

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. STEPHEN CASS V. PAMELA CASS

24FL0586

On May 23, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel disclosures and discovery responses. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and a Declaration of Attorney concurrently therewith. All required documents were personally served on July 22nd.

On June 30th, the parties filed a stipulation vacating the trial date and agreeing to the appointment of Christopher Whitaker to provide forensic services.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 30th.

The Declaration of Attorney Layla Cordero in Support of Respondent's Reply Declaration was filed and served on August 7th.

Respondent asks that Petitioner be ordered to produce his full and complete Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) and sanctions in the amount of \$6,300 pursuant to Family Code § 2107. She argues that Respondent's initial PDD is legally deficient, and Respondent must be compelled to correct the deficiencies. She states she has incurred a total of \$3,370 in attorney fees associated with the preparation and filing of her Motion to Compel. She anticipates incurring an additional \$1,987.50 preparing a Reply declaration and appearing for the hearing. She asks for \$882.50 in sanctions in excess of her attorney's fees as a deterrent to Petitioner's continued evasiveness.

Petitioner opposes the motion. He argues that the parties agreed to retain the assistance of a forensic accountant given his inability to obtain the requested documents. He further argues that the motion was filed in bad faith and has caused him to incur unnecessary attorney's fees. He requests sanctions in the amount of \$15,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271.

The parties are ordered to appear to update the court on the status of the forensic accountant's work on the matter and whether the subject documents have been obtained or are being obtained by Mr. Whitaker.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR TO UPDATE THE COURT ON THE STATUS OF THE FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT'S WORK ON THE MATTER AND WHETHER THE SUBJECT DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN OBTAINED OR ARE BEING OBTAINED BY MR. WHITAKER.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. BRYAN CHASE V. KYLIE CHASE

22FL0549

Trial in this matter was conducted on March 25-26, 2025. While several orders were made regarding custody and visitation, the court reserved on Petitioner's request for final decision-making authority. A review hearing was set for the present date.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Regarding Legal Custody Issues and Renewed Request for Primary Decision Making Authority was filed and served on August 4th. Respondent has not filed a supplemental declaration.

Petitioner is requesting the court order the parties to be required to confer about any issues involving the children. If no agreement can be reached, he requests primary decision-making authority subject to Respondent challenging the decision in court should she deem necessary.

Petitioner's request is granted. The parties are ordered to meet and confer in good faith on all issues of legal custody regarding the children. If Respondent does not respond to Petitioner's attempt to engage in good faith discussions within 48 hours, or if the parties are unable to reach an agreement, then Petitioner shall have final decision-making authority for the children.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PETITIONER'S REQUEST IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO MEET AND CONFER IN GOOD FAITH ON ALL ISSUES OF LEGAL CUSTODY REGARDING THE CHILDREN. IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT RESPOND TO PETITIONER'S ATTEMPT TO ENGAGE IN GOOD FAITH DISCUSSIONS WITHIN 48 HOURS, OR IF THE PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO REACH AN AGREEMENT, THEN PETITIONER SHALL HAVE FINAL DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY FOR THE CHILDREN. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 14, 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. LINDA FULLERTON V. LARRY FULLERTON

PFL20210556

On May 23, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking an order for CalSTRS to enter pay status and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. She filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were mail served on May 29th.

Respondent 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 Respondent. 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.

Petitioner is requesting an order for the CalSTRS plan administrator to enter payment in full on Petitioner’s pension. She also requests Section 271 sanctions in the amount of \$3,500.

Petitioner’s requests are granted. The CalSTRS plan administrator is ordered to enter payment in full on Petitioner’s pension forthwith. Petitioner is ordered to maintain documentation of all such payments received until the time of trial.

Petitioner’s request for Section 271 sanctions is granted in part. An award for attorney’s fees and sanctions may be made 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.*

Given Respondent’s clear and repeated disregard for these proceedings, his actions have unquestionably increased the cost of litigation and have frustrated any possibility of settlement. That said, the court does not have any information regarding Respondent’s current income and assets. The court is awarding Petitioner sanctions however the court is

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

reserving jurisdiction over the amount of sanctions awarded and a payment plan until the time of trial.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: PETITIONER'S REQUESTS ARE GRANTED. THE CALSTRS PLAN ADMINISTRATOR IS ORDERED TO ENTER PAYMENT IN FULL ON PETITIONER'S PENSION FORTHWITH. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO MAINTAIN DOCUMENTATION OF ALL SUCH PAYMENTS RECEIVED UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. THE COURT IS AWARDED PETITIONER SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE SECTION 271, HOWEVER THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION OVER THE AMOUNT OF SANCTIONS AWARDED AND A PAYMENT PLAN UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. AUSTIN JOHNSON V. REBEKAH SPARKMAN

25FL0127

On February 21, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. Petitioner filed another RFO on March 7, 2025, this time it was filed concurrently with and Application for an Order Shortening Time (OST). The OST was granted, and the matter was heard on March 7th at which time the court referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) and set a review hearing for May 22nd. At the May 22nd hearing, the court continued the matter to the present date and issued interim custody and visitation orders. Parties were ordered to file Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on March 12, 2025. They were unable to reach agreements therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on May 8th. It was mailed to the parties on May 12th.

