

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

1. DCSS V. CHAD MCCracken (OTHER PARTY: YULIYA PALSSON)

PFS20200179

On May 21, 2026, Other Parent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking reconsideration of the court's May 14, 2026 order and an order to change the mediator. There is no Proof of Service for this document.

On July 29th, Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order requesting the matter be dropped as the RFO had not been served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

2. ANN MARIE AZVEDO V. RANDY AZVEDO

PFL20200337

On February 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to modify child and spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail served on April 23, 2026, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore service was required to comply with Family Code § 215.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

3. RICHARD FISCHER V. DINA FISCHER

21FL0070

On May 26, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting a date for a prove-up hearing. All required documents were personally served on July 14, 2026.

According to Petitioner, a Stipulation and Order on reserved issues was filed on December 9, 2025. The stipulation contained a typographical error stating that judgment had been entered in June of 2025 though that is not the case. Petitioner now requests a hearing date for a prove up hearing.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

4. DAWNA LYNN HAYHURST V. VINCENT E. HAYHURST

26FL0482

On May 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and an order to sell the marital residence. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were personally served on June 19th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on July 23rd.

Petitioner filed her reply declaration on August 5th, it was served on August 4th.

Petitioner is requesting spousal support and need-based attorney's fees in the amount of \$8,000. She also requests an order to sell the marital residence. She would like to propose the names of three real estate agents and Respondent to choose one of the three within 10 days. She asks that the parties be ordered to defer to, and cooperate with, the listing agent in determining the price, necessary repairs and cleanup. Once sold, she asks that each party receive a distribution of \$188,000 and the remaining proceeds to be placed in a trust account pending further agreement of the parties or order of the court.

Respondent opposes the request for spousal support and the requested attorney's fees. He also asks that the court deny, or at least postpone, the sale of the marital residence until all community property issues have been resolved.

Regarding the sale of the marital residence, it is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court's authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to "[a]t any time during the proceeding...order the liquidation of community or quasi-community assets so as to avoid unreasonable market or investment risks..." Cal. Fam. Code § 2108.

Here, the court is concerned with the potential loss of homeowners insurance on the residence and Petitioner's inability to keep the residence in good condition to preserve the value of the asset. Furthermore, given that the parties will only receive a portion of the sale proceeds and the rest will be placed in trust, the court finds that this should resolve Respondent's concerns over separating the rest of the community assets and debts prior to selling the home.

In light of the foregoing, the parties are ordered to place the marital residence up for sale forthwith. Petitioner is to propose the names of three real estate agents to Respondent

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

no later than August 20, 2026. Respondent shall choose one of the three and inform Petitioner of his choice within ten days of his receipt of Petitioner's list. The parties are ordered to defer to, and cooperate with, the listing agent in selecting the listing price and determining which, if any, repairs and cleanup are necessary to prepare for the sale. Upon completion of the sale, each party is to receive a distribution of \$188,000. The remaining funds are to be placed into Petitioner's attorney's client trust account until written agreement of the parties or further order of the court.

Turning to the issue of support, generally speaking, a married person has a duty to support his or her spouse. Cal. Fam. Code § 4300. However, the court maintains broad discretion in determining whether a support award is warranted and if so, the amount and duration thereof. In re Marriage of McLain, 7 Cal. App. 5th 262, 269 (2017). Here, given that there is not much disparity between the monthly incomes of the parties, any order of support as calculated by Xspouse would be nominal. Furthermore, it would result in a payment from Respondent to Petitioner however, Respondent is paying monthly rent of \$1,000 while Petitioner is living rent free in the marital residence. For these reasons, the court is setting temporary spousal support to \$0.

Finally, regarding the request for attorney's fees, 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).

As stated above, there is little disparity in the monthly income of the parties. Furthermore, the court does not find that Respondent has the ability to pay for both his attorney and Petitioner's. As such, the request for attorney's fees is denied without prejudice.

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.

TENATIVE RULING #4: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE MARITAL RESIDENCE UP FOR SALE FORTHWITH. PETITIONER IS TO PROPOSE THE NAMES OF THREE REAL ESTATE AGENTS TO RESPONDENT NO LATER THAN AUGUST 20, 2026. RESPONDENT SHALL CHOOSE ONE OF THE THREE AND INFORM PETITIONER OF HIS CHOICE WITHIN TEN DAYS OF HIS RECEIPT OF PETITIONER'S LIST. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO DEFER TO, AND COOPERATE WITH, THE LISTING AGENT IN SELECTING THE LISTING

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

PRICE AND DETERMINING WHICH, IF ANY, REPAIRS AND CLEANUP ARE NECESSARY TO PREPARE FOR THE SALE. UPON COMPLETION OF THE SALE, EACH PARTY IS TO RECEIVE A DISTRIBUTION OF \$188,000. THE REMAINING FUNDS ARE TO BE PLACED INTO PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S CLIENT TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES OR FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT.

