

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. CRYSTAL HATFIELD V. PAUL HATFIELD

24FL0471

On March 20, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking attorney's fees and a change of venue. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were electronically served on March 31st.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and an Income and Expense Declaration on May 16th. All documents were electronically served on May 15th.

Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed on May 28th. It was served on the 27th.

Respondent is requesting to change venue to Sutter County pursuant to Civil Procedure § 397(c) and (e), and § 397.5. In the event his request is granted, he asks for attorney's fees pursuant to Civil Procedure § 396b(b). He is requesting an amount between \$3,710 to \$3,922.50.

Petitioner opposes both requests.

California Civil Procedure section 395 governs the proper venue for dissolution proceedings. According to Section 395, the proper venue in a proceeding for dissolution of marriage is the superior court in the county where *either* the petitioner or the respondent resided for at least three months prior to the commencement of the proceeding. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 395(a). The court may, upon a properly noticed motion, transfer any matter where the court determines it is not the proper venue. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 397(a). The burden is on the moving party to establish grounds for a change of venue. *Fontaine v. Sup. Ct.*, 175 Cal. App. 4th 830 (2009).

Here, the court does not find that Respondent has met his burden. Petitioner did reside in El Dorado County for the three months prior to filing. Furthermore, Respondent filed his Response in June of 2024, almost exactly a year to the day. In the interim the court has made several orders and set the matter for trial, all without objection from Respondent. For the foregoing reasons, and because the matter is already pending trial before this court, the request to change venue is denied.

Because the change of venue request has been denied, so too is the request for attorney's fees.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 5, 2025

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE AND REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. DANYELL MEYERS V. CRAIG MEYERS

22FL0451

On March 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was mail served on March 13th along with all other required documents. This is a post-judgment request for modification of custody and visitation orders; therefore, Petitioner filed a Declaration Regarding Address Verification on April 3, 2025, in accordance with Family Code section 215.

Respondent filed an RFO on March 18th seeking orders for child support, spousal support, custody, and visitation, along with orders regarding the parties' financial agreements and credits. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail served on March 18th.

Respondent and Petitioner each filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on March 25th.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed a Notice of Motion for modification of child support on March 25th. The issue is set for a contested hearing on July 28, 2025 on the DCSS calendar.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 2, 2025. It was mail served on April 1st.

Petitioner filed and served another RFO on April 17th seeking attorney's fees and costs. She filed and served another Income and Expense Declaration the same day.

Respondent filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on April 18th.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 20th, which appears to have been incorrectly file endorsed with the date March 20th. It was mail served on May 16th.

DCSS filed another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 21, 2025. It was mail served on May 20th.

Respondent filed two Responsive Declaration to Request for Order forms on May 23rd. Petitioner objected to these documents as untimely. The objection is sustained. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all opposition papers are to be filed no later than nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 May 22, 2025 the last day for filing Respondent’s Responsive Declarations.

Respondent filed a Declaration on May 27, 2025. The court deems this to be a Reply declaration and therefore, it has been considered.

Petitioner is requesting the following: (1) Each party to abstain from alcohol or any other non-prescribed mind altering substances at least 12 hours prior to, and during, their parenting time; (2) Neither party may expose the minor children to third parties who are intoxicated or on drugs; (3) Notification to the non-custodial parent if the custodial parent seeks to take the minors outside of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Placer County; (4) Final decision-making authority to Petitioner concerning Porter’s health; (5) The parties to notify one another if they travel with the minors to an area without cell service, even if it is within the tri-county area; (6) A default parenting schedule to be triggered if Respondent violates any court orders; (7) Admonishment of Respondent for making unilateral decisions regarding Porter’s health; (8) Each party to refrain from discussing the case with Porter. She also requests attorney’s fees in the amount of \$5,500 pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

Respondent is requesting joint legal and physical custody of Porter and joint legal custody of Tyson, with Respondent to have sole physical custody. He asks that the parties continue the visitation schedule they are currently practicing, and he proposes a holiday schedule. He requests modification to the existing child support and spousal support orders.

