

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. SHYLO RAE BELL V. CHRISTOPHER DWAIN LOVELESS

22FL0232

On March 25, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were served electronically on March 30th.

Only Petitioner appeared at Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on May 1, 2026, therefore a single parent report was prepared without recommendations.

Petitioner filed a reply declaration on June 12, 2026.

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, it appears the RFO and the CCRC referral were both timely and properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending requests and the CCRC appointment and chose not to appear at CCRC nor file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor child. She asks the court to vacate its prior orders wherein Respondent was granted phone calls with the minor every other week. In her reply declaration, Petitioner adds several additional requests as follows. She asks that she be permitted to discontinue use of the Talking Parents App. She further asks that Respondent be ordered to reimburse Petitioner the cost of the Talking Parents App for the months of October 2025 through June 2026 which amounts to \$255. Finally, she asks that the minor’s name be changed from Harley Bell-Loveless to Harley Lynn Bell.

The requests for sole legal and sole physical custody are granted. The court vacates its prior order for bi-weekly calls between the minor and Respondent.

Regarding the requests for reimbursement of Talking Parents fees, terminating the Talking Parents subscription and changing the minor’s name, the court finds these requests to be outside the scope of the original RFO; therefore, they are not properly before the court and the court declines to rule on them.

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 25, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE REQUESTS FOR SOLE LEGAL AND SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY ARE GRANTED. THE COURT VACATES ITS PRIOR ORDER FOR BI-WEEKLY CALLS BETWEEN THE MINOR AND RESPONDENT.

REGARDING THE REQUESTS FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF TALKING PARENTS FEES, TERMINATING THE TALKING PARENTS SUBSCRIPTION AND CHANGING THE MINOR'S NAME, THE COURT FINDS THESE REQUESTS TO BE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO; THEREFORE THEY ARE NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT AND THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON THEM.

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. JENNIFER ANN CHANEY V. JASON MICHAEL CHANEY

22FL0859

On March 26, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a post-judgment modification of spousal and child support. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. The RFO and all other required documents were served on March 30, 2026, however they were electronically served on Petitioner's counsel, not Petitioner herself. This is a post-judgment request and therefore service was required to comply with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on June 8, 2026, thereby waiving any defect in service.

Respondent asks the court to modify child and spousal support to account for income that he says Petitioner has underreported.

Petitioner opposes both requests for modification. She states that there has been no change in circumstances to warrant a change in support.

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

The request to modify child support is continued to join with the trial on the issue of spousal support.

The court reserves jurisdiction to modify child and spousal support back to the date of filing the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT TRIAL AND MANDATORY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE DATES FOR THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT. THE REQUEST TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO MODIFY CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 25, 2026

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

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. CURTIS CHRISTENSEN V. GINA CHRISTENSEN

PFL20170845

On March 30, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to quash subpoenas. The RFO was served on April 3rd, a blank FL-320 was not served nor was the Notice of Posting Tentative Ruling.

Petitioner filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a declaration of Amanda Yasbek in support thereof on June 8th. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All documents were served on June 5th.

Respondent filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on June 15th. She filed another declaration on June 17th.

Petitioner filed an Objection to Respondent's Declaration and Request to Strike Pleading on June 22nd. Petitioner objects to Respondent's June 17th declaration as it is in violation of the 5-page limit set by California Rule of Court rule 5.111(a).

Neither party has served the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) with any of the moving or opposition papers. DCSS is a party to the case and therefore, they are to be included. Accordingly, the matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service. Even if the court had reached the matter on the merits, it would be denied for the reasons stated below.

Respondent asks the court to quash the following deposition subpoenas: Kaiser Permanente (HR and payroll records); Golden 1 Credit Union/Fidelity; and Vanguard Group. She asks the court to issue a protective order preventing the disclosure of her private financial and employment records. Finally, she asks that the court award sanctions in the amount of \$1,000. She argues the subpoenas are overbroad and duplicative as Petitioner already has the necessary information.

Petitioner asks the court to deny the Motion to Quash as Respondent's objection was untimely, Respondent improperly signed and served the objection, and Petitioner is already in possession of the requested documents. He further opposes the request for a protective order as the subpoenas have not been oppressive, unduly burdensome, or a violation of privacy rights. Petitioner is requesting \$5,000 in attorney fees pursuant to Family Code § 7605 and Civil Procedure § 1987.2(a). He also requests \$2,000 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271.

