

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**1. JACINTA LASHAE BADELITA V. BOGDANEL BADELITA**

**22FL0797**

On January 22, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders to travel to Romania. It was served the same day, however Respondent did not serve the requisite blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling as required. The parties appeared for the hearing on April 9<sup>th</sup>, at which time Respondent requested a continuance to perfect service. The request was granted and the matter was continued to June 11, 2026. On June 11<sup>th</sup>, Respondent once again requested a continuance and Petitioner requested \$1,500 in Section 271 sanctions. The request for a continuance was denied. The request for sanctions was continued to join with the present hearing date which had already been set to address Petitioner's RFO.

On April 15, 2026, Petitioner filed an RFO seeking orders regarding the transfer of the Barcelona property to Petitioner and sanctions. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and a Declaration of Attorney Amber White concurrently therewith. All required documents, with the exception of a blank FL-320, were served on April 23, 2026.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on June 29, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration, a Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner, and a Supplemental Declaration of Attorney Amber White on July 2, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting an order for Respondent to sign and notarize an Interspousal Transfer Deed for the transfer of the Barcelona residence within 48 hours of the court's order. She further asks that Respondent be ordered to sign and notarize any other documents necessary to transfer the Barcelona property to Petitioner within one (1) week of the request for signature. If Respondent fails to comply, Petitioner asks that the court clerk be authorized to sign any such documents as elisor. Finally, Petitioner requests attorney's fees and sanctions in an amount no less than \$10,000, to be paid from the remainder of the \$100,000 owed to Respondent by Petitioner. Finally, she requests sanctions in the amount of \$1,500 pursuant to Family Code § 271 for the necessity of defending two hearings on Respondent's RFO.

Respondent objects to the RFO on the basis that the required blank FL-320 was not served. He asks that the RFO be dropped and he be awarded \$10,000 in sanctions due to the faulty service. He further asks the court to deny Petitioner's requests.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

According to Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration, she has received and recorded the original signed deed thereby completing transfer of the marital residence into her name only. She acknowledges that her requests regarding transfer of the property are now moot but asks that the court proceed with her requests for sanctions. She also states that the blank FL-320 was served on June 30<sup>th</sup>, immediately when the issue was brought to counsel's attention.

The court declines to rule on the requests regarding the transfer of the marital residence as the requests are now moot.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on the issue of sanctions.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**2. DANIELLA BROUGHER V. ROBERT BROUGHER**

**PFL20210176**

*Order to Show Cause*

On April 29, 2026, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging two counts of contempt. It was personally served on May 5, 2026 along with all other required documents.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

*Request for Order*

On April 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking visitation orders. It was personally served on May 5<sup>th</sup>, however Respondent did not serve the required Notice of Tentative Ruling or a blank FL-320.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 1<sup>st</sup>. It was served on May 26<sup>th</sup> along with an FL-300 however the court does not have an FL-300 filed by Petitioner.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 4, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements so a report with recommendations was prepared on June 30, 2026 and mailed to the parties on July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Respondent is requesting an order allowing the minor to transfer from Sutter's Mill Elementary School to Northside Elementary School. He further requests modification to the parenting schedule.

Petitioner opposes Respondent's request for a school change and increased parenting time. Instead, she asks that she be allowed to increase her parenting time with the minor.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the recommendations contained in the June 30, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Additionally, the minor is to be enrolled in Northside Elementary School for the 2026-2027 school year.

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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT ON THE OSC.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JUNE 30, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE MINOR IS TO BE ENROLLED IN NORTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR THE 2026-2027 SCHOOL YEAR.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**3. DESERIE FINLEY V. RYAN NUTTING**

**25FL0988**

On April 22, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were served on May 6, 2026.

