

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. JILL ALIOTO V. JOSEPH ALIOTO

23FL1208

On May 6, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as several orders regarding alcohol testing. This matter was originally filed on an ex parte basis, though the ex parte request was denied and the parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). A review hearing was set for the present date. The RFO and all other required documents were served on June 27th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 9th.

Petitioner filed and served her Reply Declaration of Attorney on July 18th and July 15th respectively.

Petitioner asks the court to order Respondent to participate in mandatory alcohol testing through SoberLink Level 1 “Plus Monitoring Plan – Parenting Time Only.” She asks that no visitation occur unless and until he has fully enrolled in, and is compliant with, all testing protocols. She also asks that the parenting schedule be reverted to week 1 of Step 4 of the step-up plan.

Respondent opposes all of the aforementioned requests. He asks that Petitioner be precluded from making disparaging remarks about him in front of the minor. He also requests an order that any medications be transferred to the custodial parent during his or her parenting time. He is requesting sanctions in the amount of \$2,000 for Petitioner’s failure to meet and confer on the issue, for her filing of the motion when trial is already pending, and for her filing ex parte despite there being no exigent circumstances.

The parties attended CCRC on June 9, 2025 but were unable to reach any agreements. A report was prepared however CCRC could not make any recommendations given the pending DVRO hearing which is set to begin on September 19th.

This matter is continued to join with DVRO trial which is currently set for September 16TH at 8:30am. The court is reserving on Respondent’s request for monetary sanctions.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE DVRO TRIAL WHICH IS CURRENTLY SET FOR SEPTEMBER 16TH AT 8:30AM. THE COURT IS RESERVING ON RESPONDENT’S REQUEST FOR MONETARY SANCTIONS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 31, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. PAUL ANDRUS V. CHI ANDRUS

23FL1194

On April 24, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders regarding school pick up for the children. All required documents were served on May 15th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 14th. It was served on July 9th.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on July 18th. It was served on July 16th.

Petitioner requests an order precluding Respondent from utilizing Ashley Rasmussen or her family to watch the minors or pick them up from school. He also asks that the Rasmussens be removed as emergency contacts with the school. In his Reply Declaration he adds the following requests – (1) an order re-referring the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC); (2) an order to continue co-parenting counseling for an additional 12-month period; (3) an order regarding parenting standards; and (4) an order for the children to remain with their pediatric dentist Dr. Danielson, and Respondent to pay a portion of the dental expenses paid by Petitioner.

Respondent opposes the requests made in Petitioner’s moving papers. She has not had the opportunity to respond to the various other requests made in Petitioner’s Reply Declaration.

Relief unrelated to the original RFO “...must be sought by scheduling a separate hearing using *Request for Order* (form FL-300)...” Cal. Rule Ct. § 5.92(g)(2). As such, Petitioner’s request for referral to CCRC, co-parenting counseling, parenting standards, and dental costs are all denied as they are outside the scope of the original RFO.

Petitioner’s requests regarding the Rasmussens are also denied. This appears to be a contentious matter amongst the adults instead of any real issue regarding the children and their best interests. Both parties are reminded of the Respect Guidelines, and both are admonished to ensure that they are following the Respect Guidelines and that any and all third parties around the children are also complying. Failure to do so may result in monetary sanctions or contempt orders.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PETITIONER’S REQUEST FOR REFERRAL TO CCRC, CO-PARENTING COUNSELING, PARENTING STANDARDS, AND DENTAL COSTS ARE ALL DENIED AS THEY ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL RFO. PETITIONER’S

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

REQUESTS REGARDING THE RASMUSSENS ARE DENIED. BOTH PARTIES ARE REMINDED OF THE RESPECT GUIDELINES AND BOTH ARE ADMONISHED TO ENSURE THAT THEY ARE FOLLOWING THE RESPECT GUIDELINES AND THAT ANY AND ALL THIRD PARTIES AROUND THE CHILDREN ARE ALSO COMPLYING. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN MONETARY SANCTIONS OR CONTEMPT ORDERS. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. ROBIN GALLOWGLAS V. MICHAEL GALLOWGLAS

PFL20190890

On March 6, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders, as well as an order to enforce the judgment entered on July 30, 2020. The RFO and all required documents were mail served on March 10, 2025.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on April 3, 2025 and were able to reach a full agreement. A report with the agreements was prepared the same day. It was mailed to the parties on April 7th.

