

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. OMAR ATEBAR V. MINA ATEBAR

PFL20140638

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and child support. Ultimately, the parties agreed to set an evidentiary hearing which took place on May 5, 2026. At that time, the court found that there was not a preponderance of the evidence to establish abuse and the parties were awarded joint legal and joint physical custody of the minor. The parties were referred back to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Respondent filed a declaration on June 4, 2026. It was served on Petitioner however there is no Proof of Service for Minor's Counsel therefore the court cannot read or consider this document.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 12, 2026 and were able to reach some agreements. While the parties could not agree on all issues, the CCRC counselor was unable to give recommendations until the minor could be interviewed. A report with the agreements only was prepared on June 29, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on June 30th.

Respondent filed her Income and Expense Declaration on July 9th. Again, it was only served on Petitioner, not Minor's Counsel therefore the court cannot consider it.

Minor's Counsel filed Minor's Counsel Statement on July 15th. It was served on all parties on July 8th.

Petitioner has not filed a supplemental declaration. He filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on July 20th however this document is late filed and there is no Proof of Service therefore the court cannot consider it.

This matter is being re-referred to CCRC with an appointment on Wednesday, September 30th at 1:00 PM. The parties are ordered to make the minor available to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor. A review hearing is set for Thursday, November 12th at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Any supplemental declarations are due no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

Pending the review hearing, all prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS BEING RE-REFERRED TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30TH AT 1:00 PM. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MAKE THE MINOR AVAILABLE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY THE CCRC

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

COUNSELOR. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE. PENDING THE REVIEW HEARING, 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
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. ELI BRUNIUS V. STEPHANIE MILHOMME

24FL0607

On April 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as child support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either document.

The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on May 28, 2026, however neither party appeared at the scheduled appointment.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed their Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 5, 2026. DCSS filed another Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 10th, which seems to be a duplicate of their first Responsive Declaration.

On July 13, 2026, Respondent filed an Objection to Petitioner's Request for Order and Request to Strike. Respondent objects to the RFO and asks that it be stricken from the record as it was not served on her until July 2nd. The same goes for the referral to CCRC.

Respondent's objection is sustained. This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED. 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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. JAMIE GOSSETT V. JOSHUA GOSSETT

24FL1225

On May 5, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, child support orders, a seek-work order and an order for Petitioner to undergo a vocational evaluation. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served by mail on May 13, 2026. Given that this is a post-judgment request, Respondent filed a Declaration Regarding Address Verification on May 19th in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Only Respondent appeared at the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on June 12, 2026. A single parent report without recommendations was prepared on June 12th and mailed to the parties on June 15th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 10th. She filed an Amended Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 13th. She has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

On July 16th Respondent filed and served a reply declaration along with a Stipulation and Order Regarding Vocational Evaluation of Petitioner. He filed and served an Income and Expense Declaration on July 17th, the court finds this to be late filed.

The court is concerned with the late filing of Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration as well as the late filing of Petitioner's amended responsive declaration, her failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration, and her failure to appear at CCRC. That said, she is requesting a return to CCRC and states she will appear this time. As such, the parties are re-referred to CCRC with an appointment on Thursday, October 1st at 1:00 PM. A review hearing is set for Thursday, November 12th at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental declarations and updated Income and Expense Declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

Regarding the remaining issues, the court declines to rule on the request for a vocational evaluation as the parties have reached an agreement on this issue and therefore, the request is moot. The requests for a seek-work order and for child support are continued to join with the CCRC review hearing. The court reserves jurisdiction on the issue of child support back to the date of filing the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE PARTIES ARE RE-REFERRED TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1ST AT 1:00 PM. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

DECLARATIONS AND UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON THE REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AS THE PARTIES HAVE REACHED AN AGREEMENT ON THIS ISSUE AND THEREFORE THE REQUEST IS MOOT. THE REQUESTS FOR A SEEK WORK ORDER AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT ARE CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE CCRC REVIEW HEARING. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT BACK TO THE DATE OF FILING THE RFO.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO* LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF 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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. DCSS V. ERIC HILL (OTHER PARENT: ANA ROSE FERRO)

PFS20150143

On April 20, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. It is unclear if the RFO was served. There is a Proof of Service indicating service of an “FL-300, FL-305, and F-27” on April 17th but that seems to be service of the ex parte paperwork and it is unclear if the filed RFO with the hearing date on it was actually served. Regardless, there is no indication that the Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) referral form, Notice of Tentative Ruling, or blank FL-320 were served.

