an award of child and temporary guideline spousal support is premature. It appears the minors' as well as Respondent's needs continue to be met by Petitioner through cohabitation. As such, the court denies Respondent's request for child and temporary guideline spousal support.

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 #17: RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT ARE DENIED AS THE PARTIES CONTINUE TO COHABITATE. 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 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**18. MELANIE SCHWARTZLER V. ROBERT CLINTON**

**PFL20170631**

On January 16, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. Petitioner was personally served on January 22, 2026, as is required by Family Code § 215.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served on Petitioner. She had notice of the pending requests and chose not to file an opposition. As such, the court finds good cause to treat her failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the children. He asks that Petitioner have visitation on the second and fourth Sunday of each month from 9:00am to 5:00pm.

Both parties and their counsel appeared for the hearing on April 9, 2026. The court stayed its tentative ruling and rereferred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 20, 2026, and a further review hearing on June 18, 2026. The court reserved on the requests for attorney’s fees and sanctions.

Both parties and the minors participated in the CCRC appointment. The parties were able to reach many agreements which are memorialized in the April 24, 2026 CCRC report along with further recommendations.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on June 8, 2026. It was electronically served on June 8<sup>th</sup>. Respondent outlines the ongoing exchange issues that have occurred since the last court hearing.

Petitioner has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the April 24<sup>th</sup> CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth. The parties are to share in the costs of co-parenting counseling equally. If Petitioner is more than 15 minutes late to pick the minors up, and has not made contact with Respondent, Petitioner’s visit shall be forfeited.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 18, 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 #18: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE APRIL 24<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE IN THE COSTS OF CO-PARENTING COUNSELING EQUALLY. IF PETITIONER IS MORE THAN 15 MINUTES LATE TO PICK THE MINORS UP, AND HAS NOT MADE CONTACT WITH RESPONDENT, PETITIONER'S VISIT SHALL BE FORFEITED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**19. JUSTIN SIMARRO V. YAJAIRA SIMARRO**

**PFL20200099**

On November 6, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for Petitioner to pay credit card debts.

On November 17<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC).

Respondent filed another RFO on January 16, 2026.

On February 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Proof of Service indicating service of an “FL300, ex parte” and an “FL300.” There are currently three RFOs pending before the court and the Proof of Service does not specify which one was served. Additionally, the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, nor was a blank Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Without a properly completed Proof of Service the matter cannot be heard

According to the Proof of Service, the “FL410” was personally served on Petitioner.

Parties appeared for the hearing on February 26, 2026. The court arraigned Petitioner on the OSC. Petitioner requested additional time to hire counsel. The court continued the OSC for further arraignment to April 23, 2026 at 1:30 PM.

The court continued the November 6, 2025, RFO to allow Respondent time to file a corrected Proof of Service.

Respondent filed Proof of Service on April 1, 2026 showing Respondent was personally served with all the required documents.

On April 23, 2026, the court appointed the office of the Public Defender to Petitioner and continued the arraignment.

Parties are ordered to appear on the RFO.

**TENTATIVE RULING #19: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
June 18, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**20. RUBEN WILBURN V. HEATHER VOGEL**

**24FL0197**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 26, 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 23, 2026 and a review hearing on June 18, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on April 23, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on April 27<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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 #20: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER 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.**