DCSS asks that the issue of child support be continued to be heard on the child support calendar in Department 10 pursuant to Family Code section 4251.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 7, 2025. They were able to reach agreements on several of the custody and visitation issues. A report codifying the agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties on May 16th.

The court has reviewed the agreements of the parties as stated in the May 16, 2025 CCRC report and finds them to be in the best interests of the minors. They are therefore, hereby adopted as the orders of the court. In addition to the foregoing, the parties are each ordered to abstain from non-prescription drugs and alcohol for the 12 hours prior to parenting time and during their parenting time. The parties are ordered to notify one another if they are taking the minor children outside of the tri-county area (El Dorado,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Sacramento, and Placer), or if they are taking the minors anywhere that does not have phone service (even if it is within the tri-county area). The parties are admonished not to discuss the case with the youngest minor, Porter, and Respondent is admonished to abide by the court's orders regarding legal custody of the minors. Failure to abide by the court's orders may result in a change in custody orders or contempt of court. The remainder of the requests made by Petitioner and Respondent regarding custody and visitation are denied.

The request for child support is continued to join the already pending child support hearing which is set to take place on July 28, 2025 in Department 10.

Regarding the request for spousal support, this is a post-judgment request for modification of spousal support therefore the court is required to take evidence on, and make findings regarding, the Family Code § 4320 factors. Because the parties are already set for an evidentiary hearing in Department 10, in the interest of judicial economy, this issue is continued to join with the evidentiary hearing on child support which is currently set to be heard on July 28, 2025 in Department 10.

The request for attorney's fees is granted. 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 assures 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. 4th 238, 251 (2009). In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Here, Petitioner has an average monthly income of \$4,630.27 plus an additional \$1,000 in spousal support. Respondent's monthly income is \$10,167. Even considering Petitioner's spousal support, and the fact that Respondent is only receiving unemployment compensation, there is still a disparity in income and the court finds Respondent has the ability to pay. As such, Respondent is ordered to pay \$5,500 directly to Petitioner's attorney as and for attorney's fees and costs. This amount may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$500 commencing on June 15, 2025 and continuing on the 15th of each month until paid in full. If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT HAS REVIEWED THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS STATED IN THE MAY 16, 2025 CCRC REPORT AND FINDS THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THEY ARE THEREFORE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING, THE PARTIES ARE EACH ORDERED TO ABSTAIN FROM NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND ALCOHOL FOR THE 12 HOURS PRIOR TO PARENTING TIME AND DURING THEIR PARENTING TIME. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO NOTIFY ONE ANOTHER IF THEY ARE TAKING THE MINOR CHILDREN OUTSIDE OF THE TRI-COUNTY AREA (EL DORADO, SACRAMENTO, AND PLACER), OR IF THEY ARE TAKING THE MINORS ANYWHERE THAT DOES NOT HAVE PHONE SERVICE (EVEN IF IT IS WITHIN THE TRI-COUNTY AREA). THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED NOT TO DISCUSS THE CASE WITH THE YOUNGEST MINOR, PORTER, AND RESPONDENT IS ADMONISHED TO ABIDE BY THE COURT'S ORDERS REGARDING LEGAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE COURT'S ORDERS MAY RESULT IN A CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS OR CONTEMPT OF COURT. THE REMAINDER OF THE REQUESTS MADE BY PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT REGARDING CUSTODY AND VISITATION ARE DENIED.

THE REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT IS CONTINUED TO JOIN THE ALREADY PENDING CHILD SUPPORT HEARING WHICH IS SET TO TAKE PLACE ON JULY 28, 2025 IN DEPARTMENT 10.

REGARDING THE REQUEST FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT, THIS ISSUE IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON CHILD SUPPORT WHICH IS CURRENTLY SET TO BE HEARD ON JULY 28, 2025 IN DEPARTMENT 10.

RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY \$5,500 DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY AS AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$500 COMMENCING ON JUNE 15, 2025 AND CONTINUING ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL. IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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 5, 2025

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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. CARLOS ROMAN V. NICI GEE

24FL0572

On March 24, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. The RFO was mail served on March 25th along with all other required documents.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 16, 2025.