The Supplemental Declaration of Petitioner was filed and served on August 7, 2025. However, this is late filed therefore the court cannot consider it. Respondent has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

Petitioner is requesting joint physical custody and joint legal custody of the minor child. He asks that he have visitation with Ronin from Wednesdays at 5:00pm to Fridays at 5:00pm. He proposes exchanges take place at 11960 CA-88 Suite 3014 in Jackson, CA. When Ronin is with Respondent, Petitioner asks that he be supervised by Respondent at all times when the minor is at 6380A Union Mine Rd. When the minor is at 6380B, Petitioner asks that the minor only be watched by Rebekah's mother or her sister Grace Sparkman, or an agreed upon babysitter.

Respondent asks that the court adopt its interim orders which allow for non-professionally supervised visitation between Petitioner and Ronin twice per week for a minimum of two hours each. She asks that the court deny Petitioner's request regarding supervision of the minor while at Respondent's home.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the May 8, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor, therefore, they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE MAY 8, 2025 CCRC

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR, THEREFORE THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. BREANDEN THOMAS KIMBRIEL V. CHELSEA CISCOE

24FL1124

On June 3, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of custody and visitation orders. Hearing on this RFO was set for August 21, 2025. The RFO was served on June 19th.

Respondent filed another RFO for custody and visitation orders on July 7th. That RFO was filed on an ex parte basis and as such, Respondent was granted temporary sole physical custody of the minors, Petitioner was ordered to have professionally supervised visits, and the parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment. A review hearing was set for the present date.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 9th.

The parties attended CCRC on July 15th. They were unable to reach an agreement, therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on August 5th and mailed to the parties on August 6th.

In her June 3rd RFO, Respondent makes the following requests: (1) The children not to be left along in the care of parental grandmother, Janeen Kimbriel; (2) Appointment of Minor's Counsel at the shared cost of both parties; (3) All communications to be held through Talking Parents and messages to be responded to within 48 hours; (4) No tracking of the children on phones, or other electronic devices; (5) Petitioner to have visits every 2nd and 4th weekend from Thursday after school or 3:00pm if there is no school to Monday at drop off at school or 8:00am if there is no school; (6) Petitioner to take an age appropriate parenting class; (7) A holiday schedule; and (8) If any corporal punishment is reported by the children, then all visitation with Petitioner to be professionally supervised at Petitioner's cost. As of her July 7th RFO, Respondent changed her requests to sole legal and sole physical custody of the children. She proposes Petitioner have professionally supervised visits, at his sole cost, twice per week for up to two hours per visit. She asks for a stay away order between the children and the paternal grandmother Ms. Kimbriel.

Petitioner opposes the requests. He states that the tracking feature on his phone is disabled, though he does not reference the tracking of the minors' on their devices. He further states that he has already enrolled in a parenting class. He too requests the appointment of Minor's Counsel. He asks the court to order a week-on/week-off schedule and to order the children be enrolled in a school equidistant between the parties. He also asks for a stay away order from the maternal grandfather. He proposes the parties each claim one child on taxes until Bentley reaches the age of majority, then they will alternate

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

claiming Bella annually. Finally, he requests oral argument on the issue of custody and visitation.

First and foremost, the court is advancing the August 21st hearing to join with the present hearing as the issues in the RFOs are inextricably intertwined.

While the court is inclined to adopt the recommendations in the CCRC report, per Petitioner's request, the parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. ALEX KUMWIEDE V. HANNAH KRUMWIEDE

23FL1044

On May 23, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking property orders. It was originally filed ex parte, though it was denied on that basis and ordered to be heard on the regular law and motion calendar. Respondent's Responsive Declaration to Request for Order was filed on May 20th.

Petitioner asks that Respondent be ordered to transfer the storage units with her personal property into her name. Should she fail to do so, he asks that payment for the storage units be paid from Respondent's share of the home sale proceeds which are currently being held in Petitioner's attorney's IOLTA account. If Respondent has removed her items, Petitioner asks that dump fees for the remaining items in the storage unit be paid from the IOLTA trust funds. Finally, Petitioner asks that outstanding taxes due for 2023 be paid from the IOLTA account and the court to reserve jurisdiction over allocation of the same until trial.

