

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

3. 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.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 1, 2026.

On July 16, 2026, a hearing on the RFO was held and the matter was continued to the present date. Pending the continued hearing date, Respondent was permitted to have phone contact with the minor.

Neither party has filed a supplemental declaration since the last hearing.

Respondent is requesting clarification of the court's prior orders regarding phone and text contact with the minor pending trial. He further requests the appointment of minor's counsel for the minor.

Petitioner opposes the request for minor's counsel and argues that counsel is not needed under the circumstances. She does not address the issue of phone/text contact with the minor.

The appointment of minor's counsel is a discretionary decision to be made where the court finds that it would be in the best interest of the child. Cal. Fam. Code § 3150. In making such a determination the court should consider "whether: (1) the issues of child custody and visitation are highly contested or protracted; (2) the child is subjected to stress as a result of the dispute that might be alleviated by the intervention of counsel representing the child; (3) counsel representing the child would be likely to provide the court with relevant information not otherwise readily available or likely to be presented; (4) the dispute involves allegations of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse or neglect of the child; (5) it appears that one or both parents are incapable of providing a stable, safe, and secure environment; (6) counsel is available for appointment who is knowledgeable about the issues being raised regarding the child in the proceeding; (7) the best interest of the child appears to require independent representation; and (8) if there are two or more children, any child would require separate counsel to avoid a conflict of interest." Cal. Rule Ct. 5.240.

Taking into consideration the relevant factors listed above, the court does find grounds for the appointment of minor's counsel in the present situation. The issue of

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

custody is quite clearly a protracted dispute between the parties and the matter is set for trial on that issue in October. As noted by the CCRC Counselor, the child appears to have been placed at the forefront of many of the disputes between the parties thereby causing him stress which may be alleviated by the appointment of counsel. The dispute does involve allegations of abuse against the minor and concerns regarding each party's ability to provide a stable home environment. And while the court concedes that the minor is articulate and at an age where he is able to provide relevant information to the court, the court still finds that overall, the weight of the factors set forth in rule 5.240 does err on the side of appointment. In light of the foregoing, the request to appoint minor's counsel is granted. The court hereby appoints Kelly Bentley as minor's counsel.

Regarding phone contact with the minor, the court is maintaining its orders from July 16, 2026.

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 #3: THE REQUEST TO APPOINT MINOR'S COUNSEL IS GRANTED. THE COURT HEREBY APPOINTS KELLY BENTLEY AS MINOR'S COUNSEL. REGARDING PHONE CONTACT WITH THE MINOR, THE COURT IS MAINTAINING ITS ORDERS FROM JULY 16, 2026.

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 30, 2026

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

4. GABRIEL C. GIAMANCO V. MONIFA A. GIAMANCO

PFL20210240

Order to Show Cause

On January 27, 2026, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging 15 violations of custody orders. Respondent was personally served on February 24, 2026. Minor's Counsel was not served.

On April 14, 2026, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order requesting dismissal of the RFO.

The parties appeared before the court on April 23rd and requested additional time to perfect service. The request was granted and the matter was continued to the present date.

Minor's Counsel was served with the OSC on April 23rd.

Petitioner alleges fifteen violations of custody and visitation orders by Respondent due to failure to produce the minor for custody exchanges.

Respondent asks the court to dismiss the OSC for failure to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action and the doctrine of unclean hands.

First and foremost, the OSC is dismissed with prejudice with regard to the missed visits on March 17, 2023, May 12, 2023, and September 25, 2023. Petitioner waited almost three years before filing his OSC for these visits therefore the court finds dismissal of these claims to be in the interests of justice.

Turning to the missed visits from April 10, 2025 through January 15, 2026, Respondent's request for dismissal of these claims is denied. The February 18, 2025 ex parte orders expressly allowed for the minor to decline visits only "pending the review hearing." As of the court's orders on the review hearing, to drop the matter from calendar, the minor was no longer permitted to decline visits.

Respondent argues that no violation occurred because she did encourage the minor to attend visits and Petitioner cannot benefit due to his own unclean hands; however these are affirmative defenses and questions of fact to be addressed at trial.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment on allegations of missed visits from April 10, 2025 through January 15, 2026.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

Request for Order

On February 17, 2026, Minor's Counsel filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The matter was originally filed ex parte, therefore the RFO and the ex parte orders were served on February 20th. There is no indication that either the Notice of Tentative Ruling or blank FL-320 was served.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on February 17th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 15, 2026. They were unable to reach any agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on May 19, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on May 20th.