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

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 5, 2026. They were able to reach some agreements but could not agree on all issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on June 10, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration to CCRC Report on July 10<sup>th</sup>. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all reply papers are to be filed at least five court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, “[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made July 9<sup>th</sup> the last day for filing Petitioner’s reply. Therefore, it is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody. She asks that Respondent have only professionally supervised, non-overnight, visits. She further requests an order prohibiting Respondent from transporting the minor with a firearm in his vehicle unless secured in accordance with California gun laws. In the event the minor ever visits Respondent’s home, Petitioner asks that all firearms and ammunition in Respondent’s home be secured in accordance with California gun laws. She further requests an order for the parents to communicate using Talking Parents and an order precluding the parents from disparaging one another in the presence of the minor or allowing others to do so. Finally, she asks that the parties be ordered to administer all prescribed medications in accordance with the prescription.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JUNE 10, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**4. EDC DCSS V. MICHAEL D. FORSSELL**

**23FL1043**

On April 16, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on May 18, 2026. Neither party appeared at CCRC and there is no Proof of Service for the RFO or the CCRC referral.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #4: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**5. APRIL ROBINSON V. GORDON ROBINSON**

**PFL20210147**

On April 9, 2026 Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking enforcement of the Judgment and reimbursements. All required documents were personally served on April 29<sup>th</sup> in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 2, 2026.

On July 8<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Petitioner in Opposition to Respondent's Request for Order, and her Income and Expense Declaration. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made July 2<sup>nd</sup> the last day for filing Petitioner's opposition therefore Petitioner's July 8<sup>th</sup> declaration is late filed. Despite the late filing, Petitioner asks the court to consider her declaration and states she would not object to the court allowing Respondent a reasonable opportunity to respond to the contents of the declaration.

Respondent is requesting an order for the immediate sale of the community residence located at 1100 Campbell Court in Rescue. He asks that he be given sole control over the sale and for the clerk to be appointed as elisor. He requests reimbursements from the sale proceeds in accordance with the Judgment for *Watts* charges, HOA costs, property taxes, pool maintenance, health insurance costs (Ollie Health), unreimbursed healthcare costs, and Petitioner's credit card bill, with an offset for Respondent's half of the homeowner's insurance, which totals \$103,810.34 in credits to Respondent. Finally, he asks for \$7,500 in sanctions pursuant to Civil Code § 1717 and Family Code § 271.

As of the time of filing her responsive declaration, Petitioner stated she was still in the process of gathering communications between the parties. She opposes the orders requested.

Given Petitioner's late filing, this matter is continued to Thursday, October 1<sup>st</sup> at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the continued hearing date.



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5: GIVEN PETITIONER'S LATE FILING, THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1<sup>ST</sup> AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**6. MARIO RODRIGUEZ V. BRITTNEY SORIANO**

**26FL0127**

On February 11, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It was personally served on March 18<sup>th</sup> along with all other required documents.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 13<sup>th</sup>. It was served on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Only Petitioner attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 16, 2026. As such, a single parent report was prepared without recommendations. It was sent to the parties on May 4, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served a reply declaration and a supplemental declaration on May 7<sup>th</sup>.

Given that Respondent missed the initial CCRC appointment, the parties were re-referred and both of them attended the reset appointment on May 20<sup>th</sup>. They were able to reach several agreements but could not agree on all issues therefore a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on May 20, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor.

Respondent states that she is not looking to restrict Petitioner's time with the minor but she asserts several requests which she argues are necessary to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the minor.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the May 20, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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 #6: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 20, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**7. SUSAN J. RONNBACK SMART V. CHARLES A. SMART III**

**23FL0467**

On April 17, 2026, counsel for Petitioner filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. The motion was served on both parties on May 6, 2026.

Counsel states that there has been an irreparable breakdown of the attorney-client relationship due to Petitioner's failure to comply with the Retainer Agreement. The motion is granted pursuant to *Aceves v. Sup. Ct.*, 51 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 584 (1996) which states that the court may rely on Counsel's representation that there is a conflict, or that the attorney-client relationship has suffered an unrepairable breakdown, without knowing the underlying facts behind those statements. Withdrawal will be effective as of the date of filing the Proof of Service of the formal, signed order upon the client.

**TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE MOTION TO BE RELIEVED AS COUNSEL IS GRANTED. WITHDRAWAL WILL BE EFFECTIVE AS OF THE DATE OF FILING PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE FORMAL, SIGNED ORDER UPON THE CLIENT.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**8. JEREMIAS SMITH V. NICOLE HAMPTON**

**25FL0954**

This matter came before the court for a review hearing on April 16, 2026 at which time the court made custody and visitation orders as well as orders regarding attorney's fees and sanctions. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on May 18, 2026 and were able to reach agreements. A report with those agreements was prepared on May 18<sup>th</sup> and mailed to the parties on May 19<sup>th</sup>.

After reviewing the agreements contained in the May 18, 2026 CCRC report, the court finds them to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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 #8: AFTER REVIEWING THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 18, 2026 CCRC REPORT, THE COURT FINDS THEM TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**10. LISA THOMASON V. LOUIS MOLAKIDES**

**PFL20210494**

Petitioner began a campaign of filing Requests for Order (RFOs) on April 22, 2026. On that date Petitioner filed an RFO requesting modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as attorney's fees, and appointment of Minors' Counsel. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on June 1, 2026 and a review hearing on July 16, 2026. Concurrent to the RFO, Petitioner filed multiple Declarations as well as a request for judicial notice. The court notes, Petitioner's RFO is 193 pages. The court cannot locate a Proof of Service which corresponds to these filings.

Petitioner then filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on April 30, which included a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declarations of Michale Whittaker, and two additional Declarations. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on April 30<sup>th</sup>. On May 1, 2026, the court denied Petitioner's ex parte request.

Petitioner filed yet another ex parte application on May 5, 2026, requesting an Order Shortening Time (OST). Again, Petitioner filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and multiple Declarations. Petitioner's filings are extremely lengthy, exceeding 100 pages. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 5, 2026. Petitioner then filed a Reply Declaration on May 5<sup>th</sup>. The court denied the OST and May 6<sup>th</sup>.

On May 11, 2026, Respondent filed and served an Objection to Petitioner's April 22, 2026 filed RFO for violating California Rule of Court 3.113 (d), California Rule of Court 5.113 (c), and Code of Civil Procedure § 435. Further, Respondent asserts he was not properly served with the RFO.

On May 18, 2026, Petitioner filed two applications for orders for leave to file Points and Authorities and Declarations exceeding 15 pages. Both requests were denied.

On May 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a Declaration in Response to Respondent's Objection. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service which corresponds to this filing; therefore, it has not been considered.

On May 22, 2026, Petitioner filed another declaration, for which there is no Proof of Service, and therefore, has not been considered.

Petitioner again filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on May 28, 2026, along with an application for reconsideration, and additional Declarations and a

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Memorandum of Points and Authorities. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 28<sup>th</sup>. On May 29<sup>th</sup> the court again denied Petitioner's request for ex parte orders.

On June 3, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, attorney's fees and costs, appointment of Minor's Counsel, and reconsideration of her request for leave to file an extended Memorandum of Points and Authorities. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of her RFO. Both documents were electronically served on June 3<sup>rd</sup> however Petitioner did not serve the required blank FL-320 or the required Notice of Tentative Ruling.

On June 25<sup>th</sup>, Respondent filed Objections on Lack of Timely Service and Request to Drop. According to Respondent, as of June 24, 2026, he had not received a copy of the pending RFO. He argues that service on that date or any later date is untimely and therefore, he requests the matter be dropped.

Petitioner filed yet another ex parte application on June 25, 2026. Petitioner again filed multiple Declarations and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities. Petitioner also filed a Response to Respondent's Objection. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 25, 2026. The court again denied the ex parte orders on June 26, 2026.

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on June 26, 2026. Again, Petitioner filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and a Declaration in support of the request. Petitioner then filed a supplemental Declaration and Supplemental Points and Authorities on June 29, 2026. The court again denied Petitioner's ex parte requests and cautioned Petitioner that continued abuse of ex parte filings may result in sanctions or the court deeming Petitioner to be a vexations litigant.