Respondent is not asking to change the current support orders however, she is asking the court to order Petitioner to pay one-half of the childcare costs, and out-of-pocket medical, dental, and therapy for the children pursuant to Family Code § 4062(a).

While Petitioner recognizes that childcare costs and uninsured healthcare costs are add-ons to base child support, he asks the court to phase in any such order to avoid undue hardship. He also asks the court to account for the totality of his court-mandated expenses and consider the outcome of the pending hearing when determining his financial obligations.

Family Code § 4062 directs the court to order, as additional child support, (1) all childcare costs which are related to employment or reasonably necessary education of the custodial parent; and (2) all reasonable uninsured healthcare costs for the children.

In light of the Section 4062 mandate, Respondent's request for child support add-ons is granted. The parties are ordered to equally split all out-of-pocket, uninsured, medical, dental and therapy costs for the children. The parties are further ordered to equally split the costs of all childcare for the children so long as such childcare is necessitated due to the custodial parent's employment or reasonably necessary education. The parties are ordered to follow the notice and reimbursement procedures as stated in the attached FL-192.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT ADD-ONS IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SPLIT ALL OUT-OF-POCKET, UNINSURED, MEDICAL, DENTAL AND THERAPY COSTS FOR THE CHILDREN. THE PARTIES ARE FURTHER ORDERED TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE COSTS OF ALL CHILDCARE FOR THE CHILDREN SO LONG AS SUCH CHILDCARE IS NECESSITATED DUE TO THE CUSTODIAL PARENT'S EMPLOYMENT OR REASONABLY NECESSARY EDUCATION. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE NOTICE AND REIMBURSEMENT

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

PROCEDURES AS STATED IN THE ATTACHED FL-192. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

Your child support order may include a provision for payment of childcare or uninsured health care costs. Childcare costs may be included as part of the monthly child support payment or reimbursable as a percentage of the costs. If the childcare costs are included as part of the monthly child support payment, you must pay that amount each month until the court changes (modifies) the child support order. If you need to change your child support order because there has been a change in the cost of childcare, see page 2.

If you have a child support order that includes a provision for the reimbursement of a percentage of childcare costs or a portion of the child's or children's health care costs and those costs are not paid by insurance, the **law says**:

1. **Notice.** You must give the other parent an itemized statement of the charges that have been billed for any childcare costs or health care costs not paid by insurance. You must give this statement to the other parent within a reasonable time, but no more than 90 days after those costs were given to you.
2. **Proof of full payment.** If you have already paid all of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid them and (2) ask for reimbursement for the other parent's court-ordered share of those costs.
3. **Proof of partial payment.** If you have paid only your share of the childcare costs or uninsured health care costs, you must (1) give the other parent proof that you paid your share, (2) ask that the other parent pay his or her share of the costs directly to the childcare or health care provider, and (3) give the other parent the information necessary for that parent to be able to pay the bill.
4. **Payment by notified parent.** If you receive notice from a parent that a childcare or uninsured health care cost has been incurred, you must pay your share of that cost within the time the court orders; or if the court has not specified a period of time, you must make payment (1) within 30 days from the time you were given notice of the amount due, (2) according to any payment schedule set by the health care provider, (3) according to a schedule agreed to in writing by you and the other parent, or (4) according to a schedule adopted by the court.
5. **Going to court.** Sometimes parents get into disagreements about childcare and health care costs. If you and the other parent cannot resolve the situation after talking about it, you can request that the court make a decision.
 - a. **Disputed requests for payment.** If you dispute a request for payment made by the other parent, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute, but only if you pay the requested amount before filing your request.
 - b. **Nonpayment.** If you claim that the other parent has failed to pay you back for a payment, or they have failed to make a payment to the provider after proper notice, you may file a request for the court to resolve the dispute.
 - c. **Paid charges.** The court will presume that if uninsured health care costs or childcare costs for employment or necessary training for job skills have been paid, those costs were reasonable. If you want to dispute paid charges, you will have to show the court that the costs were unreasonable.
 - d. **Attorney's fees.** If the court decides one parent has been unreasonable, it can order that parent to pay the other parent's attorney's fees and costs.
 - e. **Court forms.** Use forms [FL-300](#) and [FL-490](#) to get a court date. See form [FL-300-INFO](#) for information about completing, filing, and serving your court papers.
6. **Court-ordered insurance coverage.** If a parent provides health care insurance as ordered by the court, that insurance must be used at all times to the extent that it is available for health care costs.
 - a. **Burden to prove.** The parent claiming that the coverage is inadequate to meet the child's needs has the burden of proving that to the court.
 - b. **Cost of additional coverage.** If a parent purchases health care insurance in addition to that ordered by the court, that parent must pay all the costs of the additional coverage. In addition, if a parent uses alternative coverage that costs more than the coverage provided by court order, that parent must pay the difference.
7. **Preferred health providers.** If the court-ordered coverage designates a preferred health care provider, that provider must be used at all times consistent with the terms of the health insurance policy. When any parent uses a health care provider other than the preferred provider, any health care costs that would have been paid by the preferred health provider if that provider had been used must be the sole responsibility of the parent incurring those costs.
8. **Need help?** Contact the [family law facilitator](#) in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