Civil Procedure Section 1987.1 vests the court with the authority to either quash a deposition subpoena in its entirety or to modify it. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1987.1(a). Additionally,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

the court may make protective orders or any other orders as the court deems reasonably necessary to protect the moving party from “...unreasonable or oppressive demands...” *Id.* While a motion to quash must be served at least five days before the date set for production of records, failure to timely serve the motion does not invalidate it. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1985.3.

First and foremost, Petitioner objects to the motion to quash as untimely. However, as stated above, mere untimeliness does not invalidate the motion or prevent the court from ruling on it. Thus, the court does not find this argument to be persuasive.

Petitioner further objects as Respondent improperly noted the objection as a non-party and signed the Proof of Service of the objection herself. While this is true, the court does find that Petitioner received the objection and responded to it substantively therefore, the court finds that Petitioner had actual notice of the objection being made and as such, the procedural deficiencies were harmless error.

Turning to the substance of the motion, the motion should be denied in its entirety. In filing a motion to quash or seeking a protective order, the moving party bears the burden of establishing that the subpoenas are unreasonable, oppressive, or objectionable in some way. Respondent argues that the subpoenas are overbroad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, though she does not so much as attach a copy of the subject subpoenas or cite the language used in the subpoena to make a showing that it is objectionable. Furthermore, she is seeking to quash subpoenas to Kaiser Permanente, Golden 1/Fidelity and Vanguard Group but as far as the court can tell from the filings the only subpoena actually outstanding at the time of the filing was the Golden 1 subpoena and even that had been fulfilled prior to hearing on the motion.

Respondent repeatedly argues that the subpoenas are duplicative and unnecessary because she has already provided the requested documentation. This argument is without merit. In conducting discovery, each “party is permitted to use multiple methods of obtaining discovery and the fact that information was disclosed under one method is not, standing alone, proper basis for refusing to provide discovery under another method.” Irvington-Moore, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. 14 Cal. App. 4th 733 (1993).

Ultimately, Respondent has failed to establish that the subpoenas (assuming there is more than one) are overbroad, unreasonable, oppressive or otherwise objectionable. Her requests to quash the subpoenas and issue a protective order should therefore be denied.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

“[T]he court may, in its discretion award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney’s fees, if the court finds the motion was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification or that one or more of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1987.2.

Respondent is cautioned that if the court were to have reached the matter on its merits, her actions likely would be sanctionable as the court does not find that the motion was filed with substantial justification. Respondent’s argument that the information was already disclosed was made without any legal basis. The court recognizes that Respondent is pro per, yet a pro per party is held to the same standard as a practicing attorney. See Goodson v. Bogerts, Inc., 252 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40 (1967) (“One who voluntarily represents himself is not, for that reason, entitled to any more (or less) consideration than a lawyer.”) Furthermore, the requested information is directly relevant to the subject matter at hand and Respondent failed to make the required showing that the subpoenas are objectionable.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE TO DCSS. EVEN IF THE COURT HAD REACHED THE MATTER ON THE MERITS IT WOULD HAVE BEEN DENIED.

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. ABBE GINNODO V. SEAN GINNODO

25FL1144

On April 1, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and child support orders. He did not file an Income and Expense Declaration. All required documents were served on April 3rd.

On April 29th, the parties filed a Stipulation and Order for Custody and/or Visitation thereby resolving the custody issues raised in the RFO. The court signed the stipulation and adopted it as the court's order on April 29th.

On June 10th, Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Given that the parties have reached agreements as to custody and visitation the court deems the requests raised in the RFO to be moot and the court declines to rule on them.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: GIVEN THAT THE PARTIES HAVE REACHED AGREEMENTS AS TO CUSTODY AND VISITATION THE COURT DEEMS THE REQUESTS RAISED IN THE RFO TO BE MOOT AND THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON THEM. RESPONDENT FAILED TO FILE HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION CONCURRENTLY WITH THE RFO. AS SUCH, THE REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT IS DENIED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 25, 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. AMBER MAYES V. KRIS MAYES

25FL0143

On March 25, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel disclosures and sanctions. The RFO and other documents were served on April 7, 2026, however the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served.

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 RFO was timely and properly served. Respondent is aware of the requests made therein and chose not to file an opposition. As such, the court treats his failure to do so as an admission that the requests made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner asks the court to order Respondent to complete and serve his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) as soon as reasonably possible. She further requests sanctions but does not specify the amount requested.

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). “[T]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).