On May 7th Petitioner filed an RFO seeking orders for child support. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith.

The parties appeared for hearing on the RFO on May 22nd at which time they were referred to CCRC. A review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC and were once again able to reach agreements. A report with the agreements was prepared on June 24, 2025. It was mailed to the parties on June 25th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on July 17th.

After reviewing the filings, the court finds the agreements contained in the June 24, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. They are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

Regarding child support, Petitioner is requesting an order for each parent to support the child during his or her custodial time and the parties to split additional costs as they come up. Respondent consents to the requested order although he further states that he also consents to guideline support.

Given that Petitioner is the higher earning spouse and given that she has the child for approximately 99% of the time, the court is concerned that Respondent does not have sufficient income to pay guideline support if ordered. As such, the court is deviating downwards from guideline and adopting Petitioner's request for the parties to each support the minor while in his or her custody. As such, child support is set at \$0.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE JUNE 24, 2025 CCRC REPORT ARE ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE COURT IS DEVIATING DOWNWARDS FROM GUIDELINE AND ADOPTING PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR THE PARTIES TO EACH SUPPORT THE MINOR WHILE IN HIS OR HER CUSTODY. AS SUCH, CHILD SUPPORT IS SET AT \$0. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. JOSHUA KHOSHSEFAT V. HEIDI KHOSHSEFAT

24FL0682

On March 13, 2025, the parties appeared before the court for a Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) review and hearing on an RFO filed by Petitioner. The court made orders on custody and visitation then set a review hearing to address whether a step-up plan would be appropriate. Parties were ordered to file and serve Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

On April 8th, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as stated therein. All required documents were served on April 9th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 16th.

Petitioner filed and served a Declaration on July 17th.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration Re: Custody and Visitation was filed on July 18th. It was served on July 17th.

Petitioner's Reply Declaration to Respondent's Responsive and Supplemental Declarations was filed on July 24th.

On July 28th, Respondent filed an Objection to Petitioner's Reply Declaration and Motion to Strike. Respondent's objection is sustained in part. Petitioner's Reply does contain information regarding confidential settlement negotiations. As such, the objection is sustained with regard to any and all references to settlement negotiations. The court has not read or considered those portions of the Reply Declaration. The remaining objections are overruled.

Petitioner is requesting leave to propound discovery. He also seeks an order directing the parties to sell the marital residence located on Keystone Ct. in El Dorado Hills; alternatively, an order for Respondent to buy Petitioner out of the home within 90 days. He asks that the parties be ordered to sell the guns, ammunition, and body armor presently held in trust by Loyal Arms, LLC. He further seeks an Evidence Code § 730 evaluation of the parties' Lamborghini to assess its fair market value and a business valuation expert to determine the value of the two community businesses, Concierge Medical Aesthetics, Inc., and AECO, Inc. He also seeks a Family Centered Case Resolution Plan. Regarding custody and visitation, he asks for joint legal and joint physical custody with final say on certain medical and educational decisions. Alternatively, he requests joint legal custody with an increase in his parenting time and such time to be unsupervised.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent asks the court to deny the request for discovery. Instead, she asks for an order limiting the amount of discovery Petitioner may propound and allowing Respondent additional time to respond. She further asks the court to deny the request regarding a business valuation expert and the request for the sale of the guns as she states the parties reached agreements on these issues prior to the filing of the RFO. She opposes the request for the sale of the marital residence and for a joint vehicle appraiser. She is in agreement with the request for a Family Centered Case Resolution Plan. She is requesting \$750 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. Regarding custody, she is asking the court to revert to professionally supervised visits up to three days per week for up to 12 hours total per week. She is also requesting an Evidence Code § 730 evaluation with Petitioner to pay the entirety of the cost.

The request for the sale of the marital residence is denied. The court does not find grounds to grant such a request at this time as it does not appear that the community property interest in the home is at risk. Moreover, the parties are scheduled to begin trial on the issue of property division on August 25th at which time the community property interest in the home can be addressed.