The court has made a child support order in your case. This order will remain the same unless one of the parents requests that the support be changed (modified). An order for child support can be modified by filing a request to change child support and serving the other parent. If both parents agree on a new child support amount, they can complete, sign, and file with the court a *Stipulation to Establish or Modify Child Support and Order* (form [FL-350](#)). (**Note:** If the local child support agency is involved in your case, it must be served with any request to change child support and approve any agreement.)

Online Self-Help Guide

For more information about how child support works, visit: <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support>.

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

The court considers several things when ordering the payment of child support.

- First, the number of children is considered, along with the percentage of time each parent has physical custody of the children.
- Next, the net disposable incomes of both parents are determined (which is how much money is left each month after taxes and certain other items like health insurance, union dues, or other child support ordered and paid are subtracted from a parent's paycheck). The court can also look at a parent's earning ability.
- The court considers both parents' tax filing status and may consider hardships, such as the cost of raising the parent's child from another relationship who lives with the parent.

A parent can request to change an existing order for child support when circumstances change significantly. For example if the net disposable income of one of the parents changes, parenting time changes, or a new child is born.

Examples

- You have been ordered to pay \$500 per month in child support. You lose your job. You will continue to owe \$500 per month, plus 10 percent interest on any unpaid support, unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a lower amount and the court orders a reduction.
- You are currently receiving \$300 per month in child support from the other parent, whose net income has just increased substantially. You will continue to receive \$300 per month unless you file a motion to modify your child support to a higher amount and the court orders an increase.
- You are paying child support based on having physical custody of your children 30 percent of the time. After several months it turns out that you actually have physical custody of the children 50 percent of the time. You may file a motion to modify child support to a lower amount.

How to Change a Child Support Order

To change a child support order, you must file papers with the court. **Remember:** You must follow the order you have now.

What forms do I need?

If you are asking to change a child support order, you must fill out one of these forms:

- Form [FL-300](#), *Request for Order or*
- Form [FL-390](#), *Notice of Motion and Motion for Simplified Modification of Order for Child, Spousal, or Family Support*

You must also fill out one of these forms, and attach proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs):

- Form [FL-150](#), *Income and Expense Declaration or*
- Form [FL-155](#), *Financial Statement (Simplified)*

What if I am not sure which forms to fill out?

Contact the family law facilitator in your county. You can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

After you fill out the forms, file them with the court clerk and ask for a hearing date. Write the hearing date on the form. The clerk may ask you to pay a filing fee. If you cannot afford the fee, fill out these forms, too:

- Form [FW-001](#), *Request to Waive Court Fees and*
- Form [FW-003](#), *Order on Court Fee Waiver (Superior Court)*

You must serve the other parent. If the local child support agency is involved, serve it too.

- This means someone 18 or over—not you—must deliver copies of your filed court forms to the other parent, at least **16 court days** before the hearing. Add **5 calendar days** if delivered by mail within California (see Code of Civil Procedure section 1005 for other situations).
- **Court days** are weekdays when the court is open for business (Monday through Friday except court holidays). **Calendar days** include all days of the month, including weekends and holidays. To find court holidays, go to: www.courts.ca.gov/holidays.htm.