Both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment. The parties were able to reach some agreements. The report does not contain any recommendations, as there is a current Temporary Domestic Violence Restraining Order in place, which is pending a hearing on July 23, 2026. A report with the parties agreements was prepared on June 29, 2026 and mailed to the parties on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed a Proof of Service on July 2, 2026, which purports to show service on May 18, 2026, by mail of an FL-300 with attachments, and declarations, and a long cause hearing declaration. However, it does not show all the required documents were served on Respondent. The court has serious doubts as to the veracity of this Proof of Service.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner filed an Opposition to Respondent's Objection and Request to Drop on July 6, 2026. She concurrently filed a Declaration in Support of the Opposition. Both were served on July 6<sup>th</sup>.

Petitioner filed another Proof of Service on July 6, 2026, showing service of an FL-300, Attachment 7 to Request for Order, Declaration of Lisa Whitaker, Declaration of Monty Whitaker, Request for Long-Cause Hearing and Notice of Related Proceedings. As set forth above, with the number of filings in this action, it is impossible to know which FL-300 this Proof of Service correlates with and regardless, Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states: "Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California..." Electronic service extends the 16 days by two additional days. This would have made June 21, 2026 the last day for electronic service.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court again strongly cautions Petitioner that such a pattern of filings, as well as continuing to file documents of excessive length, may result in Petitioner being sanctioned and/or Petitioner being deemed a vexatious litigant.

The court finds the agreements reached by the parties in the CCRC appointment to be in the best interests of the minors. The court finds good cause to adopt the agreements of the parties only. The court adopts the agreements of the parties as set forth in the June 29, 2026 CCRC report as its orders.

The court sustains Respondent's objections to the April 22, 2026 filed RFO. The April 22, 2026 filed RFO is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper in addition to not conforming with California Rule of Court 3.113 (d), California Rule of Court 5.113 (c), and Code of Civil Procedure § 435.

Likewise, Petitioner's June 3, 2026 filed RFO is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service. In addition to not being properly served, for failure to serve all the required documents, Petitioner failed to concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration which is a prerequisite to the request for attorney's fees. Petitioner's request for a long cause hearing is also denied.



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

As noted above, the parties are pending a hearing on July 23, 2026, in Department 8, on Petitioner's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). Petitioner has requested child custody and parenting plan orders in her application. Therefore, the parties may be referred back to CCRC at the conclusion of the hearing on the DVRO.

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 AGAIN STRONGLY CAUTIONS PETITIONER THAT SUCH A PATTERN OF FILINGS, AS WELL AS CONTINUING TO FILE DOCUMENTS OF EXCESSIVE LENGTH, MAY RESULT IN PETITIONER BEING SANCTIONED AND/OR PETITIONER BEING DEEMED A VEXATIONS LITIGANT.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS REACHED BY THE PARTIES IN THE CCRC APPOINTMENT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO ADOPT THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES ONLY. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 29, 2026 CCRC REPORT.**

**THE COURT SUSTAINS RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIONS TO THE APRIL 22, 2026 FILED RFO. THE APRIL 22, 2026 FILED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE AS WELL AS FOR NOT CONFORMING WITH CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 3.113 (D), CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 5.113 (C), AND CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE § 435.**

**LIKEWISE, PETITIONER'S JUNE 3, 2026 FILED RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. IN ADDITION TO NOT BEING PROPERLY SERVED, FOR FAILURE TO SERVE ALL THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS, PETITIONER FAILED TO CONCURRENTLY FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WHICH IS A PREREQUISITE TO THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A LONG CAUSE HEARING IS ALSO DENIED.**

**AS NOTED ABOVE, THE PARTIES ARE PENDING A HEARING ON JULY 23, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 8, ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER (DVRO). PETITIONER HAS REQUESTED CHILD CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN ORDERS IN HER APPLICATION. THEREFORE, THE PARTIES MAY BE REFERRED BACK TO CCRC AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING ON THE DVRO.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 16, 2026

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

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**11. EDC DCSS V. CODY MAKOA TURNBALL (OTHER PARENT: RILEY POTTER;  
GUARDIANS: DONIELLE WILSON-POTTER AND THOMAS POTTER) 23FL1273**

On April 23, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO or any of the other required documents however Respondent, Other Parent and Guardian Donielle Wilson-Potter appeared at Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 4, 2026. Mrs. Wilson-Potter declined to move forward with the CCRC appointment as Department 8 has already made orders as to custody and visitation and CCRC could not make recommendations.