The court declines to rule on the request to sell the guns, ammo, and armor as it appears this issue is moot. Likewise, the court declines to rule on the issue of a business valuation expert as the issue has already been addressed and is also moot.

The request for a joint expert to evaluate the value of the Lamborghini is denied. The parties are each within their right to conduct what discovery they feel is necessary to accurately present their case at trial. If Respondent does not feel that such an expert is necessary nor helpful, then the court is not inclined to force her to participate in retaining one.

Regarding the remaining requests, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION TO PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION IS SUSTAINED WITH REGARD TO ANY AND ALL REFERENCES TO SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS. THE COURT HAS NOT READ OR CONSIDERED THOSE PORTIONS OF THE REPLY DECLARATION. THE REMAINING OBJECTIONS ARE OVERRULED AND THE REMAINDER OF THE REPLY DECLARATION HAS BEEN READ AND CONSIDERED. THE REQUEST FOR THE SALE OF THE MARITAL RESIDENCE IS DENIED. THE COURT DECLINES TO RULE ON THE REQUEST TO SELL THE GUNS, AMMO, AND ARMOR AS IT APPEARS THIS ISSUE IS MOOT. LIKEWISE, THE COURT DECLINES TO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

RULE ON THE ISSUE OF A BUSINESS VALUATION EXPERT AS THE ISSUE HAS ALREADY BEEN ADDRESSED AND IS ALSO MOOT. THE REQUEST FOR A JOINT EXPERT TO EVALUATE THE VALUE OF THE LAMBORGHINI IS DENIED.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUES OF CUSTODY AND VISITATION, DISCOVERY, AND A FAMILY CENTERED CASE RESOLUTION PLAN.

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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. ALEJANDRO MERJIL, SR. V. APRIL MERJIL

22FL0429

On April 30, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking orders for child custody and visitation, child support, bifurcation, and an order compelling Respondent's financial disclosures. The RFO was served on May 4th, however there is no indication that an Income and Expense Declaration was filed or served.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 5th. They were able to reach agreements as to custody and visitation, a report containing those agreements was prepared the same day. It was mailed to the parties on June 6th.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and an Income and Expense Declaration on June 30th.

Petitioner's Reply Declaration to CCRC Report was filed and served on July 9th.

Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed and served on July 22nd.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal custody with sole physical custody of the children. He requests child support be set to zero, pending any change in Respondent's circumstances. He does ask that the court preclude Respondent from collecting social security benefits for the couple's son. Finally, he is requesting bifurcation of the issue of marital status. He states that there are no community pension or retirement plans.

Respondent agrees to bifurcate the issue of marital status so long as Petitioner is responsible for all costs of bifurcation, including Respondent's attorney's fees in the amount of \$5,000. She asks that the agreement reached in CCRC be adopted with the addition that neither party consume drugs or alcohol prior to or during their parenting time.

The request for bifurcation is granted. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on this issue.

The court does not have an Income and Expense Declaration from Petitioner in order to rule on Respondent's request for attorney's fees. Petitioner is ordered to appear and bring with him a full and complete Income and Expense Declaration.

The court is adopting only a portion of the agreements reached in CCRC as it does not appear that converting to a week-on/week-off schedule would be in the best interests of the children given that they seemingly have had little contact with Respondent for the past two years. The agreements in the following sections are being adopted as the orders of

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

the court: Legal Custody, Holiday, and Social Security. The parties are ordered to appear to address establishing a parenting plan.

The parties are also ordered to appear on the issue of child support as the court is hesitant to make such an order without first establishing a visitation schedule.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE REQUEST FOR BIFURCATION IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THIS ISSUE.

THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION FROM PETITIONER IN ORDER TO RULE ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO APPEAR AND BRING WITH HIM A FULL AND COMPLETE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

THE AGREEMENTS IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE CCRC REPORT ARE BEING ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT: LEGAL CUSTODY, HOLIDAY, AND SOCIAL SECURITY. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO ADDRESS ESTABLISHING A VISITATION SCHEDULE. THE PARTIES ARE ALSO ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUE OF CHILD SUPPORT AS THE COURT IS HESITANT TO MAKE SUCH AN ORDER WITHOUT FIRST ESTABLISHING A PARENTING PLAN.