Blank copies of both of these forms must also be served:

- Form [FL-320](#), *Responsive Declaration to Request for Order*
- Form [FL-150](#), *Income and Expense Declaration*

Then the server fills out and signs a *Proof of Service*. Take this form, plus one copy, to the clerk and file it at least one week before your hearing.

Go to your hearing and ask the judge to change the support.

Bring your tax returns from the last two years and your proof of income for the past two months (like your paycheck stubs). The judge will look at your information, listen to both parents, and make an order. After the hearing, fill out:

- Form [FL-340](#), *Findings and Order After Hearing and*
- Form [FL-342](#), *Child Support Information and Order Attachment*

Need help?

Contact the [family law facilitator](#) in your county or call your county's bar association and ask for an experienced family lawyer.

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

- 1. Child support.** As of September 27, 2022, child support automatically stops if the parent who has to pay is confined against their will for more than 90 days in a row in jail, prison, juvenile detention, a mental health facility, or other institution.

Exception. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay has money available to pay child support.

- 2. Past confinement.** Child support also automatically stops during past confinement if it was ordered from October 8, 2015, through December 31, 2019, or January 1, 2021, through September 26, 2022, and the parent who has to pay was confined for more than 90 days in a row during the same time frame.

Exceptions for past confinement. Child support does not automatically stop if the parent who has to pay was in jail or prison for failing to pay child support or for domestic violence against the other parent or the child, or if they had money available to pay support.

- 3. Timing.** The date child support automatically restarts will depend on the parent's release date. If you need to change your child support order, see page 2.

- a. If released before January 1, 2024,** child support automatically restarts the first day of the first full month after the parent is released.
- b. If released after January 1, 2024,** child support will automatically restart the first day of the 10th month after the parent is released.

Employment before the 10-month period ends: If the parent who has to pay support starts working before the date child support is set to automatically restart, the person who is owed support or the local child support agency can request the court restart the child support order early. The court may order a different amount of child support if appropriate.

- 4. More info.** For more information about child support and incarcerated parents, see Family Code section 4007.5 or go to <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support/incarcerated-parent>. You can also contact the family law facilitator in your county and can find them here: www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-facilitators.htm.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. JOEY SELBY V. PAUL JUDGE

23FL0851

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 17, 2024, requesting the court make orders as to spousal support, attorney's fees, and sanctions. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on January 2, 2025. At that time, the parties presented the court with an agreement which was adopted as the order of the court. A review hearing was set for March 28th; however, it was later continued to the present date. Parties were ordered to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

As of the January hearing, the parties agreed to meet and confer on discovery issues and on the sale of the property. It was further agreed that Petitioner would pay \$500 per month in spousal support and the court would reserve jurisdiction over support back to October 1, 2024. Support arrears were stayed and the court reserved jurisdiction over attorney's fees and sanctions.

On May 5, 2025, the parties filed a Stipulation and Order Re: Sale of Home at 2765 Loyal Lane; Property Division. The court has not received updating declarations regarding support arrears, attorney's fees, sanctions, or the discovery issues. Given that neither party has filed a supplemental declaration with the court updating it on the remaining issues, this matter is dropped from calendar. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS NEITHER PARTY HAS FILED A SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION WITH THE COURT. 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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. JESSICA STEPHENS V. DUSTIN CARELL-STEPHENS

PFL20170100

On March 14, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was mail served on March 18th along with all other required documents. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor. She states the minor has not had contact with Respondent in over five years.

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 Respondent. He had notice of the pending requests and chose not to 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.

In light of the foregoing, the court finds it to be in the best interest of the minor to award Petitioner sole legal and sole physical custody.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: PETITIONER SHALL HAVE SOLE LEGAL AND SOLE PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINOR. PETITIONER IS TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. AMANDA TESSANDORI V. ERIC TESSANDORI

PFL20200407

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 18, 2025, seeking modification of child support. Respondent filed a Simplified Financial Statement concurrently therewith.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: 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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. AMOR TORRES V. ROBERT NEIL TORRES