Guardians filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 25, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service. Even if the court were to reach the matter on the merits, it would be denied as Department 8 has already made custody and visitation orders.

**TENTATIVE RULING #11: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 16, 2026

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**12. RILEY BEBITA V. NICHOLAS BEBITA**

**26FL0071**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 5, 2026, seeking custody and parenting time orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on March 4, 2026, and a review hearing on April 30, 2026.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on April 30, 2026, and requested the matter be continued to allow additional time to properly serve Respondent. Petitioner confirmed Respondent is on active duty in the military and is currently deployed. The court granted the request to continue the matter and rereferred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on June 8, 2026, and set a further review hearing for July 16, 2026.

Respondent was personally served all required documents, including the Petition and Summons, on April 30, 2026. Respondent was subsequently personally served with the amended referral to CCRC, changing the appointment to June 11<sup>th</sup>.

Only Petitioner appeared at the June 11, 2026, CCRC appointment. A single parent report was lodged with the court on June 11, 2026 and mailed to the parties the same day. Respondent's copies were returned by the Postal Service.

The court is concerned about Respondent's ability to participate fully in the proceedings given his current active-duty status. As such, under the Servicemembers Relief Act (50 USC §§§ 3901-4026) the court appoints counsel to Respondent. Kelly Bentley is appointed to Respondent. The court finds good cause to continue the matter to allow counsel to contact Respondent to determine his position as to a stay of these proceedings. The court sets the matter for a further review hearing on Thursday, October 1<sup>st</sup> at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Pending the review hearing, the court grants Petitioner temporary sole legal and physical custody of the minor pursuant to Family Code § 3047.

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 #12: PURSUANT TO THE SERVICEMEMBERS RELIEF ACT (50 USC §§§ 3901-4026) THE COURT APPOINTS COUNSEL TO RESPONDENT. KELLY BENTLEY IS APPOINTED TO RESPONDENT. THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE MATTER TO ALLOW COUNSEL TO CONTACT RESPONDENT TO DETERMINE HIS POSITION AS TO A STAY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS. THE COURT SETS THE MATTER FOR**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1<sup>ST</sup> AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING, THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER TEMPORARY SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINOR PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 3047.**

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**14. JENNIFER DANIELS V. JOSE CARRERO**

**PFL20170812**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 1, 2026, requesting clarification of the current orders regarding communication with the minor and appointment of Minor's Counsel. The request was served concurrently with a request for an Order Shortening Time (OST). Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on June 1, 2026. The court denied the request for an OST and set the matter in the regular course. Petitioner was served on June 2, 2026.

Respondent filed a second RFO on June 11, 2026, requesting to change the trial dates. Petitioner was served on June 16, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on July 1, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner is not opposed to continuing the trial dates.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #14: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**15. STEPHEN HARRINGTON V. MICHELE HARRINGTON**

**25FL1230**

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 13, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, child and spousal support, as well as an order setting aside the default. Respondent did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration previously on April 8, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served with some, but not all the required documents on April 14, 2026.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and reached full agreements. A copy of the parties' agreements was filed with the court on June 3, 2026 and mailed to the parties the same day.

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

The court finds good cause to proceed with the custody and parenting plan portion of the RFO only as both parties appeared at CCRC and reached full agreements. The court drops the remaining requests due to the lack of proper service.

The court finds the parties' agreements to be in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the parties' agreements as set forth in the June 3<sup>rd</sup> CCRC report.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THE CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN PORTION OF THE RFO ONLY, AS BOTH PARTIES APPEARED AT CCRC AND REACHED FULL AGREEMENTS. THE COURT DROPS THE REMAINING REQUESTS DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.**

**THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 3<sup>RD</sup> CCRC REPORT.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY**



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 16, 2026

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

**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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**16. ASHLEY HIGHTREE V. JEFFREY MCQUARY**

**25FL0021**

On November 13, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as child support orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith and the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). Both documents were served on November 18, 2025, however there is no indication that the CCRC referral was served and Respondent did not appear at the scheduled CCRC appointment.