Despite the defect in service, both parties did participate in CCRC and they were able to reach some agreements. A report containing those agreements was prepared on June 8, 2026; it was mailed to the parties on June 9th. There are no recommendations contained in the report as the CCRC counselor was unable to make recommendations without speaking with the child.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above the court finds the agreements contained in the CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Additionally, the parties are referred back to CCRC with an appointment on Thursday, October 1st at 9:00 AM. The parties are ordered to make the minor available to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor. A review hearing is set for Thursday, November 12th at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #5: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ADDITIONALLY, THE PARTIES ARE REFERRED BACK TO CCRC WITH AN APPOINTMENT ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1ST AT 9:00 AM. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MAKE THE MINOR AVAILABLE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY THE CCRC COUNSELOR. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. DAVID KNIGHT V. AUBREY KNIGHT

23FL0645

On April 28, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders to enforce payment of the \$600,000 equalization payment and an order for the court clerk to sign the QDRO as elisor. All required documents were served by mail and electronically on April 28th, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore service was to comply with Family Code § 215. There is no Declaration Regarding Address Verification as required.

On July 8th, Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration in Support of Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. He notes that he filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on April 27th when Respondent first raised the requests via ex parte. By filing his responsive declaration and his supplemental declaration, the court finds that Petitioner waived any potential defect in service and as such, the matter may be reached on the merits.

Respondent asks that the clerk of court be appointed as elisor to sign the Qualified Domestic Relations Order (QDRO) for \$1,530,000 immediately. Respondent further requests enforcement of the court's April 9, 2026 order wherein Petitioner was ordered to use his retirement account to pay the \$600,000 equalization payment.

Petitioner opposes the request and states that he is willing to pay the \$600,000 equalization payment plus legal interest, \$5,000 in attorney's fees, and \$3,000 in Family Code § 271 sanctions however he disputes Respondent's request for \$1,530,000 which he argues is an attempt to shift the tax consequences to Petitioner. He asks that the parties be ordered to cooperate in preparing and executing a proper QDRO or other plan-compliant order that implements the Judgment and the April 9th ruling without any additional funds awarded for tax liability. He asks that court to deny Respondent's request for additional attorney's fees and costs not already ordered and award Petitioner reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in responding to the RFO. He further asks that Respondent be ordered to execute all documents necessary to transfer the family residence located on Hamblen Way in Cool, to Petitioner and, if she fails to do so, appoint the clerk of court to act as elisor and sign any such documents. He asks the court to deny any request for open-ended access to his property and make any further orders as deemed just and proper to enforce the terms of the Judgment.

It appears Petitioner is opposing requests that were brought before the court in Respondent's November 13, 2025 RFO. Hearing on that RFO was held on April 9, 2026 and

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

any issues raised therein were already ruled upon therefore the court is not addressing them.

Respondent's requests are denied. The Judgment awarded Respondent \$600,000 gross. It does not assign Petitioner the tax liability for the equalization payment. In fact, much to the contrary, the judgment states that "[e]ach party shall timely file and pay his/her tax liability in connection with the tax return filed by said party." Judgement, § 10.02. Nothing in the Judgment awards Respondent additional monies to account for her tax liability. Accordingly, the parties are ordered to work together, in good faith, to prepare a QDRO that properly implements the terms of the Judgment and the court's April 9, 2026 orders only. Each party is to bear his or her tax liability on the amounts awarded therein.

Petitioner's request for an order directing Petitioner to execute all documents necessary to transfer the family residence to Respondent is outside the scope of the RFO and therefore, the court declines to rule on it in accordance with California Rule of Court rule 5.92(g)(2), "unrelated relief must be sought by scheduling a separate hearing using *Request for Order* (form FL-300)..." Cal. Rule Ct. § 5.92(g)(2). Nevertheless, Respondent is admonished to comply with the terms of the Judgment and failure to do so may result in award of attorney's fees to Petitioner if he is forced to bring a motion on this issue.