PFL20210332

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 13, 2025, seeking modification of child custody and parenting time orders, as well as modification of child and spousal support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 9, 2025, and a review hearing on June 5th. Proof of Service shows the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was served by mail on April 21, 2025. DCSS filed a Proof of Service showing service of the RFO and an Income and Expense Declaration on Petitioner and her counsel via mail on April 28, 2025. There is no Proof of Service from Respondent showing service on Petitioner. The court notes this is a post-judgement request for modification, and therefore, Family Code section 215 applies.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on April 29, 2025. Parties were served on April 28th. DCSS is providing enforcement of both child and spousal support. DCSS requests the issue of child support be continued to be heard by the child support commissioner pursuant to Family Code section 4251. DCSS does not oppose the issue of spousal support being heard concurrently with the child support request.

Parties submitted a stipulation, which the court signed and adopted as its orders on May 7, 2025. The stipulation addresses child custody, parenting plan, and child support orders. Therefore, the court finds this portion of the RFO to be moot.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration, nor an Income and Expense Declaration.

The court finds Respondent failed to properly serve Petitioner. Family Code section 215 applies as this is a post-judgement request for modification. As such, personal service is required for a request to modify permanent spousal support. Additionally, the Proof of Service provided by DCSS, does not show all the requisite documents were served. Therefore, the court drops the request to modify permanent spousal support from calendar.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE COURT FINDS THE ISSUES OF CHILD CUSTODY, PARENTING PLAN, AND CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS HAVE BEEN RESOLVED BY THE PARTIES' STIPULATION. THEREFORE, THE COURT FINDS THIS PORTION OF THE RFO TO BE MOOT. THE REQUEST TO MODIFY PERMANENT SPOUSAL SUPPORT IS DROPPED

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

FROM CALENDAR. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER 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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. ERIC WEXELMAN V. JAMAICA WEXELMAN

24FL0838

On March 6, 2025, the court set a review hearing for June 5, 2025, on the status of the sale of the former family residence. Parties were directed to file and serve Supplemental Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on May 15, 2025. It was mail served the same day. Petitioner confirms the home has been listed for sale and has a scheduled open house. Petitioner requests the court order Respondent to initiate the process of rehoming or relocating the animals currently housed on the property. Additionally, Petitioner requests the proceeds from the sale of the home be placed in a blocked account until the parties are able to reach agreements as to their distribution or further orders of the court.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on May 21, 2025. It does not address the issue of the sale of the home.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds Petitioner's requests to be appropriate. The court directs Respondent to seek to relocate or rehome the animals currently located on the property, forthwith. Upon the sale of the home, the proceeds are to be deposited into a blocked account until agreement of the parties or further order of the court.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT DIRECTS RESPONDENT TO SEEK TO RELOCATE OR REHOME THE ANIMALS CURRENTLY LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY, FORTHWITH. UPON THE SALE OF THE HOME, THE PROCEEDS ARE TO BE DEPOSITED INTO A BLOCKED ACCOUNT UNTIL AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 5, 2025

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

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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. JACK YOUNGBLOOD V. COLLEEN YOUNGBLOOD

23FL0236

On February 5, 2025, parties reached a full agreement and set this review hearing to assess compliance with the agreements. Parties were directed to file and serve Supplemental Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on May 22, 2025. It was mail served the same day. Petitioner asserts Respondent has failed to comply with the orders regarding the disposition of the former family residence as well as the orders regarding the division of the community interest in the CalPERS account.

Petitioner filed a Declaration of Counsel on May 30, 2025. The court finds this to be late filed and has not considered it.

Respondent has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the review hearing.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 21, 2025, requesting the clerk of the court serve as elisor to sign the QDRO on Respondent's behalf and for the court to enter orders as to the QDRO. Respondent was served on March 24, 2025. According to Petitioner, he advanced the entire fee to complete the QDRO and he is seeking reimbursement for Respondent's share. Petitioner requests the court order Respondent to sign the QDRO, and if she fails to do so, the clerk of the court sign on Respondent's behalf. Petitioner also seeks attorney's fees should an appearance on the RFO be required.