Minor's Counsel asks the court to revert to its prior orders issued on February 18, 2025 and cease any visitation between the minor and Respondent.

Petitioner opposes the request and asks that the current custody orders remain in place.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the recommendations contained in the May 19, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the correction of one typo in paragraph 4 of the Parenting Time section. The word "Norman" shall be corrected to read "normal." The remainder of the recommendations are adopted as-is.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE OSC IS DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE WITH REGARD TO THE MISSED VISITS ON MARCH 17, 2023, MAY 12, 2023, AND SEPTEMBER 25, 2023. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT ON ALLEGATIONS OF MISSED VISITS FROM APRIL 10, 2025 THROUGH JANUARY 15, 2026.

THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 19, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE CORRECTION OF ONE TYPO IN PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE PARENTING TIME SECTION. THE WORD "NORMAN" SHALL BE CORRECTED TO READ "NORMAL." THE REMAINDER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ADOPTED AS-IS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

MINOR'S COUNSEL 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 30, 2026

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

5. JORDAN LYKINS V. SONJA GILSON

24FL0295

This matter is before the court for a Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) review hearing. The parties were referred to CCRC on January 20, 2026, during the hearing on Petitioner's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO). In accordance with the court's order, the parties attended CCRC on February 4, 2026 and were able to reach agreements on all issues. A report containing those agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties on March 13, 2026.

The parties appeared for the hearing on this matter on July 2nd, however due to extenuating circumstances the matter was continued to the present date.

Respondent filed and served a supplemental declaration on July 20th.

Petitioner filed his supplemental declaration on July 23rd, however the court finds this to be late filed and therefore it has not been read or considered.

The court has reviewed the filings as outlined above and, given that Petitioner has dropped the DVRO request, the court finds the agreements contained in the March 13, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors 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 #5: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE MARCH 13, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

7. KATIE MOYER V. RODNEY LONG

PFL20190731

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

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

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

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

On June 17th, Petitioner and Respondent each filed a reply declaration to the CCRC report. However there is no Proof of Service for Respondent's declaration therefore, the court has not read or considered it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the parties' agreements and the further recommendations as set forth in the May 1st CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations as set forth with the following modification. The section titled Parent's Involvement in Child's School Events shall be modified to read – "The non-custodial parent shall have the first option to attend the child's school outings and volunteer in the classroom if the custodial parent is unable to attend or volunteer."

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 #7: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS AND THE FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MAY 1ST CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION. THE SECTION TITLED PARENT'S INVOLVEMENT IN CHILD'S SCHOOL EVENTS SHALL BE MODIFIED TO READ – "THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT SHALL HAVE THE FIRST OPTION TO ATTEND THE CHILD'S SCHOOL OUTINGS AND VOLUNTEER IN THE CLASSROOM IF THE CUSTODIAL PARENT IS UNABLE TO ATTEND OR VOLUNTEER." 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

(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 30, 2026

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

8. DCSS V. BRIAN ORTEGA (OTHER PARENT: REBECCA ANNE GIERHART) PFS20160102

On December 9, 2025, the parties filed a Stipulation and Order Re: Custody/Visitation and Vacating Trial. In accordance with the stipulation, the parties were ordered to attend Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and a review hearing was set for the present date.

Other Parent filed and served two declarations regarding custody on May 29, 2026.

The parties attended CCRC on June 1, 2026. They were able to reach some agreements but could not agree on all issues. Therefore, a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on June 17, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on June 18, 2026.

Other Parent filed and served a reply to the CCRC report and an updating declaration on July 10, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a supplemental declaration or a declaration in response to the CCRC report.