Here, Petitioner has complied with her disclosure obligations and as such she can afford herself of relief under Family Code § 2107 for Respondent’s failure to do the same. The Response to the Petition was filed on March 21st. It has been more than sixty days since that date and Respondent has yet to file his required PDD. Accordingly, Respondent is ordered to serve his full and complete PDD, with supporting documents no later than July 9, 2026. He is sanctioned \$500 for his failure to comply with his disclosure obligations. This amount is to be paid directly to Petitioner’s attorney. Respondent may pay the amount in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$50 commencing on July 1, 2026 and continuing

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

on the 1st 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.

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 #5: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE HIS FULL AND COMPLETE PDD, WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS NO LATER THAN JULY 9, 2026. HE IS SANCTIONED \$500 FOR HIS FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH HIS DISCLOSURE OBLIGATIONS. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY. RESPONDENT MAY PAY THE AMOUNT IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$50 COMMENCING ON JULY 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST 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.

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. KYRA MCAFEE V. MAXWELL MCAFEE (OTHER PARTIES: BRIAN BUNCH AND CORINNE BUNCH) **PFL20210499**

On March 27, 2026 Other Parties Brian and Corinne Bunch filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. There are Proofs of Service showing only service of the FL-300 and “supplemental declarations.” There is no Proof of Service for the required blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling.

Despite the fact that she was one of the moving parties, Other Party Corinne Bunch filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 14th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 24, 2026.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 30, 2026 and were able to reach agreements. A report with those agreements was prepared on May 1st. It was mailed to the parties on May 1, 2026.

Other Party Corrine Bunch filed and served another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 22nd along with an MC-030 declaration.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 11th.

Other Party Corrine Bunch filed and served another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 16th.

Other Parties ask the court to make the following orders: (1) leniency in the 8:00pm bedtime order; (2) permission to travel with the children outside of El Dorado County up to twice per year; (3) clarification of the holiday order; (4) a minimum of 48 hours’ notice of extracurricular activities; (5) modifications to Paisley’s visitation schedule.

Respondent is requesting a set pick up/drop off location for the visits and a set holiday schedule. Additionally, he would like increased visitation time with the children and eventually 50/50 custody.

Petitioner asks the court to modify the current visitation order to remove overnight visitation at the grandparents’ residence. Instead, she proposes grandparent visits occur on the first, third and fifth Saturday from noon to 7:00pm.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements in the May 1, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children. The court adopts those

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

agreements as the orders of the court with the following modifications. Petitioner shall have the children on Mother's Day each year and Respondent shall have the children on Father's Day each year. The Parenting Plan schedule shall be amended to include the following – "Paisley shall have visits with the maternal grandparents from Saturday at noon until Saturday at 7:00pm. If Paisley chooses, she may extend her visit to Sunday at 9:00pm." This section is also modified to include the provision that the maternal grandparents are to select the bedtime for the children during their parenting time. The Vacation section of the report shall be amended to include the following – "Vacations with the maternal grandparents may take place outside of Sacramento and El Dorado counties."

In addition to the above, the court is ordering Petitioner to give Respondent and Other Parties at least 48 hours' notice of any and all extracurricular or school events that will take place during the parenting time of Respondent or Other Parties. Petitioner is ordered to provide the date, time, location, and a list of required items needed for the activity.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS IN THE MAY 1, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN. THE COURT ADOPTS THOSE AGREEMENTS AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE THE CHILDREN ON MOTHER'S DAY EACH YEAR AND RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE THE CHILDREN ON FATHER'S DAY EACH YEAR. THE PARENTING PLAN SCHEDULE SHALL BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING – "PAISLEY SHALL HAVE VISITS WITH THE MATERNAL GRANDPARENTS FROM SATURDAY AT NOON UNTIL SATURDAY AT 7:00PM. IF PAISLEY CHOOSES, SHE MAY EXTEND HER VISIT TO SUNDAY AT 9:00PM." THIS SECTION IS ALSO MODIFIED TO INCLUDE THE PROVISION THAT THE MATERNAL GRANDPARENTS ARE TO SELECT THE BEDTIME FOR THE CHILDREN DURING THEIR PARENTING TIME. THE VACATION SECTION OF THE REPORT SHALL BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING – "VACATIONS WITH THE MATERNAL GRANDPARENTS MAY TAKE PLACE OUTSIDE OF SACRAMENTO AND EL DORADO COUNTIES."