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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. ANGELA SCHIFANDO V. ANDREW SCHIFANDO

PFL20190365

On May 2, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as stated therein. All required documents were mail served on May 7th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 16th.

Petitioner is requesting an order for the minor, Jack, to be evaluated at The Center for Cognition and Compassion. Petitioner has agreed to pay the cost thereof. She also requests an order for him to undergo occupational therapy at Petitioner's cost. She asks that the right of first refusal be clarified with regard to Respondent's work schedule and holidays. Finally, she is seeking an order allowing the non-custodial parent to have phone contact with the children on Thursdays between 7-7:30pm.

Respondent opposes the request for a neurophysiological exam for the minor as he argues it is unnecessary. And while he agrees to occupational therapy in the school setting, he is opposed to additional occupational therapy. In the event the court orders additional occupational therapy, Respondent asks that it be done in conjunction with medication. He requests an order allowing him to call the children once a week and an order for the parties to set a date and time to obtain passports for the children. Finally, Respondent asks the court to appoint a parenting coordinator, at Petitioner's expense.

The request for a neurophysiological examination is denied. The parties are ordered to schedule an appointment for the minor with a psychiatrist qualified in diagnosing and treating ADHD, forthwith. The parties are ordered to follow the treatment recommendations as prescribed by the psychiatrist. The parties are ordered to ensure that appointments with the psychiatrist continue at a frequency and duration as prescribed by the psychiatrist.

In addition to treatment with a qualified psychiatrist, the request for occupational therapy is granted. The cost of occupational therapy for the minor is to be paid by Petitioner.

Regarding the request for phone calls, the parties are to ensure that the non-custodial parent has at minimum, one phone call with the children per week. The parties are to meet and confer on the date and time of the phone call. If they are unable to come to an agreement, the call shall take place on Thursdays from 7-7:30. If the children wish to extend the duration of the call, or terminate the call early, they may do so in their sole discretion. The custodial parent is not to interfere with the phone call in any way.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Regarding the right of first refusal, the prior order is clear, it does not apply to absences caused by a parent working. If the court, or the mediator, had intended this to apply to an 8-hour workday only, the order would have specified as such. It does not and Petitioner has not established a change in circumstances sufficient to warrant a change to the prior order. As such, Petitioner's request to limit the right of first refusal is denied.

The right of first refusal does apply to the holiday schedule as well as the regular schedule. The only enumerated exceptions are for regular childcare when a parent is working or as expressly agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the court. As such, the court is clarifying that the right of first refusal does apply to the holiday schedule.

The parties are ordered to meet and confer to select a date and time to obtain passports for the children.

Respondent's request for a parenting coordinator is denied. However, the parties are admonished to work together in furtherance of the best interests of the children. Continued failure to do so may result in the appointment of such a coordinator at the joint expense of both parties.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE REQUEST FOR A NEUROPHYSIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION IS DENIED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT FOR THE MINOR WITH A PSYCHIATRIST QUALIFIED IN DIAGNOSING AND TREATING ADHD, FORTHWITH. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE PSYCHIATRIST. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO ENSURE THAT APPOINTMENTS WITH THE PSYCHIATRIST CONTINUE AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS PRESCRIBED BY THE PSYCHIATRIST.

IN ADDITION TO TREATMENT WITH A QUALIFIED PSYCHIATRIST, THE REQUEST FOR OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY IS GRANTED. THE COST OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FOR THE MINOR IS TO BE PAID BY PETITIONER.