Other Parent asks the court to adopt the agreements and recommendations set forth in the CCRC report with a number of modifications which she enumerates in her July 10th declaration.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the June 17, 2026 report to be in the best interests of the children and therefore, they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the following modifications. Regarding legal custody, the parties are to share joint legal custody however, the court is maintaining its order for Other Parent to have final decision-making authority in accordance with the court's order of February 19, 2025. Regarding extracurricular activities, the court is adopting the recommendations in the CCRC report with the additional order that the parties shall permit the children to continue participating in their established extracurricular activities, including soccer and futsal, from season to season. Each parent is ordered to provide transportation for these activities during his or her parenting time. If the custodial parent is unable to do so, the other parent may provide transportation. The parties are to equally share in the costs of soccer and futsal with reimbursement to be made within thirty (30) days of receiving proof of payment. Regarding exchanges, the parties are ordered to remain in their respective vehicles during the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

exchange. Finally, the court is granting the request for minor's counsel. Rebecca Esty Burke is appointed as minor's counsel for the children.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #8: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JUNE 17, 2026 REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEREFORE, THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. REGARDING LEGAL CUSTODY, THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY HOWEVER THE COURT IS MAINTAINING ITS ORDER FOR OTHER PARENT TO HAVE FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COURT'S ORDER OF FEBRUARY 19, 2025. REGARDING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE CCRC REPORT WITH THE ADDITIONAL ORDER THAT THE PARTIES SHALL PERMIT THE CHILDREN TO CONTINUE PARTICIPATING IN THEIR ESTABLISHED EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING SOCCER AND FUTSAL, FROM SEASON TO SEASON. EACH PARENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION FOR THESE ACTIVITIES DURING HIS OR HER PARENTING TIME. IF THE CUSTODIAL PARENT IS UNABLE TO DO SO, THE OTHER PARENT MAY PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION. THE PARTIES ARE TO EQUALLY SHARE IN THE COSTS OF SOCCER AND FUTSAL WITH REIMBURSEMENT TO BE MADE WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF RECEIVING PROOF OF PAYMENT. REGARDING EXCHANGES, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO REMAIN IN THEIR RESPECTIVE VEHICLES DURING THE EXCHANGE. FINALLY, THE COURT IS GRANTING THE REQUEST FOR MINOR'S COUNSEL. REBECCA ESTY BURKE IS APPOINTED AS MINOR'S COUNSEL FOR THE CHILDREN.

OTHER PARENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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 30, 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 30, 2026

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

9. KELLY OWEN V. BRIAN GOSHORN

26FL0052

On April 1, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking support orders and attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on April 2nd.

On June 23, 2026, the parties filed a Judgment with an attached stipulation settling all issues. The court has not yet reviewed or signed the Judgment.

Given that the stipulation attached to the Judgment resolves the issues pending before the court, this matter is dropped from calendar as moot.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: GIVEN THAT THE STIPULATION ATTACHED TO THE JUDGMENT RESOLVES THE ISSUES PENDING BEFORE THE COURT, THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS MOOT.

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 30, 2026

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

10. JOHN ABATE V. AMANDA CARROLL

PFL20180902

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO), on February 27, 2026, seeking modification of child custody orders, an order for the minor to obtain a passport, elimination of the right of first refusal, and to alternate the child tax credit. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). Respondent was personally served on March 13, 2026. The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was not served.

Both parties appeared for CCRC and were unable to reach agreements. A report with recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on June 10, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court finds good cause to proceed with the custody requests only, as DCSS was not served and has standing on the tax credit issue. The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the June 10th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED WITH THE CUSTODY REQUESTS ONLY. THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 10TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 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 30, 2026

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

11. AMANDA ALESSANDRO V. JEREMY ALESSANDRO

PFL20200677

On March 24, 2026, Respondent filed two FL-300 Request for Order (RFO) forms; one seeking joinder and the other seeking attorney's fees. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is a Proof of Service for the attorney's fees RFO showing it was served on May 27th.

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

On May 27, 2026, Respondent filed and served a Notice of Motion and Declaration for Joinder. Proof of Service for the RFO regarding joinder shows the potentially joined parties were served on May 27, 2026.

Respondent attached copies of Petitioner's Income and Expense Declaration and her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order to his Declaration for Joinder therefore the court finds that he has actual knowledge of the contents thereof and he has effectively waived any defect in service.

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

On June 11th, Respondent filed and served two MC-030 declarations.

Parties appeared for the hearing on June 18, 2026. The parties agreed that the Krejci's were served, however, service was late. To cure the defect in service the parties agreed to have the issue of joinder heard on July 30, 2026. The Motion to Quash was withdrawn. Parties argued the issue of attorney's fees and sanctions, which the court went on to deny.