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE, THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO GIVE RESPONDENT AND OTHER PARTIES AT LEAST 48 HOURS' NOTICE OF ANY AND ALL EXTRACURRICULAR OR SCHOOL EVENTS THAT WILL TAKE PLACE DURING THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 25, 2026

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

PARENTING TIME OF RESPONDENT OR OTHER PARTIES. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE THE DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND A LIST OF REQUIRED ITEMS NEEDED FOR THE ACTIVITY.

OTHER PARTY 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. KELSEY MCPARLAND V. PATRICK MCPARLAND

24FL0881

On March 24, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for a long cause trial on the issues of property division, attorney's fees, spousal support, pet custody, and pet care orders per Family Code § 2605. At that time the parties conceded that they were not ready to proceed and the trial was continued to August 31st. The matter was set for a review hearing on the present date.

Also on March 24th, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support retroactive back to the date of originally filing for support in November of 2025, and attorney's fees. She attached her March 16th Income and Expense Declaration to the moving papers.

On March 26th, Petitioner filed another RFO for reconsideration of prior court orders and division of community property.

There are two Proofs of Service showing service of an FL-300 but neither specifies which FL-300 was actually served.

Respondent filed and served two Responsive Declarations to Request for Order on June 11th, one addressing the March 24th RFO and the other addressing the March 26th RFO. The court finds this effectively waives any potential defect in service of the RFOs.

Petitioner filed an Amended Brief Re Request for Spousal Support and an Income and Expense Declaration on June 15th. She also filed a Notice of Withdrawal of Motion the same day withdrawing her Motion for Reconsideration.

Given that Petitioner has withdrawn her Motion for Reconsideration the court will not be addressing the March 26th RFO herein.

Turning to the March 24th RFO, Petitioner is requesting guideline spousal support back to the date of her original request which was filed in November of 2025. She further requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$75,288.

Respondent opposes Petitioner's requests. He argues that the issue of spousal support is already pending trial and Petitioner has not sought bifurcation of that issue. He further asks the court to deny Petitioner's request for attorney fees.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. ERIN ANNE WATSON V. ADAM LEE WATSON

24FL0010

On November 10, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, an order to sell the marital residence, and an order to compel disclosures. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on February 19, 2026, at which time they were able to reach a full agreement. As part of their agreement, the parties stipulated to allow Petitioner to remain in the family home so long as she made all mortgage payments in a timely manner. In the event of a missed mortgage payment, or two late payments more than 10 days past due, then Respondent may sell the home in accordance with the court's tentative ruling for the February hearing. The parties agreed to set a review hearing on the present date to address the status of the mortgage payments.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on June 2, 2026.

Respondent filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration on June 4, 2026. He filed and served his Supplemental Declaration on June 12th.

Petitioner filed her Supplemental Declaration on June 15th, it was served on June 13th.

Respondent states that the purpose of the present hearing was for Petitioner to show that she has the financial ability to remain in the home and continue to timely pay the mortgage. He argues that she has not made such a showing therefore he requests the stay on the court's prior tentative ruling be lifted and the home be ordered sold. He further requests \$30,000 from the sale be distributed to each party immediately upon closing with the balance to be held in an attorney client trust account for distribution according to the terms of a written agreement of the parties or further court order.

Petitioner asks the court to deny Respondent's requests. She asks that she be allowed to remain in the residence until the minor Jack graduates in June of 2028. Once sold, Petitioner requests an award of 60% of the net proceeds, she asks that the remaining 40% go to Respondent. She further requests a continuance to allow her additional time to obtain employment.

According to the stipulation of the parties, "[a]t the review hearing, Petitioner will be required to demonstrate she has a reasonable ability to pay the mortgage based upon her earnings. Mere timely payment of the mortgage is not sufficient; Wife must demonstrate an income ability and timely payments of the mortgage obligation." Stip. pg. 1 Ln 12-16. In keeping with the stipulation of the parties, the court finds that Petitioner has failed to make a showing of income sufficient to continue making timely payments on the mortgage. As

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

such, the stay on the applicable portion of the court's February 19, 2026 tentative ruling is hereby lifted and the court is reissuing those orders as follows: "The parties are ordered to place the house up for sale with Keith Wenger of Imperial Real Estate and Mortgage no later than July 25, 2026. 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 in furtherance of its sale. 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 to sign all documents related to the sale of the home in a timely manner."

Once the home is sold, the parties shall each retain \$30,000 of the net proceeds from the sale of the home. The remainder shall be placed in an attorney-client trust account until court order or a written agreement of the parties.