REGARDING THE REQUEST FOR PHONE CALLS, THE PARTIES ARE TO ENSURE THAT THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT HAS AT MINIMUM, ONE PHONE CALL WITH THE CHILDREN PER WEEK. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER ON THE DATE AND TIME OF THE PHONE CALL. IF THEY ARE UNABLE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT, THE CALL SHALL TAKE PLACE ON THURSDAYS FROM 7-7:30. IF THE CHILDREN WISH TO EXTEND THE DURATION OF THE CALL, OR TERMINATE THE CALL EARLY, THEY MAY DO

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

SO IN THEIR SOLE DISCRETION. THE CUSTODIAL PARENT IS NOT TO INTERFERE WITH THE PHONE CALL IN ANY WAY.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO LIMIT THE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO AN 8-HOUR WORKDAY IS DENIED. THE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL DOES APPLY TO THE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER TO SELECT A DATE AND TIME TO OBTAIN PASSPORTS FOR THE CHILDREN.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A PARENTING COORDINATOR IS DENIED. HOWEVER, THE PARTIES ARE ADMONISHED TO WORK TOGETHER IN FURTHERANCE OF THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN. CONTINUED FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN THE APPOINTMENT OF SUCH A COORDINATOR AT THE JOINT EXPENSE OF BOTH PARTIES.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. MARGARETTE TEMPLE V. GREGORY TEMPLE

24FL0614

On April 29, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel further discovery, seeking to compel Preliminary Declarations of Disclosure (PDDs), sanctions, attorney's fees, and custody of the parties' dog. She filed a Separate Statement in support thereof and her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently with the RFO. All required documents were served the same day as filing.

On July 14th, the parties stipulated to several of the issues in the pending RFO. Specifically, Respondent agreed to provide his full and complete PDDs and his responses to discovery no later than July 18th. They further agreed that Respondent would pay Petitioner \$5,000 as and for attorney's fees. The stipulation expressly states that the hearing on the RFO is to remain on calendar. It was agreed that the MSC would be continued to join with the RFO hearing and the parties would meet with Mr. Forester at the time of the hearing. In the event of Mr. Forester's unavailability, the parties stipulated to meet and confer in an effort to further resolve the matter.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 17th along with a Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and his Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner is requesting the court order Respondent to provide his PDDs within 10 days of the hearing date along with all requisite attachments. She asks that Respondent be ordered to provide further responses to Demand for Production of Documents, Set One, no later than 20 days from the date of the hearing. She requests attorney's fees and sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 2107 in the amount of \$2,500 and an additional \$3,500 pursuant to Civil Procedure §§ 2031.300 and 2023.010. Finally, she seeks an order for the parties to equally share custody of the parties' dog, Lady.

Respondent cites the stipulation of the parties. He states he provided further discovery responses and that he has provided all documents in his possession and control. He states that he has served his PDDs and has attempted to resolve the matter in good faith. He further states that both parties have received money from the sale of the family residence and there is \$50,000 held in a trust account. He asks that Petitioner not be awarded any additional attorney's fees.

Per the stipulation, the parties are ordered to appear to meet with Mr. Forrester to attempt to resolve the remaining issues pending before the court.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 31, 2025

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: PER THE STIPULATION, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO MEET WITH MR. FORRESTER TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE THE REMAINING ISSUES PENDING BEFORE THE COURT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. RYAN CORTEZ V. SHERI CORTEZ

25FL0142

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 15, 2025, seeking temporary guideline spousal support. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was properly served on May 23, 2025.

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

In reviewing the moving papers, Respondent failed to complete the portion of her Income and Expense Declaration regarding her monthly expenses. Because the moving party in a support request is required to file a completed Income and Expense Declaration, the court cannot grant Respondent's request with her Income and Expense Declaration as-is. Accordingly, this matter is continued to 10/9/2025 at 1:30 in Department 5. Both parties are ordered to file and serve full and complete Income and Expense Declarations, along with the required supporting documents, no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date. The court reserves jurisdiction to award support back to the date of filing the RFO.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 10/9/2025 AT 1:30 IN DEPARTMENT 5. BOTH PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVE FULL AND COMPLETE INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS, ALONG WITH THE REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS, NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING DATE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AWARD 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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. EMMA CROWLEY V. MICHAEL CROWLEY

PFL20200062

On March 10, 2025, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC). The OSC was personally served on March 26, 2025.

The parties appeared for the arraignment on May 22nd at which time the court appointed the public defender. The arraignment was continued to the present date.

The parties again appeared on June 12, 2025, at which time the public defender declared a work overload conflict. The court thanked and relieved the public defender and appointed the office of the alternate public defender. The matter was continued to July 31st for further arraignment.