THE COURT IS SETTING TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO \$0.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

5. CYNTHIA JACKS V. TODD V. JACKS

23FL0881

On May 15, 2026, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging one count of contempt. She filed a Declaration of Due Diligence on May 26th.

The parties are ordered to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

6. NICOLE LONG V. KYLE LONG

24FL0660

On May 15, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child and spousal support orders. He did not file an Income and Expense Declaration until July 8, 2026. Both documents were served on July 8th, however Respondent failed to serve the Notice of Tentative Ruling and a blank FL-320, as required. This request is on the heels of the court's child and spousal support orders dated April 30, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on July 29th.

Respondent filed and served a declaration dated July 30th. He filed and served another declaration on August 3rd.

Respondent is requesting a change in child support orders on the basis that one child will have aged out by the time of the hearing. He further argues that updated orders are necessary due to the fact that each party's income has recently changed.

Petitioner agrees that the eldest child has aged out of the support calculation. She further agrees to the use of each party's current income to calculate support. She requests attorney's fees and sanctions in the amount of \$3,000.

"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. Here, Respondent did not file and serve his Income and Expense Declaration until almost two months after filing the RFO. And, once filed, the declaration did not include the requisite supporting documents which were not filed until July 30th and August 3rd. Moreover, it appears that as of the filing of Petitioner's responsive declaration the parties still had yet to meet and confer on the issue of support.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing and ordered to bring their proposed Xspouse reports.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING AND ORDERED TO BRING THEIR PROPOSED XSPOUSE REPORTS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

7. JESSALYN MANZER V. KEVIN MANZER

24FL1282

On May 27, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were served by mail and electronically on May 27th, however this is a post-judgment request and therefore service was to comply with Family Code § 215.

Respondent filed a declaration on July 1, 2026. It was served on July 30th.

Despite the defect in service, the parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on July 2, 2026 and were able to reach agreements on all issues. A report codifying their agreements was prepared the same day. It was mailed to the parties on July 6, 2026.

Respondent filed and served a reply declaration on July 27th.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Nevertheless, she did show up at, and participate in, the CCRC appointment. Therefore, the court finds that she has actual knowledge of the pending requests and the matter may be reached on the merits.

Respondent is asking the court to order Petitioner to comply with the 2-2-5 visitation schedule which was previously agreed upon by the parties. He also requests sanctions in the amount of \$5,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court does find the agreements contained in the July 2, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors with the following modifications. Paragraph 2 of the Holidays section shall be amended to delete the sentence “Mother shall have Monday at 3:00pm to Wednesday at 3:00pm.” Paragraph 1 of the Terms and Conditions section shall be modified to read – “The terms and conditions of this order may be added to or changed as the needs of the children and parties change. Such changes will be in writing, dated and signed by the parties; each party will retain a copy. If the parties are unable to agree, they will be required to return to mediation for the pending issue. The parties will not unilaterally change the existing agreement, and it will be followed until otherwise resolved in mediation or the courts.” Finally, in keeping with the section wherein the parties agree not to make negative comments about one another or make such comments via social media, Petitioner is ordered to remove from the internet the social media post which is attached as Exhibit F to Respondent’s July 1st declaration.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Respondent is requesting sanctions pursuant to Family Code section 271 which states, in pertinent part, "...the court may base an award of attorney's fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction." Fam. Code § 271(a). While the purpose of Section 271 is to impose a punitive sanction, the court is not to impose a sanction that would create an "unreasonable financial burden on the party against whom the sanction is imposed." *Id.*

Here, the court is concerned with Petitioner's repeated discussions with the minors regarding custody and her blatant disregard for the terms of the Marital Settlement Agreement which became the judgment of the court; this includes introducing her significant other to the minors without following the agreed upon steps for doing so and her refusal to comply with the visitation schedule. Petitioner's repeated failure to comply with the terms of the judgment directly increased the costs of litigation for Respondent and therefore, the court does find sanctions to be warranted. That said, the court is concerned that the requested amount of \$5,000 would pose an unreasonable financial burden on Petitioner. Furthermore, the court does not find \$5,000 to be a reasonable amount of fees incurred in connection with Petitioner's misfeasance. As such, Petitioner is sanctioned \$1,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271. This amount is to be paid directly to Respondent's attorney. Payment may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$100 commencing on September 1, 2026 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