Potentially Joined Parties filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on July 2, 2026, regarding the Motion to Quash. The court is unable to locate a Proof of Service which corresponds to this document.

Respondent is requesting the court join Thomas Krejci and Kathy B. Krejci, individually and as trustees of the Krejci Family Trust dated September 14, 2017.

Regarding the request for joinder, "[t]he court may order that a person be joined as a party to the proceeding if the court finds that it would be appropriate to determine the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

particular issue in the proceeding and that the person to be joined as a party is either indispensable for the court to make an order about that issue or is necessary to the enforcement of any judgment rendered on that issue.” Cal. Rule Ct. 5.24(e)(2). Importantly, joinder of a third-party owner is permissive, not mandatory, for purposes of adjudicating the spouses’ rights amongst themselves. See Long v. Long, 88 Cal. App. 2d 544 (1948).

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

Petitioner opposes the joinder asserting that the third parties are not indispensable to the court nor is it necessary to the enforcement of the judgment.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court denies the request for joinder, as the parties sought to be joined are not indispensable and are not necessary to enforce the judgment. Respondent has appropriate remedies available through the civil court.

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 #11: THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR JOINDER, AS THE PARTIES SOUGHT TO BE JOINED ARE NOT INDISPENSABLE AND ARE NOT NECESSARY TO ENFORCE THE JUDGMENT. RESPONDENT HAS APPROPRIATE REMEDIES AVAILABLE THROUGH THE CIVIL COURT. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

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 30, 2026

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

12. JUAN CHAVEZ V. SHIANNE HUNSAKER

PFL20130587

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 15, 2026, following the court's denial of his ex parte application. Petitioner is seeking enforcement of the court's prior orders regarding reunification therapy. Respondent was personally served with some, but not all, of the required documents on May 15, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on May 13, 2026. Petitioner was served on May 14, 2026. Respondent is not opposed to the reunification therapy and has selected a therapist from one recommended by one of the proposed therapists.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The parties are to enroll the minor for therapeutic services with Darren Shapard LMFT, if they have not already done so. The minor is to be scheduled for the first available intake with Mr. Shapard. The parties are to follow the directives of the therapist for frequency and duration of therapeutic services, as well as to follow the recommendations of the therapist. Respondent is reminded that the court's orders are effective immediately and are not conditional, including not requiring a formal written order.

All prior 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 #12: THE PARTIES ARE TO ENROLL THE MINOR FOR THERAPEUTIC SERVICES WITH DARREN SHAPARD LMFT, IF THEY HAVE NOT ALREADY DONE SO. THE MINOR IS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR THE FIRST AVAILABLE INTAKE WITH MR. SHAPARD. THE PARTIES ARE TO FOLLOW THE DIRECTIVES OF THE THERAPIST FOR FREQUENCY AND DURATION OF THERAPEUTIC SERVICES, AS WELL AS TO FOLLOW THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THERAPIST. RESPONDENT IS REMINDED THAT THE COURT'S ORDERS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY AND ARE NOT CONDITIONAL, INCLUDING NOT REQUIRING A FORMAL WRITTEN ORDER.

ALL PRIOR 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

13. LAURIE ENEA V. SALVADOR ENEA

25FL0447

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 18, 2026, seeking spousal support. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

The matter is dropped from calendar due to the lack of proper service. Additionally, the matter is dropped from calendar due to Petitioner's failure to concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. "For 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.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ADDITIONALLY, THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO CONCURRENTLY FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

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 30, 2026

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

14. SCOTT RONNINGEN V. ANGELINA RONNINGEN

23FL0127

On November 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking sanctions and further sentencing for Petitioner's noncompliance with court orders. The RFO was served by mail on January 13, 2026. It appears the Notice of Posting Tentative Ruling was not served with the RFO.

The parties appeared for the hearing on February 26, 2026 at which time the court found improper service of the RFO. Because the RFO deals with failure to comply with an Order to Show Cause (OSC), the RFO must be personally served as would an OSC. The court granted Respondent's request to continue to allow for proper service.

The RFO and the February 26th Minute Order were personally served on Petitioner on March 24, 2026.