On December 19, 2025, Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Ashley Hightree in Support of Request for Visitation Orders.

The parties attended CCRC on March 13, 2026, and were able to reach agreements as to custody and visitation. A report codifying those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties the same day.

On March 25<sup>th</sup>, Petitioner filed another RFO seeking attorney's fees and a continuance of the trial date. She concurrently filed a Declaration of Attorney Rebecca Esty-Burke in Support of Petitioner's Request for Order. All required documents, with the exception of the Notice of the Tentative Ruling, were served on April 8<sup>th</sup>. While this generally would have been untimely service, Petitioner obtained ex parte leave to have the matter heard on a shortened basis. The request was granted and Respondent's time to file a responsive declaration was extended to April 20<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 14<sup>th</sup>.

Respondent filed another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 16<sup>th</sup>. It appears both were served on April 14, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Declaration of Ron McQuary on April 15, 2026. It was served the same day.

Parties appeared for the hearing on April 23, 2026. The court continued the custody and parenting plan portion of the hearing and rereferred the parties to CCRC. The court set a further review hearing for July 16, 2026. The court adopted the remainder of its tentative ruling.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Both parties attended the CCRC appointment on May 29, 2026. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on May 29, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on June 12, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner makes requests regarding the parenting plan and custody orders, including that Respondent provide 30 days' notice for his parenting time in California.

Respondent filed two declarations on July 6, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for either declaration, therefore, the court cannot consider them.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements contained in the March 13, 2026 CCRC report and the recommendations in the May 29<sup>th</sup> CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. To be clear, all of Respondent's parenting time is to take place in California.

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 #16: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 13, 2026 CCRC AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE MAY 29<sup>TH</sup> CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. TO BE CLEAR, ALL OF RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME IS TO TAKE PLACE IN CALIFORNIA.**

**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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 16, 2026

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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**17. SARAH LESTER V. JASON LESTER**

**23FL1169**

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

On May 7, 2026, the court found Respondent does not qualify for the services of the Public Defender. The court continued the matter to allow Respondent additional time to secure counsel. Respondent waived time to a speedy trial.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

**TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERD TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT.**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**18. AVERELLE ROBBINS V. KEVIN MEDEIROS**

**26FL0412**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 4, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as child support orders. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 4, 2026, and a review hearing on July 16, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at CCRC and reached a full agreement. The parties submitted a stipulation which the court adopted as its order regarding custody and the parenting plan on June 8, 2026, and again on June 23, 2026. The court deems the custody and parenting plan portion of the RFO to be moot.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on May 8, 2026. Both were served on Petitioner on May 8<sup>th</sup>.

As 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. Petitioner has failed to do so in the present matter, therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar due to Petitioner’s failure to file and serve the necessary documents.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

**TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT FINDS THE CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN PORTION OF THE RFO TO BE MOOT. THE COURT DROPS THE REQUEST FOR CHILD SUPPORT FROM CALENDAR DUE TO PETITIONER’S FAILURE TO FILE AND SERVE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENT. 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**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 16, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

**PFL20200099**

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

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

Respondent filed another RFO on January 16, 2026.

On February 13, 2026, Respondent filed a Proof of Service indicating service of an “FL300, ex parte” and an “FL300.” There are currently three RFOs pending before the court and the Proof of Service does not specify which one was served. Additionally, the Notice of Tentative Ruling was not served, nor was a blank Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

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

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

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

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

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

On June 18, 2026, the office of the Public Defender declared an overwork conflict and they were thanked and relieved. The court appointed the office of the Alternate Public Defender to Petitioner and once again continued the arraignment.

The parties are ordered to appear on the RFO.