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 FINDS THE AGREEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE JULY 2, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE HOLIDAYS SECTION SHALL BE AMENDED TO DELETE THE SENTENCE "MOTHER SHALL HAVE MONDAY AT 3:00PM TO WEDNESDAY AT 3:00PM." PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS SECTION SHALL BE MODIFIED TO READ – "THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE ADDED TO OR CHANGED AS THE NEEDS OF THE CHILDREN AND PARTIES CHANGE.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

SUCH CHANGES WILL BE IN WRITING, DATED AND SIGNED BY THE PARTIES; EACH PARTY WILL RETAIN A COPY. IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO AGREE, THEY WILL BE REQUIRED TO RETURN TO MEDIATION FOR THE PENDING ISSUE. THE PARTIES WILL NOT UNILATERALLY CHANGE THE EXISTING AGREEMENT, AND IT WILL BE FOLLOWED UNTIL OTHERWISE RESOLVED IN MEDIATION OR THE COURTS.” FINALLY, IN KEEPING WITH THE SECTION WHEREIN THE PARTIES AGREE NOT TO MAKE NEGATIVE COMMENTS ABOUT ONE ANOTHER OR MAKE SUCH COMMENTS VIA SOCIAL MEDIA, PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO REMOVE FROM THE INTERNET THE SOCIAL MEDIA POST WHICH IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT F TO RESPONDENT’S JULY 1ST DECLARATION.

PETITIONER IS SANCTIONED \$1,000 PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT’S ATTORNEY. PAYMENT MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$100 COMMENCING ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

8. JARED SILVA V. GRACE SILVA

25FL0397

On May 11, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to clarify support orders and seeking visitation orders. All required documents were served on May 18th.

Only Respondent appeared at Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 26, 2026. Because Petitioner did not appear, a report without recommendations was prepared on June 26th. It was mailed to the parties on June 29th.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served on Petitioner. He had notice of the pending requests and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Respondent asks the court to adopt her proposed Xspouse for overtime and commission calculation purposes. She further requests an order for the children to continue their homeschooling program. Finally, she asks that the children reside primarily with Respondent or, alternatively, for them to be in her care while Petitioner is working.

Respondent’s moving papers refer to an “attached” Xspouse report, however no such report is attached. The parties are ordered to appear and Respondent is ordered to bring with her a copy of the proposed Xspouse report.

The parties are also ordered to appear to present argument on the issues of schooling and visitation.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: RESPONDENT’S MOVING PAPERS REFER TO AN “ATTACHED” XSPOUSE REPORT, HOWEVER NO SUCH REPORT IS ATTACHED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR AND RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO BRING WITH HER A COPY OF THE PROPOSED XSPOUSE REPORT.

THE PARTIES ARE ALSO ORDERED TO APPEAR TO PRESENT ARGUMENT ON THE ISSUES OF SCHOOLING AND VISITATION.

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

August 13, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

9. MICHAEL L. SOUDERS V. DONNA JUNE SOUDERS

25FL0270

On May 20, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an appraisal of the marital property and sanctions. All required documents were served on May 21st.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order. Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure “as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious.” El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, the RFO was timely and properly served on Petitioner. He had notice of the pending requests and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Respondent is requesting to have the marital residence, located at 4661 Consumnes View Trail, appraised by a licensed real estate appraiser.

Respondent’s request for an appraisal is granted. The parties are ordered to have the property located at 4661 Consumnes View Trail appraised by a jointly selected, licensed real estate appraiser. If the parties cannot mutually agree on an appraiser by August 18, 2026, then Respondent shall select the appraiser. The parties are ordered to fully cooperate with scheduling and providing access to the property. The cost of the appraisal shall be advanced by Petitioner, subject to reallocation.

The court is reserving on Respondent’s request for sanctions until the time of trial.

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 #9: RESPONDENT’S REQUEST FOR AN APPRAISAL IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO HAVE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4661 CONSUMNES VIEW TRAIL APPRAISED BY A JOINTLY SELECTED, LICENSED REAL ESTATE APPRAISER. IF THE PARTIES CANNOT MUTUALLY AGREE ON AN APPRAISER BY AUGUST 18, 2026, THEN RESPONDENT SHALL SELECT THE APPRAISER. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FULLY COOPERATE WITH SCHEDULING AND PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE PROPERTY. THE COST OF THE APPRAISAL SHALL BE ADVANCED BY PETITIONER, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION.

THE COURT IS RESERVING ON RESPONDENT’S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

10. ADRIAN STROH V. SABRINA STROH

26FL0264

On April 24, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. It was served on April 27th. She filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration on May 5th. She filed and served another Income and Expense Declaration on May 7th.