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

Respondent is seeking the following: (1) Petitioner to be found in noncompliance with his sentence issued at the March 12, 2025 hearing; (2) Petitioner to be found in violation of his probation; (3) further sentencing; and (4) Family Code § 271 sanctions. Of note, Respondent seems to be referencing Petitioner as "Respondent" in her moving papers.

Respondent and her counsel appeared for the hearing on May 21, 2026. Petitioner failed to appear. The court found good cause to proceed in his absence and continued the matter to July 30, 2026 at 1:30 PM. The court issued a bench warrant for Petitioner, however, stayed the warrant pending the next hearing. The court reserved on Respondent's request for attorney's fees and sanctions.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

15. LEE SARRAIN V. GINA SARTAIN

25FL0329

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 6, 2026, seeking an order compelling Respondent's disclosures and to set trial dates. Proof of Service shows Respondent was only served with the FL-300 and a Blank FL-320 on May 12, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

Petitioner filed a second RFO on June 9, 2026, seeking bifurcation of marital status. Respondent was served by mail on June 11, 2026.

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

California Rules of Court, rule 5.390(a) states that on noticed motion of a party, using form FL-300, "Request for Order," "the stipulation of the parties, case management, or the court's own motion, the court may bifurcate one or more issues to be tried separately before other issues are tried."

Family Code section 2337 provides that "[i]n a proceeding for dissolution of marriage, the court, upon noticed motion, may sever and grant an early and separate trial on the issue of the dissolution of the status of the marriage apart from other issues." Fam. Code, § 2337, subd. (a). The trial court may separately try the issue of termination of marriage if doing so "is likely to simplify the determination of the other issues." Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.390(b)(7).

Public policy favors bifurcation of trial on pivotal issues in a dissolution action. In re Marriage of Macfarlane & Lang, 8 Cal.App.4th 247, 257(1992); see In re Marriage of Wolfe, 173 Cal.App.3d 889, 893–894 (1985) ["To the extent bifurcation of issues such as custody, support or the division of community property can assist the parties to achieve settlement of remaining issues, it should be encouraged"]. For the issue of marital status, "[c]onsistent with the legislative policy favoring no fault dissolution of marriage, only slight evidence is necessary to obtain bifurcation and resolution of marital status. On the other hand, a spouse opposing bifurcation must present compelling reasons for denial." Gionis v. Superior Court, 202 Cal.App.3d 786, 790 (1988).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

The minimum statutory requirements for bifurcating and terminating marital status are that six months must have passed since the date of service of the summons and petition (§ 2339, subd. (a)), and that the party seeking termination of marital status must have served a preliminary declaration of disclosure or obtained a written agreement to defer service to a later date (§ 2337, subd. (b)). Both requirements were met here.

Parties are ordered to appear for the bifurcation.

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

THE COURT DROPS THE MAY 6, 2026 RFO FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

16. BECKY SUTTON V. DONALD SUTTON

PFL20060639

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 13, 2026, seeking modification of the permanent spousal support orders. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

17. AMELIA VERDUGO V. ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ

PFL20180504

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 13, 2206, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. Petitioner and Minor's Counsel were electronically served on May 13, 2026. Respondent is requesting sole legal and physical custody of the minor. Respondent did not check the box on the face of the FL-300 requesting modification of the current child support orders. However, Respondent did check section #3 within the body of the FL-300 requesting modification of the child support orders. Respondent did not file or serve an Income and Expense Declaration.

Minor's Counsel filed a Responsive Declaration on May 21, 2026, opposing the request. Parties were electronically served the same day. Minor's Counsel asserts Respondent's pleadings lack any specific factual developments since the trial held in January 2026 which would warrant a modification of the current custody orders. Minor's Counsel states the orders issued in January imposed conditions upon Respondent to demonstrate a substantial change in circumstances and compliance with conditions precedent to show the current custody orders should be modified. Additionally, Respondent has only had five visits with the minor since the time of the trial. Minor's Counsel requests the court to deny Respondent's requested changes and maintain the current orders.