Petitioner's request for attorney's fees associated with responding to the present motion is denied as Petitioner failed to assert the statutory basis for his request, the amount requested, or any argument whatsoever to support this request.

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 #6: IT APPEARS PETITIONER IS OPPOSING REQUESTS THAT WERE BROUGHT BEFORE THE COURT IN RESPONDENT'S NOVEMBER 13, 2025 RFO. HEARING ON THAT RFO WAS HELD ON APRIL 9, 2026 AND ANY ISSUES RAISED THEREIN WERE ALREADY RULED UPON THEREFORE THE COURT IS NOT ADDRESSING THEM.

RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS ARE DENIED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO WORK TOGETHER, IN GOOD FAITH, TO PREPARE A QDRO THAT PROPERLY IMPLEMENTS THE TERMS OF THE JUDGMENT AND THE COURT'S APRIL 9, 2026 ORDERS ONLY. EACH PARTY IS TO BEAR HIS OR HER TAX LIABILITY ON THE AMOUNTS AWARDED THEREIN.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING PETITIONER TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO TRANSFER THE FAMILY RESIDENCE TO RESPONDENT IS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE RFO AND THEREFORE THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON IT.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES ASSOCIATED WITH RESPONDING TO THE PRESENT MOTION IS DENIED AS PETITIONER FAILED TO ASSERT THE STATUTORY BASIS FOR HIS REQUEST, THE AMOUNT REQUESTED, OR ANY ARGUMENT WHATSOEVER TO SUPPORT THIS REQUEST.

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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. SUNG LEE V. YUNJEE AHN

25FL1114

On April 22, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, property control orders, and a 730 custody evaluation. The RFO and Notice of Tentative Ruling were both served on April 24th; a blank FL-320 was not served.

Respondent filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 13, 2026. It was served on July 10th. 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 10th the last day for filing the Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Petitioner filed and served a reply declaration on July 14th.

Petitioner asks the court to order a week-on, week-off schedule with exchanges to occur every Friday evening. He asks the court to vacate its prior order giving the children discretion to decline visits and that he be given control of the home located at 915 Bullion Lane in Folsom. He also asks that Respondent be ordered to undergo a 730 Evaluation with Eugene Roeder.

Given that the court just made custody and visitation orders on April 2nd, twenty days before the filing of the RFO, the court deems this to be a motion for reconsideration. Any party may move for reconsideration of a court’s order where the moving party (1) has been affected by the court’s order; and (2) moves for reconsideration within 10 days of the service upon the moving party written notice of the entry of the order. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 1008. The moving party must establish “...new or different facts, circumstances, or law...” that would warrant reconsideration of the order and such facts, circumstances or law shall be set forth in a written affidavit including “...what application was made before, when and to what judge, [and] what order or decisions were made...” *Id.* The moving party must also provide a satisfactory explanation for its failure to present the new or different facts or law earlier. *Yolo County Dept. of Child Support Services v. Myers*, 248 Cal. App. 4th 42, 50 (2016).

Here, the motion for reconsideration is untimely. Even if it was timely, the motion would be denied as Petitioner failed to establish any new or different facts than those that

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 23, 2026

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

were already considered by the court. In fact, nothing that has been provided by Petitioner changes the court's prior determination that it is in the best interests of the children to have the ability to decline visits should they choose to do so. If Petitioner is looking to improve his relationship with the children, the court has already made orders regarding conjoint counseling.

Regarding the request for a 730 Evaluation, that request is also denied. Evidence Code § 730 give the court the discretion to appoint an expert where "...expert evidence is or may be required." Ev. Code § 730. Here, the court does not find that expert testimony is necessary to determine the best interests of the children. As such, the request is denied.

Finally, regarding the request for possession and control of 915 Bullion Lane, that request is also denied. The court is not changing its prior custody and visitation orders and the court does not find grounds to award use or possession of the subject property to Petitioner either in the best interests of the children, or for the purpose of preserving the asset.

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: FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE, PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORDER IS DENIED IN ITS ENTIRETY.

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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. MAHCOYA-ROSE OSTROM V. MATTHEW BAKER

26FL0050

On January 27, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Because this matter was originally filed ex parte, Respondent filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order the same day the RFO was filed, however, he did not use the required FL-320 therefore, this document has not been read or considered.