Petitioner filed his Income and Expense Declaration on May 8th, it was served on April 27th. Petitioner filed his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his updated Income and Expense Declaration on July 29th.

“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. “‘Current’ means the form has been completed within the past three months providing no facts have changed.” Cal. Rule Ct. 5.260(3). Here, Respondent’s Income and Expense Declaration is just outside the three month period. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing. Respondent is ordered to bring with her an updated Income and Expense Declaration with supporting documents. Both parties are ordered to bring their proposed Xspouse reports.

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO BRING WITH HER AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS. BOTH PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO BRING THEIR PROPOSED XSPOUSE REPORTS.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

11. AMANDA TESSANDORI V. ERIC TESSANDORI

PFL20200407

On May 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for Respondent to undergo a vocational evaluation, an order regarding travel expenses, and arrears. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were personally served on July 19th in accordance with Family Code § 215.

Petitioner filed and served her updated Income and Expense Declaration on July 27th.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and his Income and Expense Declaration on July 30th. Respondent filed a supplemental declaration on July 31st. It was served the same day.

Petitioner filed her reply declaration on August 6th, it was served on August 1st.

Petitioner is requesting an order for Respondent to pay half of the travel expenses associated with the minors' travel to California. She further asks the court to determine arrears owed for Respondent's half of the uninsured medical expenses for the minors and an order to pay those expenses forthwith. Finally, she requests an order for Respondent to undergo a vocational evaluation with Patrick Sullivan.

Respondent opposes all of the requested orders. He asks that if he is required to undergo a vocational evaluation then Petitioner should be required to do the same. He argues that he should not have to pay for the uninsured medical expenses because the Marital Settlement Agreement (MSA) requires the requesting party to provide an Explanation of Benefits (EOB) in order to request reimbursement. Respondent further requests reimbursement of the following: (1) his travel costs to Texas; (2) the costs of enrolling the children in summer camp; (3) the costs associated with Respondent's travel to transport the children back from Texas for Christmas of 2025. He also asks that he be credited for an overpayment of support and asks for that be offset from any amount he may owe Petitioner.

Petitioner's request to amend the court's prior order for travel costs is denied. Petitioner is the parent who chose to move away. For that reason, the burden of paying the costs for the children to travel back to California for their visits rests with Petitioner. The court is maintaining all prior orders regarding payment of costs for visitation.

Petitioner's request for a vocational evaluation is granted. Respondent is ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation with Patrick Sullivan. The evaluation shall be completed at

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

Petitioner's cost, subject to reallocation. Respondent's request for a vocational evaluation of Petitioner is denied as Respondent has not provided the court with the name or credentials of a qualified evaluator.

Regarding each party's reimbursement requests, the court is in need of evidence for each party to prove their respective requests. The parties are ordered to appear to select dates for an evidentiary hearing on these issues.

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 #11: PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO AMEND THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER FOR TRAVEL COSTS IS DENIED. THE COURT IS MAINTAINING ALL PRIOR ORDERS REGARDING PAYMENT OF COSTS FOR VISITATION.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO UNDERGO A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION WITH PATRICK SULLIVAN. THE EVALUATION SHALL BE COMPLETED AT PETITIONER'S COST, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION OF PETITIONER IS DENIED.

REGARDING EACH PARTY'S REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS, THE COURT IS IN NEED OF EVIDENCE FOR EACH PARTY TO PROVE THEIR RESPECTIVE REQUESTS. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO SELECT DATES FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON THESE ISSUES.

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

August 13, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

12. GRISELDA AGUYA V. SARAH YOUNG AND JASON YOUNG

26FL0487

Petitioner filed a Petition for Grandparent Joinder on May 22, 2026. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking grandparent visitation. Proof of Service shows Jason Young was personally served on July 18, 2026.

Petitioner filed a responsive declaration to the RFO on July 17, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing this document was properly served, therefore, the court has not considered it.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

13. CURTIS CHRISTENSEN V. GINA CRISTENSEN

PFL20170845

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) on June 4, 2026, alleging 21 counts of contempt. Respondent was personally served on July 7, 2026.

Parties are ordered to appear for arraignment.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR ARRAIGNMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

15. CATHERINE GARAVITO V. FRANK GARAVITO

24FL1127

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 1, 2026, seeking leave to amend the Petition for Legal Separation, to a Petition for Dissolution. Respondent was personally served on April 15, 2026. It is unclear whether Respondent was served with a blank FL-320.

Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on May 28, 2026. Respondent did not appear. The court found the service on Respondent was defective due to the lack of a blank FL-320. The court continued the matter to August 13, 2026 at 1:30 PM in Department 5 and directed Petitioner to serve Respondent with a copy of the minute order continuing the hearing and a blank FL-320.

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

Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar.

Respondent filed an RFO on May 20, 2026 seeking a modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on July 2, 2026 and a review hearing on August 13, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at CCRC and reached a full agreement. The court submitted a stipulation to the court, which was adopted as its order on July 6, 2026. The court, therefore, finds Respondent's RFO to be moot and drops the matter from calendar.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: PETITIONER'S APRIL 1, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

RESPONDENT'S MAY 20, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 13, 2026

8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

16. APRIL GREEN V. MERLIN TURNER

26FL0299

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency orders regarding personal property and spousal support on May 19, 2026 and again on May 20, 2026. Respondent filed responsive declarations on May 19th and May 21st respectively. The court denied both ex parte requests on May 20th and May 22nd respectively.

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 22, 2026, seeking the same orders as in the ex parte requests. Petitioner filed an Income and Expense Declaration on May 20, 2026. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on July 24, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for these documents, therefore, the court cannot consider them.

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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

17. DEVON MATHIS V. AUBREY MATHIS

26FL377

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 28, 2026, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counselling (CCRC). Proof of Service shows Petitioner was electronically served on August 5, 2026. The court notes this is a post-judgment request for modification, and as such, Family Code section 215 applies.

Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states: “Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. However, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the hearing shall be increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within the State of California...” This would have made July 22, 2026, the last day for personal service. This case required personal service or mail service with address verification. The last day for mail service would have been July 17, 2026.

The matter is dropped 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.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

18. BEVERLY MOORE V. KENNETH MOORE

25FL0651

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on June 1, 2026, seeking an order appointing the clerk of the court to act as elisor. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #18: 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
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

19. MATT MORTON V. ANNE MORTON

25FL0296

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 19, 2026, seeking mortgage and expense hardships. The matter was originally set to be heard on May 28, 2026. Respondent filed a Request to Reschedule on May 20, 2026, as she had not served Petitioner with the moving papers. On May 21st the court rescheduled the matter to August 13, 2026, and directed Respondent to serve Petitioner with the FL-309 as well as all the original moving papers. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served with the FL-306, FL-309, and an MC-040. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner was properly served with the RFO.

Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on July 27, 2026. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail and electronically served on July 27, 2026. Petitioner asserts he was not served with the entirety of the RFO, it was missing page 2. Additionally, Petitioner objects to the requested orders, as they are not plead with specificity.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds service was not proper and dops the matter from calendar on those grounds. Even if service had been proper, the court would have denied the requested orders as they are not plead with specificity, and the requests are vague and ambiguous. Respondent has provided no grounds upon which the requested relief could be granted.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

20. SIERRA OLSON V. JUAN CHAVEZ

PFL20140209

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on April 6, 2026, along with a declaration regarding address verification, a declaration under the UCCJEA, and a declaration regarding visitation and records. There is no Proof of Service for these documents.

Petitioner filed a responsive declaration on May 6, 2026, which does not object to service, therefore, the court deems the issue to be waived. Petitioner objects to Respondent's requests for custody and parenting plan orders.

Respondent filed a declaration on May 12, 2026. It was mail served on May 12, 2026.

The court rereferred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and set a further review hearing for August 13, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Both parties attended CCRC on July 2, 2026, and were able to reach agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was filed with the court on July 9, 2026, and mailed to the parties on July 10th.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the section titled Agreements to be in the best interest of the minor with the following modifications. The court is striking "Mother and" from section 1 under Alcohol or Substance Abuse on page seven of 10. The court finds there is no evidence to support an abstention order restricting Petitioner. As to the recommendations portion, the court is not adopting the provision labeled Initial Agreement.

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 #20: THE COURT FINDS THE SECTION MARKED AGREEMENTS TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS. THE COURT IS STRIKING "MOTHER AND" FROM SECTION 1 UNDER ALCOHOL OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE ON PAGE SEVEN OF 10. THE COURT FINDS THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT AN ABSTENTION ORDER RESTRICTING PETITIONER. AS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS PORTION THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE PROVISION LABELED INITIAL AGREEMENT.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 13, 2026
8:30 AM/1:30 PM

21. KERRY STAMOS V. SPIRO STAMOS

26FL0300

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) and Order Shortening Time (OST) on May 28, 2026. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. On May 29th, the court denied the OST. Petitioner filed the RFO on May 29th which was set in the ordinary course. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing the RFO was properly served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #21: 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.