Minor's Counsel filed a Supplemental Declaration on July 16, 2026. It was served the same day. After meeting with her client, Minor's Counsel is requesting the court deny Respondent's requests and suspend the current visitation orders.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on July 17, 2026. It was electronically served the same day. Petitioner opposes Respondent's requested orders. Specifically, she requests any modification of child support be heard by the Child Support Commissioner pursuant to Family Code §4251, as the Department of Child Support Services are a party to the case. As to the custody and parenting plan orders, Petitioner requests the current orders as to custody remain in full force and effect and that Respondent's parenting time be professionally supervised at a frequency of one time per month. Additionally, Petitioner requests the visitation guidelines prohibit Respondent from bringing gifts to the minor at visits. Petitioner is also requesting the orders be made "final" orders. Last, Petitioner requests the court implement a pre-filing order, requiring Respondent to seek leave of court prior to filing further RFOs in this matter.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court denies Respondent's request to modify the current child support orders. First, Respondent failed to serve the Department of Child Support Services, who are a party to the case. Therefore, the request is denied on those grounds. Next, Respondent failed to concurrently file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration. "For 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. Therefore, the request is denied on those grounds as well.

As to the request to modify the current child custody and parenting plan orders, those requests are denied. Respondent has failed to demonstrate substantial compliance with the court's January 27, 2026, orders. The court cautioned Respondent that filing subsequent RFOs without a clear demonstration of compliance with the court's orders would result in a denial of any requested modification. It is clear to the court Respondent did not heed the court's admonition. Respondent has filed two RFOs since the January 27, 2026 ruling. Neither has been supported by any evidence that Respondent has complied with the court's orders. Rather, Respondent continues to try to relitigate the prior issues. Essentially, each of Respondent's requests have been akin to motions for reconsideration which are wholly unsupported by new facts, new evidence, or new case law. Respondent's requests are denied in their entirety.

Turning next to Minor's Counsel's and Petitioner's requests. The court finds those requests have merit. The court grants Petitioner's request to make the orders "final" orders pursuant to Montenegro v. Diaz, 26 Cal.4th 249 (2001).

The court is reducing Respondent's parenting time to one time per month for two hours to be professionally supervised. Respondent is responsible for the costs of supervision. Further the court is ordering the following conditions for professional supervision: (1) Allow no giving or receiving of gifts, money, or cards; (2) Allow no photographing, audiotaping, or videotaping of the child; (3) Allow no physical contact with the child such as lap sitting, hair combing, stroking, hand holding, hugging, wrestling, tickling, horseplaying, changing diapers, or accompanying the child to the bathroom; and (4) Allow no whispering, passing notes, hand signals, or body signals. (See Cal. Rule Ct. 5.20(m).) While the court had considered fully suspending Respondent's parenting time,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

the court finds with the added provisions as set forth above, professionally supervised parenting time remains appropriate.

The court denies Petitioner's request for pre-filing approval for Respondent's filings. Essentially, Petitioner is requesting the court impose vexatious litigant conditions on Respondent without notice and a hearing on a vexatious litigant finding. Petitioner may file a request for such orders. The court finds Petitioner's request exceeds the scope of the RFO 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 that should he continue "...attempts to relitigate, in propria persona, either (1) the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or (ii) the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined;" or "repeatedly files unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conducts unnecessary discovery, or engages in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay" he may be deemed a vexatious litigant. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 391(b)(2) & (b)(3). A finding of as few as three motions on the same issue has been upheld as grounds for a vexatious litigant ruling. Goodrich v. Sierra Vista Reg'l Med. Ctr., 246 Cal. App. 4th 1260 (2016).

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 #17: THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CURRENT CHILD SUPPORT ORDERS. FIRST, RESPONDENT FAILED TO SERVE THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES, WHO ARE A PARTY TO THE CASE. THEREFORE, THE REQUEST IS DENIED ON THOSE GROUNDS. NEXT, RESPONDENT FAILED TO CONCURRENTLY FILE AND SERVE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. "FOR 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

DORADO SUP. CT. RULE 8.03.01. THEREFORE, THE REQUEST IS DENIED ON THOSE GROUNDS AS WELL.