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



LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**20. JAYCEE THOMAS V. HUNTER MEANS**

**23FL0177**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 1, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as a change in venue to Sutter County. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 3, 2026, and a review hearing on July 16, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on May 15, 2026. The court notes this is a post-judgement request for modification, which requires compliance with Family Code section 215.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and reached full agreements. The parties submitted a stipulation and order to the court on June 3, 2026. The court has not signed the order, as there was additional handwritten language which had not been initialed by the parties.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court finds the agreement of the parties as set forth in the June 3, 2026, stipulation to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the stipulation, including the additional handwritten language, as no party has filed an objection to the handwritten portion of the stipulation, as its orders. The court will sign and adopt the stipulation as its order.

As to the request to change venue, the court finds the RFO was not properly served on Respondent. Family Code section 215 requires personal service on all post judgement requests for modification, other than for child custody or child support orders, which requires address verification if the service is by mail. Petitioner served Respondent via mail. The court finds Respondent was not properly served with the request, and therefore, drops the request to change venue from calendar.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 3, 2026, STIPULATION TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE STIPULATION, INCLUDING THE ADDITIONAL HANDWRITTEN LANGUAGE, AS NO PARTY HAS FILED AN OBJECTION TO THE HANDWRITTEN PORTION OF THE STIPULATION, AS ITS ORDERS. THE COURT WILL SIGN AND ADOPT THE STIPULATION AS ITS ORDER.**

**AS TO THE REQUEST TO CHANGE VENUE, THE COURT FINDS THE RFO WAS NOT PROPERLY SERVED ON RESPONDENT. FAMILY CODE SECTION 215 REQUIRES PERSONAL SERVICE ON ALL POST JUDGEMENT REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION,**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**OTHER THAN FOR CHILD CUSTODY OR CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS, WHICH REQUIRES ADDRESS VERIFICATION IF THE SERVICE IS BY MAIL. PETITIONER SERVED RESPONDENT VIA MAIL SERVICE WITHOUT ADDRESS VERIFICATION. THE COURT FINDS RESPONDENT WAS NOT PROPERLY SERVED WITH THE REQUEST, AND THEREFORE, DROPS THE REQUEST TO CHANGE VENUE FROM CALENDAR.**

**ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE 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  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**21. ADRIANA YANEZ V. JULIAN SILVA**

**26FL0113**

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 6, 2026, seeking child custody and child support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 23, 2026, and a review hearing on April 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with some of the required documents on February 21, 2026. Respondent was not served with the referral to CCRC.

Only Petitioner appeared at CCRC on February 23, 2026. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on April 20, 2026. It was mailed to the parties the same day.

On April 23, 2026, the court adopted its tentative ruling, rereferring the parties to CCRC, and setting a review hearing on July 16<sup>th</sup>.

On May 4, 2026, the court issued an ex parte minute order changing the CCRC appointment location to South Lake Tahoe. The parties were informed that they were authorized to appear by phone, and to contact the court directly to provide their current phone number to the court. Petitioner's copy was emailed to her at the email address on file. Respondent's copy was mailed to his address of record.

Neither party appeared at the CCRC appointment.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on June 29, 2026. It was served on Respondent the same day. Petitioner asserts she was never informed of the change in location of the CCRC report.

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

The court has reviewed and considered the filings as outline above. The court finds Petitioner's request for sole legal and physical custody is in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts Petitioner's request for Respondent's parenting time. Respondent must request parenting time 48 hours in advance. Respondent must specify a date and time between the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM. The parties are to agree to the location. Petitioner shall provide transportation to and from the visit.

As to Petitioner's request to modify child support, the request is denied. Petitioner asserts in her request there are child support orders in Sacramento County. As such, those orders must be modified in Sacramento County.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS  
DEPARTMENT 5  
July 16, 2026  
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 #21: THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME. RESPONDENT MUST REQUEST PARENTING TIME 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE. RESPONDENT MUST SPECIFY A DATE AND TIME BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 9:00 AM AND 6:00 PM. THE PARTIES ARE TO AGREE TO THE LOCATION. PETITIONER SHALL PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM THE VISIT.**

**AS TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT, THE REQUEST IS DENIED. PETITIONER ASSERTS IN HER REQUEST THERE ARE CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY. AS SUCH, THOSE ORDERS MUST BE MODIFIED IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY.**

**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.**