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 STAY ON THE APPLICABLE PORTION OF THE COURT'S FEBRUARY 19, 2026 TENTATIVE RULING IS HEREBY LIFTED AND THE COURT IS REISSUING THOSE ORDERS AS FOLLOWS: "THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE HOUSE UP FOR SALE WITH KEITH WENGER OF IMPERIAL REAL ESTATE AND MORTGAGE NO LATER THAN JULY 25, 2026. 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 IN FURTHERANCE OF ITS SALE. 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 TO SIGN ALL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SALE OF THE HOME IN A TIMELY MANNER."

ONCE THE HOME IS SOLD, THE PARTIES SHALL EACH RETAIN \$30,000 OF THE NET PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE HOME. THE REMAINDER SHALL BE PLACED IN AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL COURT ORDER OR A WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES.

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 25, 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. STEVE GIRDLESTONE V. ASHLEY GIRDLESTONE

PFL20160763

Petitioner's Requests for Orders

Petitioner has filed three Requests for Orders (RFOs) since the last hearing on January 29, 2026, which was a review hearing set on Petitioner's RFO. Petitioner filed RFOs on February 18, 2026, April 2, 2026, and April 29, 2026. It appears all the RFOs were served, however, there are defects in service. Despite the Defects, Responsive Declarations have been filed, which do not raise the issue of defective service, therefore, the court deems the issue to have been waived.

Minor's Counsel Filed a Responsive Declaration on April 28, 2026.

Minor's Counsel filed an Amended Responsive Declaration on April 29, 2026.

Minor's Counsel filed a Responsive Declaration on May 5, 2026. It was served the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 11, 2026, which was served the same day. Respondent opposes Petitioner's requests.

Respondent's Requests for Orders

Respondent has filed two RFOs since the January 29, 2026, hearing. The first was filed on April 17, 2026, and the second on April 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner and Minor's Counsel were electronically served on April 27, 2026, which is not in conformance with Family Code section 215. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service for the April 23, 2026 RFO, however, both Petitioner and Minor's Counsel have filed Responsive Declarations to the RFO and do not raise the issue of the lack of service, therefore, the court deems it to have been waived.

Minor's Counsel filed a Responsive Declaration on May 5, 2026. It was served the same day.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on April 29, 2026. It was served on April 30, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on June 2, 2026. It was served on June 2, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. BRANDON GOMEZ V. TARA GOMEZ

22FL0491

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 26, 2026, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 27, 2026, and a review hearing on June 25, 2026. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on April 22, 2026. Petitioner is seeking sole physical custody of the minor with Respondent to have weekend parenting time.

Both parties and the minor attended CCRC. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 12, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 13th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 10, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent objects to the requested orders and asks that the current orders remain in place.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the May 13th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 13TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 25, 2026

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

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. MEGAN HAMAN V. JUSTIN HAMAN

25FL1156

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 27, 2026, requesting a modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders made on February 26, 2026. Petitioner was mail served on February 27th.

Petitioner filed an RFO on March 18, 2026, seeking child support orders. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration, rather one was filed on March 13, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served on March 24, 2026.

Parties filed a stipulation, which the court adopted as its order, on April 28, 2026, continuing the hearing on both RFOs from May 28, 2026 to June 25, 2026.

Respondent filed an amended RFO on June 8, 2026. The Proof of Service shows a service date of April 14, 2026, which the court finds to lack credibility as the RFO was not filed until June 8th. The court drops the amended RFO from calendar, due to the lack of proper service.

Respondent also filed an Income and Expense Declaration on June 8, 2026. It also shows a service date of April 14, 2026, which once again, the court finds to lack credibility.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Respondent's February 27th RFO on June 11, 2026. It was served on June 11th. Petitioner asserts the parties have reached agreements on the issues before the court and requests the matter be dropped as moot.

The court orders parties to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. NICOLE MORTON V. DYLAN MORTON

25FL0366

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency custody orders on March 23, 2026. On March 24th, the court denied the request. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 24, 2026, seeking the same orders requested in the ex parte application. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 23, 2026 and a review hearing on June 25, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Neither party appeared at the CCRC appointment.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service as well as Petitioner's failure to appear at CCRC which was set at her request.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO APPEAR AT CCRC WHICH WAS SET AT HER REQUEST. 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. KATIE MOYER V. RODNEY LONG

PFL20190731

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on January 15, 2026. The court denied the request on January 16th. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 16, 2026, seeking a modification of child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 13, 2026, and a review hearing on April 9th. Petitioner was personally served on January 17, 2026.