The parties were originally scheduled to attend CCRC on February 19th, however, due to inclement weather, neither party was able to appear. Accordingly, CCRC was rescheduled for March 26th.

Only Petitioner appeared at the rescheduled CCRC appointment. It is unclear if either parent was properly served with notice of the rescheduled date.

In light of the circumstances, the parties were re-referred to CCRC and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Both parties appeared at the re-set CCRC appointment and were able to reach agreements on all issues. A report codifying their agreements was prepared on May 28, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on May 29th.

Petitioner requests sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor. She asks that the child be immediately returned to her care and for an order precluding the minor from missing school unless there is a medical emergency. Finally, she asks that Respondent be restrained from moving the minor outside of El Dorado County without a written agreement of the parties or a court order.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements contained in the May 28, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. In addition to the foregoing, the parties are ordered to ensure that the minor does not miss school unless she is sick or has a valid agreed upon reason for being absent. Neither party may move away with the minor without a written agreement of the parties or prior court order.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 28, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ENSURE THAT THE MINOR DOES NOT MISS SCHOOL UNLESS SHE IS SICK OR HAS A VALID AGREED UPON REASON FOR BEING ABSENT. NEITHER PARTY MAY MOVE AWAY WITH THE MINOR WITHOUT A WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR PRIOR COURT ORDER.

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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. LISA RENNER V. CHRISTOPHER RENNER

PFL20210613

On April 21, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents with the exception of a blank FL-320 were mail-served on April 23, 2026. On May 4th, Respondent filed a Declaration Regarding Address Verification in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 7th.

Respondent filed and served a reply declaration on July 7th.

According to Respondent's moving papers, he is not requesting a change in physical custody, however, he does ask the court to adopt the parenting agreement attached as Exhibit B to the RFO, which addresses procedures for joint legal custody, holidays/vacations, right of first refusal, and communication with the children.

Petitioner agrees to some of the proposed changes but with modifications. Her proposed changes are attached as Exhibit G to her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the terms contained in Exhibit G of Petitioner's Responsive Declaration to Request for Order to be in the best interests of the minors. 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 #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE TERMS CONTAINED IN EXHIBIT G OF PETITIONER'S RESPONSIVE DECLARATION TO REQUEST FOR ORDER TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 23, 2026

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

BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; *SEE ALSO* LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999). NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. N. TRUXLER V. C. TRUXLER

23FL0639

On April 29, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking submission of the Judgment, passport issues, and child support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration on May 4, 2026. All required documents were served on May 5th.

On July 7, 2026, the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) filed a Substitution of Payee.

Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on July 9th. It was served the same day but only Petitioner was served. DCSS was not served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 10, 2026, the Proof of Service says it was served on “Makayla Scott” it is unclear if this was meant to reference Makayla Sooth on behalf of Respondent, there is no Proof of Service for DCSS.

Despite the defect in service, Respondent filed and served a reply declaration on July 16th, though again, there is no Proof of Service for DCSS. Respondent does not raise the issue of service but objects on the basis that the Responsive Declaration to Request for Order is unsigned and he asks for it to be stricken from the record. The objection is sustained. The Responsive Declaration to Request for Order is stricken from the record.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on July 16th, the Proof of Service indicates Nicky Richardson was served, it is unclear if that individual was served on behalf of Respondent though she is not counsel of record, and there is no Proof of Service or DCSS. The court cannot consider these documents due to the lack of proper service. Additionally, the Income and Expense Declaration and the supplemental declaration were untimely so the court cannot consider them on that ground as well.

Respondent is requesting modification to the child support orders to reflect the current custody orders. He further requests sole decision-making authority regarding the minor’s passport and international travel or, alternatively, sole legal custody. He also asks that the Judgment, which was prepared in 2024, be submitted to include the October 2025 custody orders and any orders regarding Respondent’s requests made herein.