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

Petitioner's RFO is granted. Respondent shall sign the QDRO on or before June 9, 2025. If Respondent fails to do so, the clerk of the court is authorized to act as elisor and sign on Respondent's behalf. The court also grants Petitioner's request for reimbursement of Respondent's portion of the fees to prepare the QDRO. Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner her portion of the fee on or before June 15, 2025. The court reserves on Petitioner's request for attorney's fees.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

PETITIONER'S RFO IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT SHALL SIGN THE QDRO ON OR BEFORE JUNE 9, 2025. IF RESPONDENT FAILS TO DO SO, THE CLERK OF THE COURT IS AUTHORIZED TO ACT AS ELISOR AND SIGN ON RESPONDENT'S BEHALF. THE COURT ALSO GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF RESPONDENT'S PORTION OF THE FEES TO PREPARE THE QDRO. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER HER PORTION OF THE FEE ON OR BEFORE JUNE 15, 2025. THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. SHYLO RAE BELL V. CHRISTOPHER LOVELESS

22FL0232

On March 6, 2025, parties appeared for a hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order (RFO). The parties reached agreements as to custody, parenting time, and child support and an agreement was reached to set a review hearing in 90 days. The court adopted the parties' agreements as its orders and set a review hearing for June 5, 2025, at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court ordered parties to file and serve updated Income and Expense Declarations as well as Supplemental Declarations at least 10 days prior to the hearing. The court admonished parties that failure to do so may result in the matter being dropped from calendar.

Petitioner filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on May 28, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court cannot consider it. Respondent has not filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court finds the current orders remain in the best interest of the minor. The court drops the matter from calendar due to the failure of the parties to file Income and Expense Declarations and Supplemental Declarations.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE OF THE PARTIES TO FILE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. TIFFANY CHAVERS V. RYAN COMBS

PFL20200592

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on March 14, 2025. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on the same day. The court denied the ex parte request and Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 17, 2025, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 9, 2025, and a review hearing was set for June 5th. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on March 17, 2025.

Both parties appeared for the CCRC appointment and were unable to reach a full agreement. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 16, 2025, and mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the May 16th CCRC report are in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 16TH CCRC REPORT ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON

23FL0077

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on November 25, 2024. On November 26, 2024, the court denied the request and referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on December 10, 2024. A review hearing was set for January 16, 2025. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 26, 2024, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on November 26, 2024.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment on December 10th. As such a single parent report was filed on December 16, 2024. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed two Declarations on January 6, 2024. Proof of Service shows they were mailed to Respondent on January 3, 2025. Petitioner asserts he missed the CCRC appointment because he was too emotionally distraught to attend due to being served with a restraining order. Petitioner states he was served on December 4, 2024. In his Supplemental Declaration, Petitioner requests the court appoint minors' counsel, order Respondent to have supervised parenting time at her sole cost, and various other orders.

On January 16, 2025, the court ordered the following: Minors Counsel, Sarah Kukuza was appointed to represent the minors. Parties were ordered to share the costs of Minors Counsel equally, subject to reallocation. Respondent's parenting time was ordered to be professionally supervised one time per week for two hours. The court further ordered that no other individuals be present during Respondent's parenting time. Respondent was ordered to be solely responsible for the costs of professionally supervised visitation. Respondent was ordered not to bring gifts, under any circumstances, including holidays and birthdays for the minors. If Respondent appears to be under the influence of any intoxicating substance, the court authorized the visit to be cancelled. The court rereferred the parties to CCRC. The minors were ordered to be made available to the CCRC Counselor for interview upon the counselor's request. The court set a further review hearing on the present date. Any Supplemental Declarations were ordered to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the hearing. Petitioner was ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$50 for the failure to attend CCRC on December 10th. Payment was to be made on or before January 30, 2025.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on April 2, 2025. Respondent and Minor's Counsel were served the same day. Petitioner requests the current orders remain in full force and effect.

Both parties and the minors participated in the CCRC appointment. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on April 4, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties and Minors' Counsel the same day.

Petitioner filed an Objection to the CCRC report on April 11, 2025. Parties were served with the Objection the same day.

Minors' Counsel filed a Declaration on April 16, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document. Minors' Counsel is requesting the matter be continued to allow additional time to meet and confer with the parties as well as their counsel, and to meet with the minors again.