The court issued an ex parte minute order on January 28, 2026, reassigning the CCRC appointment. Parties were mailed copies at their addresses listed with court.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on February 13, 2026, and mailed to the parties on February 18th.

Petitioner filed a declaration regarding the missed CCRC appointment on February 17, 2026. Respondent was mail served on February 17th. Petitioner asserts she never received the reassignment order and appeared at the originally scheduled location. Petitioner is requesting to be referred back to CCRC.

Respondent filed a declaration on February 23, 2026. Petitioner was served on February 24th.

Respondent filed additional declarations on March 16, 2026. They were served on March 16, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 18, 2026. It was served on March 11, 2026. Petitioner objects to the requests made by Respondent and requests the current orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner proposes slight modifications to the current orders.

Respondent filed a Declaration on April 1, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, and as such, the court has not considered it.

Petitioner filed a Notice of Objection to Respondent's April 1st Declaration. The court finds the objections to be moot.

On April 9, 2026, the court adopted its tentative ruling, rereferring the parties to CCRC and setting a further review hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent filed a Declaration in Opposition to the Motion to Strike on April 13, 2026. It was served on April 13th.

Respondent filed and served two more declarations on April 21st and April 22nd respectively.

Both parties attended CCRC and were able to reach many agreements. A report containing the parties' agreements and further recommendations was filed with the court on May 1, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 4th.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the parties' agreements and the further recommendations as set forth in the May 1st CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth.

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 #13: THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AND THE FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 1ST CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. KARINA MYERS V. MICHAEL MYERS

25FL0727

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 29, 2026, seeking child and spousal support as well as Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served on April 30, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 9, 2026 along with an Income and Expense Declaration. Both were served on June 9th.

Petitioner is seeking guideline child support and temporary spousal support. Petitioner is also seeking \$7,500 in Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Respondent agrees to the request for guideline child support. However, Respondent opposes the request for guideline temporary spousal support as well as for attorney's fees. Respondent has included a proposed X-Spouse in his declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court adopts the proposed X-Spouse calculation contained in Respondent's Exhibit A.

The court finds guideline child support to be \$179 per month. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$179 per month as and for guideline child support. This order is effective May 1, 2026, with payments due on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court further finds that Respondent has the opportunity to routinely earn overtime. While that may be currently reduced, the opportunity is still available. Therefore, the court is ordering Petitioner to prepare an overtime table to be included with the Findings and Orders After Hearing. Parties are directed to true-up any overtime earned by Respondent on a quarterly basis.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$358 dollars. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$358 as and for arrears on or before July 15, 2026.

As to the request for guideline temporary spousal support, the court finds guideline temporary spousal support would be \$53 per the Alameda Formula as set forth in Exhibit A. However, the court is not ordering Respondent to pay Petitioner temporary guideline spousal support. The court finds Petitioner's income is sufficient to meet her needs. See Family Code § 3600. Petitioner works full-time and earns sufficient income to meet her needs. Additionally, Petitioner has been and continues to receive adoption assistance for the minor. Therefore, the court denies the request for temporary guideline spousal support.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In re Marriage of Keech, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This ensures each party has access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

The court finds there is a disparity in income between the parties. However, the court is unable to find Respondent has the ability to pay for both his counsel as well as Petitioner's counsel given the reduction in his overtime, as well as his expenses. As such, the court denies the request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees, without prejudice.

The court notes Respondent has asserted in his declaration that there were no attempts to meet and confer prior to Petitioner filing this motion. The court reminds parties of their obligations to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation through mutual cooperation of clients and their counsel.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$179 PER MONTH. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$179 PER MONTH AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2026, WITH PAYMENTS DUE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$358 DOLLARS. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$358 AS AND FOR ARREARS ON OR BEFORE JULY 15, 2026.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS THAT RESPONDENT HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO ROUTINELY EARN OVERTIME. THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO PREPARE AN OVERTIME TABLE TO BE INCLUDED WITH THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

HEARING. PARTIES ARE DIRECTED TO TRUE-UP ANY OVERTIME EARNED BY RESPONDENT ON A QUARTERLY BASIS.

AS TO THE REQUEST FOR GUIDELINE TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT WOULD BE \$53 PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA AS SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT A. HOWEVER, THE COURT IS NOT ORDERING RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT. THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S INCOME IS SUFFICIENT TO MEET HER NEEDS.