Because DCSS has substituted in as the payee, the issue of child support is continued to Monday, September 14th at 8:30 AM to be heard in Department 10 by the Child Support Commissioner in accordance with Family Code § 4251. Respondent is ordered to serve DCSS with the RFO and other required documents.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Regarding the passport and international travel with the minor, it appears to the court that the parties still do not have vacation time orders (they were ordered to address the issue during private mediation with Mr. Forrester but according to Respondent, Petitioner pulled out of their agreement). The parties are therefore referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on Friday, October 2nd at 9:00 AM to address issues regarding the minor's passport and international vacations with the minor. A review hearing is set for Thursday, November 12th at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Supplemental declarations are to be filed no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The issue regarding the Judgment is continued to join with the review hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED. THE RESPONSIVE DECLARATION TO REQUEST FOR ORDER IS STRICKEN FROM THE RECORD.

THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT IS CONTINUED TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH AT 8:30 AM TO BE HEARD IN DEPARTMENT 10 BY THE CHILD SUPPORT COMMISSIONER IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAMILY CODE § 4251. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE DCSS WITH THE RFO AND OTHER REQUIRED DOCUMENTS.

THE PARTIES ARE THEREFORE REFERRED TO CHILD CUSTODY RECOMMENDING COUNSELING (CCRC) ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2ND AT 9:00 AM TO ADDRESS ISSUES REGARDING THE MINOR'S PASSPORT AND INTERNATIONAL VACATIONS WITH THE MINOR. A REVIEW HEARING IS SET FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

THE ISSUE REGARDING THE JUDGMENT IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE REVIEW 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
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. JENNIFER COWELS V. BENJAMINE COWELS

PFL20180808

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 4, 2026, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders as well as modification of 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 10, 2026 and a review hearing on July 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on June 26, 2026.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was prepared and mailed to the parties on June 10th.

Petitioner subsequently filed a new RFO seeking custody orders on June 30, 2026. The parties were again referred to CCRC with an appointment on August 20, 2026 and a review hearing on October 1, 2026.

For judicial economy, the court continues this matter to join with the review hearing set for October 1, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: FOR JUDICIAL ECONOMY, THE COURT CONTINUES THIS MATTER TO JOIN WITH THE REVIEW HEARING SET FOR OCTOBER 1, 2026 AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. 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
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. NICOLE CRADDOCK V. NATHAN CRADDOCK, JR.

24FL0996

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 7, 2026, seeking child and spousal support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on May 21, 2026 and requested a continuance to allow additional time to serve Respondent. The court granted the request to continue the matter and directed Petitioner to serve Respondent with the original moving papers as well as a copy of the minute order with the continued hearing date and time.

Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on June 22, 2026 with all the required documents.

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) substituted into the case on July 14, 2026. Notice was provided to the parties the same day.

The court finds good cause to continue the matter to Monday, September 14th at 8:30 AM in Department 10 pursuant to Family Code section 4251. Respondent is directed to file and serve his Income and Expense Declaration at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO CONTINUE THE MATTER TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 10 PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE SECTION 4251. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO FILE AND SERVE HIS INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE 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
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. CAROLINE HICKS V. TIMOTHY HICKS

25FL0280

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 13, 2026, seeking modification of the current child and spousal support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The matter was set for a review hearing on June 18, 2026. On April 16, 2026, Respondent filed a request to reschedule the hearing due to the unavailability of his counsel. The court granted the request and reset the review hearing for July 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served on May 5, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on July 8, 2026. It was served the same day.

Respondent filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on July 13, 2026. It was served the same day.

Petitioner last filed an Income and Expense Declaration on May 14, 2026. The court is unable to locate a corresponding Proof of Service.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing. Petitioner is directed to bring an updated complete Income and Expense Declaration with her.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO BRING AN UPDATED COMPLETE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH HER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. LISA HOGAN V. ERIK HOGAN

23FL0307

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 21, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on May 29, 2026 and a review hearing on July 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was personally served on April 22, 2026.

Both parties attended CCRC on May 29, 2026, and reached a full agreement. On June 1, 2026, the parties submitted a stipulation to the court, which the court signed and adopted as its order. The stipulation included vacating the July 23, 2026 hearing.

Petitioner filed an ex parte request for emergency orders on June 4, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the court granted the request in part, allowing Petitioner to request Respondent to submit to drug/alcohol testing up to 24 hours prior to his parenting time or upon suspicion that Respondent is under the influence. If Respondent refuses to test, admits that he will not test clean, or tests positive, that visit will be cancelled without make up time. Respondent shall be responsible for the costs of all positive tests. Petitioner shall be responsible for the cost of all negative tests. The court set a hearing for July 23, 2026 and directed Petitioner to personally serve Respondent with the ex parte orders.