Parties appeared for the hearing on April 17, 2025. The court found good cause to continue the hearing to allow Minors' Counsel additional time to complete further investigation.

Petitioner filed a Declaration and Memorandum of Points and Authorities on May 21, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent and Minors' Counsel were mail served the same day.

Neither Respondent nor Minors' Counsel have filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court finds it needs further input from Minors' Counsel, as such, parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. ALEJANDRA ORTIZ V. WELFRED ORTIZ

23FL0131

Each party filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 18, 2025, both of which are seeking orders for child custody and parenting time. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 21, 2025. Upon review of the court file, neither party served the other their respective RFO.

Both parties appeared for the CCRC appointment on March 21st. They were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on April 28, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Parties appeared for the hearing on May 15, 2025, despite neither party requesting oral argument. Unfortunately, there was not a Spanish language interpreter available to assist the parties. Therefore, the court continued the hearing to June 5, 2025 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court ordered a Spanish interpreter be available for the continued hearing.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed with reaching the matter on the merits, as both parties appeared for CCRC and fully participated. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the April 28th CCRC report to be in the best interest of minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH REACHING THE MATTER ON THE MERITS, AS BOTH PARTIES APPEARED FOR CCRC AND FULLY PARTICIPATED. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE APRIL 28TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 5, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. ASHLEY RITTERS V. RYAN SMITH

PFL20180345

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 21, 2025, requesting modification of the current parenting plan orders as well as a holiday schedule. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 10, 2025, and a review hearing on June 5, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent and Minor's Counsel were mail served on March 24, 2025. Petitioner filed an Address Verification for Respondent in accordance with Family code section 215.

Both parties and the minor participated in the CCRC appointment on April 10th. A report containing the parties' agreements was filed with the court on March 15, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 19, 2025. Petitioner and Minor's Counsel were served on May 20th. Respondent requests the court adopt his proposed holiday schedule and leave all other orders in place.

Minor's Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on May 22, 2025. Parties were served on May 22nd. Minor's Counsel requests all current orders remain in full force and effect.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on May 29, 2025. Both parties were served the same day.

Respondent filed a Supplemental/Reply Declaration on May 29, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document, and therefore, the court has not considered it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the current orders remain in the minor's best interest. The court adopts the agreements of the parties as set forth in the May 15th CCRC report.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 15TH CCRC REPORT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

June 5, 2025

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 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. LORRAINE SEBREN V. ERNEST SEBREN

PFL20200288

On April 10, 2025, the court set a review hearing on June 5, 2025, to determine the progress of removing Petitioner from the mortgage of the home on Shell Lane. The court reserved on Petitioner's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions until the June 5th hearing.

Respondent filed a Declaration on May 13, 2025, showing the mortgage for 501 Shell Lane has a zero balance. Petitioner was electronically served on May 13th.

There have been no new filings from Petitioner.

The court finds Respondent has complied with the court's order to have Petitioner removed from the mortgage on the Shell Lane property by the mortgage being paid in full. The court declines making orders for sanctions pursuant to Family Code section 271.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RUIING #19: THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE COURT'S ORDER TO HAVE PETITIONER REMOVED FROM THE MORTGAGE ON THE SHELL LANE PROPERTY BY THE MORTGAGE BEING PAID IN FULL. THE COURT DECLINES MAKING ORDERS FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE SECTION 271. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. DANIEL STEVENSON V. MAUDENA STEVENSON

24FL0166

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 11, 2025, requesting temporary guideline spousal support. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was mail served with the RFO and Income and Expense Declaration on April 14, 2025. The court finds Petitioner was not served with all the necessary documents.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. RUSSELL TABAYOYON V. ROBIN TABAYOYON

23FL0903

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support on February 19, 2025. Respondent did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Respondent appeared for the hearing on April 17, 2025 and requested a continuance to allow him time to file an Income and Expense Declaration as well as properly serve Petitioner. The court granted the request to continue and set the matter for a further review hearing on June 5, 2025 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Upon review of the court file, there have been no new filings since the April 17th hearing.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to the failure to properly serve Petitioner and the failure to concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE PETITIONER AND THE FAILURE TO CONCURRENTLY FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. 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.