THE COURT FINDS THERE IS A DISPARITY IN INCOME BETWEEN THE PARTIES. HOWEVER, THE COURT IS UNABLE TO FIND RESPONDENT HAS THE ABILITY TO PAY FOR BOTH HIS COUNSEL AS WELL AS PETITIONER'S COUNSEL GIVEN THE REDUCTION IN HIS OVERTIME, AS WELL AS HIS EXPENSES. AS SUCH, THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES, WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. KRISTY REDPATH V. THOMAS PISILLO

21FL0148

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 28, 2026, requesting a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders, child support, as well as a name change for the minor. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 19, 2026, and a review hearing on April 16, 2026. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on January 29, 2026. It does not appear Respondent was served with all the required documents, namely a blank FL-320 and Blank FL-150.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report with no recommendations was filed with the court on February 19, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on February 23, 2026.

Both parties appeared at the hearing set for April 16, 2026. Petitioner requested the matter be continued and that the parties be rereferred to CCRC. The court granted the request and set a further review hearing for June 25, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Petitioner was directed to perfect service on Respondent.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and reached full agreements. The parties submitted a stipulation which the court adopted as its order on May 11, 2026.

Petitioner filed an amended Proof of Service showing all required documents were served on Respondent on January 29, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration or Income and Expense Declaration.

As Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, the court deems his failure to do so as an admission that Petitioner's moving papers have merit. See El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C).

The court grants Petitioner's request to change the name of the minor, as it is in the best interest of the minor. The minor's name shall be Rio Nova Mcgee.

Parties are ordered to appear on the issue of child support. Respondent is ordered to bring a completed Income and Expense Declaration with him to the hearing.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner is directed to prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing (FOAH); however,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

this order is effective immediately upon the court's adoption of the tentative ruling and is not conditioned on the preparation of the FOAH.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO BRING A COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH HIM TO THE HEARING.

THE COURT MAINTAINS ALL CURRENT ORDERS AS TO CUSTODY AND PARENTING TIME. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE MINOR, AS IT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE MINOR'S NAME SHALL BE RIO NOVA MCGEE.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. GURINDER SINGH V. JATINDER KAUR

25FL1246

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) along with an Order Shortening Time (OST) on June 3, 2026, and an ex parte application for emergency orders. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to the ex parte request on June 4, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the court denied the ex parte request. The court granted the OST and set the RFO for a hearing on June 25, 2026, at 1:30 PM. The court directed Respondent to serve Petitioner by June 5, 2026, and directed Petitioner to file a Responsive Declaration on or before June 19, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on June 5th.

Respondent is requesting authorization to travel to Canada with the minors to attend a family wedding. Respondent is seeking authorization to travel from July 21st to July 28th. Additionally, Respondent is requesting Petitioner provide the minors' passports. It is unclear from Respondent's RFO if there is a request for custody orders, as the parties' continue to cohabitate.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on June 22, 2026. It was served on June 19, 2026. This is late filed, as the court had directed the Responsive Declaration be filed on or before June 19, 2026. However, the court notes June 19th was a court holiday, and therefore, it has read and considered the declaration. The court notes, the requests made in Petitioner's Responsive Declaration exceed the scope of the RFO. Those requests are denied.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court grants Respondent's request to travel with the minors to Canada for the dates proposed. Respondent shall provide Petitioner with a full itinerary including flight information, lodging details, and contact information. Petitioner shall make every effort to locate the minor's passport. If the passport cannot be located, parties shall work together to obtain an emergency replacement passport. If Petitioner refuses to cooperate in signing the necessary documents to obtain the replacement passport, the court authorizes the clerk of the court to act as an elisor and sign on Petitioner's behalf.

As to the request for the court to make custody orders, the court finds that request to be premature as the parties continue to cohabitate. Therefore, the request for custody orders is denied. Parties continue to share joint legal and physical custody of the minors and neither party has a right to withhold the minors from the other.

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,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO TRAVEL WITH THE MINORS TO CANADA FOR THE DATES PROPOSED. RESPONDENT SHALL PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH A FULL ITINERARY INCLUDING FLIGHT INFORMATION, LODGING DETAILS, AND CONTACT INFORMATION. PETITIONER SHALL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO LOCATE THE MINOR'S PASSPORT. IF THE PASSPORT CANNOT BE LOCATED, PARTIES SHALL WORK TOGETHER TO OBTAIN AN EMERGENCY REPLACEMENT PASSPORT. IF PETITIONER REFUSES TO COOPERATE IN SIGNING THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO OBTAIN THE REPLACEMENT PASSPORT, THE COURT AUTHORIZES THE CLERK OF THE COURT TO ACT AS AN ELISOR AND SIGN ON PETITIONER'S BEHALF.