Petitioner filed an RFO on June 12, 2026, requesting the same orders as set forth in the ex parte request. There does appear to have been a clerical error in that the RFO does not state the date and time for the hearing, however, the Local Form F-20 does. Additionally, on the FL-300, box #7 is checked directing personal service of the FL-305 and FL-300. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was personally served with the ex parte orders or the RFO.

The court vacates the ex parte orders and drops the RFO from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT VACATES THE EX PARTE ORDERS AND DROPS THE RFO FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 23, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. CHRISTY NEUWORTH V. CORY NEUWORTH

25FL1179

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 30, 2026, requesting modification of the child custody orders and parenting plan orders, as well as enforcement of financial arrears, and modification of the split of child related expenses. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 11, 2026, and a review hearing on July 23, 2026. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215 on May 2, 2026.

Both parties attended CCRC on June 11th and were able to reach many agreements. A report memorializing the parties' agreements along with additional recommendations was prepared on June 16th and mailed to the parties on June 17, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration or an Income and Expense Declaration. The court deems his failure to do so as an admission that Petitioner's moving papers have merit. See El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C).

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on July 10, 2026. It was served on Respondent the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements of the parties to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the agreements as set forth in the June 16, 2026 CCRC report. The court is not adopting the recommendations regarding the provision that the tie breaking authority shall be removed. The court is adopting provision #2 as set forth on page 17, with the following modification: "If the parties are unable to agree on a particular matter, then they shall address this matter first in co-parenting counseling and if the matter cannot be resolved by counseling services, the tie breaking provisions in the parties' Judgment shall apply. If the situation is of an exigent nature, then the prerequisite to address the issue in co-parenting counseling first shall not apply." The remainder of the recommendations are adopted as set forth.

The court grants Petitioner's request for reimbursement of the medical stipend in the amount of \$657, for the monthly payments of January, February, and March 2026. This payment is to be made on or before August 1, 2026. Respondent is reminded that these payments are due on or before the 15th of each month.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

The court grants Petitioner's request to modify the allocation of child related expenses from 50/50 to 70/30 with Respondent responsible for 70% and Petitioner responsible for 30%.

The court denies Petitioner's request to add an abstention order. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate the requisite facts to allow the court to make such an order. The current orders regarding consumption of alcohol as set forth in the parties' judgment remain in full force and effect.

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 #15: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 16, 2026 CCTC REPORT. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PROVISION THAT THE TIE BREAKING AUTHORITY SHALL BE REMOVED. THE COURT IS ADOPTING PROVISION #2 AS SET FORTH ON PAGE 17, WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION: "IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO AGREE ON A PARTICULAR MATTER, THEN THEY SHALL ADDRESS THIS MATTER FIRST IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING AND IF THE MATTER CANNOT BE RESOLVED BY COUNSELING SERVICES, THE TIE BREAKING PROVISIONS IN THE PARTIES' JUDGMENT SHALL APPLY. IF THE SITUATION IS OF AN EXIGENT NATURE, THEN THE PREREQUISITE TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING FIRST SHALL NOT APPLY." THE REMAINDER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ADOPTED AS SET FORTH.

THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF THE MEDICAL STIPEND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$657, FOR THE MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH 2026. THIS PAYMENT IS TO BE MADE ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1, 2026. RESPONDENT IS REMINDED THAT THESE PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON OR BEFORE THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH.

THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE ALLOCATION OF CHILD RELATED EXPENSES FROM 50/50 TO 70/30 WITH RESPONDENT RESPONSIBLE FOR 70% AND PETITIONER RESPONSIBLE FOR 30%.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO ADD AN ABSTENTION ORDER. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THE REQUISITE FACTS TO ALLOW THE COURT TO MAKE SUCH AN ORDER. THE CURRENT ORDERS REGARDING CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL AS SET FORTH IN THE PARTIES' JUDGMENT REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. JANELL PALMER V. RAFE PALMER

24FL1174

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency orders on May 29, 2026. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on May 29, 2026. The court made orders on June 1, 2026, granting only the request that the child be returned to California and that they are not to relocate out of state without court permission. The court referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on June 23, 2026 and a review hearing for July 23, 2026. Petitioner was served by overnight service on June 17, 2026.