The parties are ordered to appear.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. JUNG HAN V. LIEN HAN

PFL20160529

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 10, 2025, seeking a modification of child support orders as well as attorney's fees. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration as well as a Declaration of Counsel in Support of Attorney's Fees. Petitioner was mail served with address verification on March 18, 2025. Respondent is seeking guideline child support as well as \$20,000 in Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on May 15, 2025. Respondent was electronically served the same day. Petitioner consents to guideline child support. Petitioner is opposed to the court granting Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on May 19, 2025. Petitioner was served the same day. Respondent asserts Petitioner is earning substantially more income than what is disclosed in his Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on June 24, 2025. Respondent was served the same day. The court deems this to be a Sur Reply, for which Petitioner did not obtain leave of court to file and therefore, will not consider.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court notes the Respondent's Income and Expense Declaration was filed more than 90 days ago, however, the court finds good cause to proceed, given Respondent is a W-2 employee with the state of California, and it is unlikely there have been any changes to Respondent's income in that time. Utilizing the figures as set forth in the parties' Income and Expense Declarations, with a 50% timeshare, the court finds guideline child support to be \$161 per month payable from Petitioner to Respondent (see attached X-Spouse). The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$161 per month as and for guideline child support effective August 1, 2025, and payable on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

In addition to the foregoing monthly support payments, the parties are ordered to equally share in any uninsured medical care costs for the children and childcare costs when such costs are incurred as a result of employment or necessary education for employment. The parties are ordered to follow the procedures set forth in the attached FL-192.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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

The court finds there is little disparity in income between the parties. Further, the court finds there is parity between the parties in the access to funds. Therefore, the court denies the request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$161 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$161 PER MONTH AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2025, AND PAYABLE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW. IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING MONTHLY SUPPORT PAYMENTS, THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SHARE IN ANY UNINSURED MEDICAL CARE COSTS FOR THE CHILDREN AND CHILDCARE COSTS WHEN SUCH COSTS ARE INCURRED AS A RESULT OF EMPLOYMENT OR NECESSARY EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE ATTACHED FL-192. THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 2030 ATTORNEY'S FEES. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 31, 2025

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.

2025

Xspouse 2025-1.2-CA

Monthly Figures

1/1

NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING CHILD SUPPORT

Childcare and Health Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures

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

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

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

Information Sheet on Changing a Child Support Order

General Info

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

Online Self-Help Guide

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

When a Child Support Order May Be Changed

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

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

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

Examples

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

How to Change a Child Support Order

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

What forms do I need?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Need help?

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

Information About Child Support for Incarcerated or Confined Parents

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

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

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

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

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

a. If released before January 1, 2024, child support automatically restarts the first day of the first full month after the parent is released.

b. If released after January 1, 2024, child support will automatically restart the first day of the 10th month after the parent is released.

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

4. More info. For more information about child support and incarcerated parents, see Family Code section 4007.5 or go to <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/child-support/incarcerated-parent>.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. JESSIE LUDDY V. LOGAN LUDDY

25FL0275

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 28, 2025 seeking custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 23, 2025, and a review hearing on July 3rd. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served on April 2, 2025.

Respondent filed a Request to Reschedule the Hearing on May 8, 2025. On the same day, the court granted the Request to Reschedule the Hearing and set the matter for a review hearing on July 31, 2025, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Respondent sought and was granted a temporary Domestic Violence Restraining Order in case number 25FL0272 on March 24, 2025. The temporary orders included custody orders.

Petitioner filed a Request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order on June 20, 2025. The court granted a temporary restraining order which included custody and parenting time orders.

The parties attended CCRC on April 23, 2025. A CCRC report was filed with the court on July 18, 2025, and mailed to the parties on July 23rd. The CCRC counselor recommends the parties be rereferred to CCRC upon resolution of the mutual requests for restraining orders and that the current orders continue in full force and effect in the interim.