AS TO THE REQUEST FOR THE COURT TO MAKE CUSTODY ORDERS, THE COURT FINDS THAT REQUEST TO BE PREMATURE AS THE PARTIES CONTINUE TO COHABITATE. THEREFORE, THE REQUEST FOR CUSTODY ORDERS IS DENIED. PARTIES CONTINUE TO SHARE JOINT LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS AND NEITHER PARTY HAS A RIGHT TO WITHHOLD THE MINORS FROM THE OTHER.

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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. LU SUN V. DARUI JIANG

25FL0340

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 14, 2026, seeking orders for child and spousal support, as well as property control and a variety of other orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Responded 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 #17: 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 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. CARRIE WALLACE V. FORREST WALLACE

23FL0549

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 22, 2026, seeking to set aside or vacate the default. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner 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 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. ERIC WEXELMAN V. JAMAICA WEXELMAN (JOINED PARTY: SPENCER WEXELMAN)
24FL0838

Petitioner's March 2, 2026 Request for Order

On March 2, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting release of funds from the sale of the home as well as for Respondent to provide documents and personal property items to joined party Spencer Wexelman, following the court's denial of Petitioner's ex parte request for the same orders. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 12, 2026. In her declaration she states that as of the date of the filing, she had not been served. She was only aware of the requests due to the ex parte application. She requests the court deny Petitioner's requests.

The court finds good cause to proceed on the merits, as Respondent has filed a Responsive Declaration which addresses the requests raised in Petitioner's motion. The court denies Petitioner's requests, without prejudice and reserves on all requests until the time of trial.

All prior 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.

Respondent's May 4, 2026 Request for Order

Respondent filed an RFO on May 4, 2026, seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, bifurcation, restoration of her former name, sanctions, fees for a forensic accountant, as well as reimbursements. Respondent did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service for this document.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration, as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on June 11, 2026. Respondent and Joined Party were served the same day. Petitioner does not raise the issue of service, therefore, the court deems it to have been waived. Petitioner opposes modification of spousal support, reimbursement of support, sanctions, attorney's fees, reimbursement of vocational costs, as well as fees for a forensic accountant. Petitioner does not oppose bifurcation or restoration of Respondent's former name.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Joined Party has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. As to the request for reservation over the issue of spousal support, that request is granted. The court reserves on spousal support to the time of trial. The court is not granting the request to retroactively modify support to December 9, 2024.

Respondent's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees is denied. Respondent has failed to concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. This denial is without prejudice.

The court reserves on Respondent's request for reimbursement of spousal support to the time of trial.

The court denies Respondent's request for fees for a forensic accountant. Respondent is free to retain a forensic accountant if she finds one to be necessary. This denial is without prejudice, and the court reserves jurisdiction to reallocate the costs at the time of trial.

The court reserves on the issue of the "misuse of community funds" to the time of trial.

The court reserves on the issue of the "Gift of Fund-2174 Talon Drive" until the time of trial.

The court denies the request for reimbursement of the cost for the vocational evaluation.

The court reserves on Respondent's requests for Family Code section 271 sanctions until the time of trial.

The court finds the alleged violations of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order are not properly before the court.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on the issue of the bifurcation and restoration of Respondent's former name.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 25, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF THE BIFURCATION AND RESTORATION OF RESPONDENT'S FORMER NAME.

PETITIONER'S MARCH 2, 2026 REQUEST FOR ORDER

THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED ON THE MERITS. THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUESTS, WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND RESERVES ON ALL REQUESTS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

ALL PRIOR 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.

RESPONDENT'S MAY 4, 2026 REQUEST FOR ORDER

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED. RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO CONCURRENTLY FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. THIS DENIAL IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

THE COURT RESERVES ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FEES FOR A FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT. RESPONDENT IS FREE TO RETAIN A FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT IF SHE FINDS ONE TO BE NECESSARY. THIS DENIAL IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO REALLOCATE THE COSTS AT THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE ISSUE OF THE "MISUSE OF COMMUNITY FUNDS" TO THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE COURT RESERVES ON THE ISSUE OF THE "GIFT OF FUND-2174 TALON DRIVE" UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF THE COST FOR THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION.

THE COURT RESERVES ON RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 25, 2026

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

THE COURT FINDS THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER ARE NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT.

PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF THE BIFURCATION AND RESTORATION OF RESPONDENT'S FORMER NAME.

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

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