Both parties attended the emergency set CCRC appointment. The minors were interviewed as well. The parties were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as additional recommendations was lodged with the court on July 9, 2026 and mailed to the parties the same day.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements and recommendations to be in the best interests of the minors. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth in the July 9, 2026 CCRC report as its orders.

Respondent is strongly cautioned that future filings with false or misleading declarations may result in sanctions or other penalties.

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 #16: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JULY 9, 2026 CCRC REPORT AS ITS ORDERS.

RESPONDENT IS STRONGLY CAUTIONED THAT FUTURE FILINGS WITH FALSE OR MISLEADING DECLARATIONS MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS OR OTHER PENALTIES.

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 23, 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 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. CHELSEY ROMERO V. ROBERT ROMERO

PFL20190274

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 4, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 11, 2026 and a review hearing on July 23, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) were both mail served on May 4, 2026. The court notes, this is a post judgment request for modification, and as such, Family Code section 215 applies, which requires service to be personal or with address verification. Upon review of the court file, no address verification has been filed.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and were able to reach some agreements. A report containing the parties agreements was prepared on June 15, 2026 and mailed to the parties on June 17th.

Respondent filed a Declaration on June 26, 2026. It was served on Petitioner and DCSS on June 26, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed, despite the defect in service as Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment and fully participated. The court finds the parties' agreements to be in the best interests of the minor. The court adopts the agreements as set forth in the June 15th CCRC report as its orders.

The court is further ordering the minor to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor and sets a further appointment on Monday, October 5th at 9:00 am for that interview to take place. Petitioner is to make the minor available to the CCRC counselor for the interview. Petitioner is further ordered to sign any and all necessary releases for the CCRC counselor to interview the minor's counselor. Petitioner is not to inhibit the CCRC counselor from contacting collateral contacts to conduct a complete investigation of the minor's circumstances. If Petitioner fails to abide by these orders, she may be subject to sanctions or a change in custody orders as well as contempt of court. The court sets a further review hearing for Thursday, November 19th at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Any supplemental Declarations are due at least 10 days prior to the next hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED, DESPITE THE DEFECT IN SERVICE AS PETITIONER APPEARED AT THE CCRC APPOINTMENT AND FULLY PARTICIPATED. THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 15TH CCRC REPORT AS ITS ORDERS.

THE COURT IS FURTHER ORDERING THE MINOR TO BE INTERVIEWED BY THE CCRC COUNSELOR AND SETS A FURTHER APPOINTMENT ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 5TH AT 9:00 AM FOR THAT INTERVIEW TO TAKE PLACE. PETITIONER IS TO MAKE THE MINOR AVAILABLE TO THE CCRC COUNSELOR FOR THE INTERVIEW. PETITIONER IS FURTHER ORDERED TO SIGN ANY AND ALL NECESSARY RELEASES FOR THE CCRC COUNSELOR TO INTERVIEW THE MINOR'S COUNSELOR. PETITIONER IS NOT TO INHIBIT THE CCRC COUNSELOR FROM CONTACTING COLLATERAL CONTACTS TO CONDUCT A COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF THE MINOR'S CIRCUMSTANCES. IF PETITIONER FAILS TO ABIDE BY THESE ORDERS, SHE MAY BE SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS OR A CHANGE IN CUSTODY ORDERS AS WELL AS CONTEMPT OF COURT. THE COURT SETS A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19TH AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 23, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. NICHOLAS WILLIAMS V. JENNIFER WILLIAMS

23FL0197

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) along with a request for an Order Shortening Time (OST) on June 2, 2026. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The court denied the OST and the RFO was set to be heard on August 27, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the court advanced the RFO to be heard on July 23, 2026 at 1:30 PM. The unfiled documents were served on June 2, 2026. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on July 9, 2026, along with a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and two additional declarations. The documents were served on July 9, 2026.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration regarding sanctions as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on July 9, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court has not read or considered them.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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