The court, on its own motion, continues this matter to join with the requests for Domestic Violence Restraining Orders which are currently pending a hearing on 11/5/2025 at 8:30 AM in Department 8.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, CONTINUES THIS MATTER TO JOIN WITH THE REQUESTS FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDERS WHICH ARE CURRENTLY PENDING A HEARING ON 11/5/2025 AT 8:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 8. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 31, 2025

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

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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. EMMA MILO V. ROBERT MILO

PFL20150565

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 7, 2025, seeking modification of child custody orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on May 7, 2025 and a review hearing on July 3rd. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served with some, but not all, the necessary documents on April 7th.

Petitioner filed an amended RFO on April 25, 2025, seeking modification of child custody orders as well as reimbursement of shared expenses for the minor. Once again, the Proof of Service shows Respondent was served some, but not all the necessary documents on April 26, 2025.

Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on April 29, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served on May 17, 2025.

Neither party appeared at the CCRC appointment on May 7th.

On May 19, 2025, the parties submitted a stipulation to be referred back to CCRC and set a review hearing. The court signed the stipulation and rereferred the parties to CCRC with an appointment on June 12, 2025. A new review hearing was set for July 31, 2025 at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Only Petitioner appeared for the CCRC appointment on June 12th. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on June 24, 2025 and mailed to the parties on June 25th.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

July 31, 2025

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. ANGELICA MOFFITT V. JAMES MOFFITT

22FL0121

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 13, 2025, seeking visitation orders as well as drug testing orders. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #13: 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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. CAITLIN OSBORNE V. CAMERON SANTO

22FL0257

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on November 26, 2024. It was mail served on Respondent on December 5th. The parties appeared before the court for hearing on the RFO on February 27, 2025. At that time, the court re-referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and set a review hearing for the present date. Supplemental declarations were ordered to be served no later than 10 days prior to the review hearing.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 28, 2025. A report with recommendations was prepared on April 11th. It was mailed to the parties on April 23rd.

The parties appeared for the hearing on May 22, 2025. The matter was continued to receive input from Minors' Counsel. The court directed supplemental declarations to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions on May 29, 2025. Parties were mail served the same day. Minors' Counsel recommends Petitioner have an additional weekend each month, as well as conjoint therapy between the minors and Respondent. Additionally, Minors' Counsel requests a review hearing in four months.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on July 22, 2025. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) 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 18th the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Petitioner has not filed a supplemental declaration.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the April 11, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors with the following addition. The court is ordering Respondent and the minors to participate in conjoint therapy. Petitioner shall recommend the names of three potential conjoint therapists no later than August 14, 2025. Respondent will have until August 21, 2025 to select one of the three. Counseling services are to begin as soon as possible

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

thereafter. The court adopts the agreements and recommendations with the added provision for conjoint counseling as the orders of the court. The court declines setting a review hearing.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE APRIL 11, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITION. THE COURT IS ORDERING RESPONDENT AND THE MINORS TO PARTICIPATE IN CONJOINT THERAPY. PETITIONER SHALL RECOMMEND THE NAMES OF THREE POTENTIAL CONJOINT THERAPISTS NO LATER THAN AUGUST 14, 2025. RESPONDENT WILL HAVE UNTIL AUGUST 21, 2025 TO SELECT ONE OF THE THREE. COUNSELING SERVICES ARE TO BEGIN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE THEREAFTER. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE ADDED PROVISION FOR CONJOINT COUNSELING AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE COURT DECLINES SETTING A REVIEW HEARING. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
July 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. THOMAS PULVINO V. AMBUR MORRISON

23FL0764

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 23, 2025, seeking property control orders, spousal support orders, Minor's Counsel be appointed, as well as what appears to be a motion to compel preliminary declarations of disclosure.

Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on July 7, 2025. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states, "[u]nless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed, or to be filed, with the court. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California..." This would have made July 3, 2025 the last day for mail service.

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 #15: 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 31, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. DANIEL STEVENSON V. MAUDENA STEVENSON

24FL0166

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 11, 2025, requesting temporary guideline spousal support. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was mail served with the RFO and Income and Expense Declaration on June 26, 2025 and again on July 8, 2025. The court finds Petitioner was not served with all the necessary documents in either service. Additionally, the court finds the service on July 8th to be late. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states, “[u]nless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed, or to be filed, with the court. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California...” This would have made July 3, 2025 the last day for mail service.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: 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.