AS TO THE REQUEST TO MODIFY THE CURRENT CHILD CUSTODY AND PARENTING PLAN ORDERS, THOSE REQUESTS ARE DENIED. RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S JANUARY 27, 2026, ORDERS. THE COURT CAUTIONED RESPONDENT THAT FILING SUBSEQUENT RFOS WITHOUT A CLEAR DEMONSTRATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S ORDERS WOULD RESULT IN A DENIAL OF ANY REQUESTED MODIFICATION. IT IS CLEAR TO THE COURT RESPONDENT DID NOT HEED THE COURT'S ADMONITION. RESPONDENT HAS FILED TWO RFOS SINCE THE JANUARY 27, 2026 RULING. NEITHER HAS BEEN SUPPORTED BY ANY EVIDENCE THAT RESPONDENT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE COURT'S ORDERS. RATHER, RESPONDENT CONTINUES TO TRY TO RELITIGATE THE PRIOR ISSUES. ESSENTIALLY, EACH OF RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS HAVE BEEN AKIN TO MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION WHICH ARE WHOLLY UNSUPPORTED BY NEW FACTS, NEW EVIDENCE, OR NEW CASE LAW. RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS ARE DENIED IN THEIR ENTIRETY.

TURNING NEXT TO MINOR'S COUNSEL'S AND PETITIONER'S REQUESTS. THE COURT FINDS THOSE REQUESTS HAVE MERIT. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO MAKE THE ORDERS "FINAL" ORDERS PURSUANT TO MONTENEGRO V. DIAZ, 26 CAL.4TH 249 (2001).

THE COURT IS REDUCING RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME TO ONE TIME PER MONTH FOR TWO HOURS TO BE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED. RESPONDENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COSTS OF SUPERVISION. FURTHER THE COURT IS ORDERING THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION: (1) ALLOW NO GIVING OR RECEIVING OF GIFTS, MONEY, OR CARDS; (2) ALLOW NO PHOTOGRAPHING, AUDIOTAPING, OR VIDEOTAPING OF THE CHILD; (3) ALLOW NO PHYSICAL CONTACT WITH THE CHILD SUCH AS LAP SITTING, HAIR COMBING, STROKING, HAND HOLDING, HUGGING, WRESTLING, TICKLING, HORSEPLAYING, CHANGING DIAPERS, OR ACCOMPANYING THE CHILD TO THE BATHROOM; AND (4) ALLOW NO WHISPERING, PASSING NOTES, HAND SIGNALS, OR BODY SIGNALS. (SEE CAL. RULE CT. 5.20(M).) WHILE THE COURT HAD CONSIDERED FULLY SUSPENDING RESPONDENT'S PARENTING TIME, THE COURT FINDS WITH THE ADDED PROVISIONS AS SET FORTH ABOVE, PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED PARENTING TIME REMAINS APPROPRIATE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 2026

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

THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR PRE-FILING APPROVAL FOR RESPONDENT'S FILINGS. ESSENTIALLY, PETITIONER IS REQUESTING THE COURT IMPOSE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT CONDITIONS ON RESPONDENT WITHOUT NOTICE AND A HEARING ON A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FINDING. PETITIONER MAY FILE A REQUEST FOR SUCH ORDERS. THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S REQUEST EXCEEDS THE SCOPE OF THE RFO 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 THAT SHOULD HE CONTINUE "...ATTEMPTS TO RELITIGATE, IN PROPRIA PERSONA, EITHER (1) THE VALIDITY OF THE DETERMINATION AGAINST THE SAME DEFENDANT OR DEFENDANTS AS TO WHOM THE LITIGATION WAS FINALLY DETERMINED OR (II) THE CAUSE OF ACTION, CLAIM, CONTROVERSY, OR ANY OF THE ISSUES OF FACT OR LAW, DETERMINED OR CONCLUDED BY THE FINAL DETERMINATION AGAINST THE SAME DEFENDANT OR DEFENDANTS AS TO WHOM THE LITIGATION WAS FINALLY DETERMINED;" OR "REPEATEDLY FILES UNMERITORIOUS MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR OTHER PAPERS, CONDUCTS UNNECESSARY DISCOVERY, OR ENGAGES IN OTHER TACTICS THAT ARE FRIVOLOUS OR SOLELY INTENDED TO CAUSE UNNECESSARY DELAY" HE MAY BE DEEMED A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT. CAL. CIV. PRO. § 391(B)(2) & (B)(3). A FINDING OF AS FEW AS THREE MOTIONS ON THE SAME ISSUE HAS BEEN UPHELD AS GROUNDS FOR A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT RULING. GOODRICH V. SIERRA VISTA REG'L MED. CTR., 246 CAL. APP. 4TH 1260 (2016).

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 30, 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.**