Respondent opposes the requests. She says she moved her personal property on April 16th and never authorized use of a storage unit. She states that Petitioner forced the sale of the former family residence in bad faith and he is now attempting to use funds from her share of the proceeds.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds that Respondent is not making a claim to any of the property left in the storage units. As such, Petitioner is granted the authority to dispose of the remaining items as he deems necessary. Petitioner may use the funds from the IOLTA account to pay for any and all disposal costs and storage costs that are incurred until disposal. The court is reserving jurisdiction to allocate these costs at the time of trial. Petitioner is ordered to keep documentation evidencing all such costs.

Petitioner's request regarding the tax payment is granted. The parties are ordered to pay the outstanding 2023 taxes, and all penalties associated therewith (if any), forthwith. Payment shall be made using the proceeds in Petitioner's attorney's IOLTA account. The court reserves jurisdiction to allocate this debt at the time of trial.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: PETITIONER IS GRANTED AUTHORITY TO DISPOSE OF THE PROPERTY IN THE STORAGE UNITS AS HE DEEMS NECESSARY. PETITIONER MAY USE THE FUNDS FROM THE IOLTA ACCOUNT TO PAY FOR ANY AND ALL DISPOSAL COSTS AND STORAGE COSTS THAT ARE INCURRED UNTIL DISPOSAL. THE COURT IS

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

**RESERVING JURISDICTION TO ALLOCATE THESE COSTS AT THE TIME OF TRIAL.
PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO KEEP DOCUMENTATION EVIDENCING ALL SUCH COSTS.**

PETITIONER'S REQUEST REGARDING THE TAX PAYMENT IS GRANTED. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PAY THE OUTSTANDING 2023 TAXES, AND ALL PENALTIES ASSOCIATED THEREWITH (IF ANY), FORTHWITH. PAYMENT SHALL BE MADE USING THE PROCEEDS IN PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S IOLTA ACCOUNT. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO ALLOCATE THIS DEBT AT THE TIME OF TRIAL.

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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. CODY METZGER V. CRYSTAL SCHMEHL

PFL20190072

On May 29, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The RFO was personally served on Petitioner's attorney, not on Petitioner himself.

Respondent filed a Declaration supporting her RFO on June 18, 2025. However, there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court cannot consider it.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 31st.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 26th. They were unable to reach any agreements, therefore a report with recommendations was prepared on July 31, 2025. The CCRC report was mailed to the parties on August 1st.

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor child. She also asks that Petitioner be ordered to participate in the minor's medical care.

Petitioner opposes the request to change custody. He asks for more specific orders directing Respondent to inform Petitioner of medical appointments prior to the appointments being held. Finally, he asks that the parties be ordered to attend coparenting counseling.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the recommendations contained in the July 31, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minor. Those recommendations are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect, this includes the current visitation schedule and order for joint legal custody.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JULY 31, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR. THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT, THIS INCLUDES THE CURRENT VISITATION SCHEDULE AND ORDER FOR JOINT LEGAL CUSTODY. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. JENNIFER M. NEWMAN V. JOHN T. NEWMAN

24FL0608

On May 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and additional orders regarding the finances of the parties. He filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of his requests, along with a Declaration of Richard Eldridge and an Income and Expense Declaration. All documents were electronically served on May 15th.

On July 8, 2025, Petitioner filed an RFO seeking a vocational evaluation of Respondent. She filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of her request on July 9th. All required documents were served on July 17th.

Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, her Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and her Income and Expense Declaration on July 30th.

Respondent filed and served his Reply Declaration Regarding Various Statements Made by Petitioner on August 5th.

Respondent is requesting guideline spousal support back to the date of filing the Petition. He is agreeable to an offset of \$8,209 per month for expenses paid by Petitioner since separation. In addition to guideline support, Respondent is requesting an additional \$2,542 so he can put some money in savings. He further requests an order for Petitioner to list Respondent as the sole irrevocable beneficiary of the Farmers Universal Life Insurance policies and the Guardian Life Insurance Company of America policy. He asks that he remain the beneficiary for as long as he is collecting support. Respondent argues that Petitioner kept the entirety of the 2023 tax payout and he requests the court order her to pay Respondent his ½ portion in the amount of \$5,867. He also asks that she be ordered to provide him with documentation of the 2024 tax payout and his half of that amount, less the \$2,000 he was already given. Finally, he is requesting \$35,000 as and for attorney's fees pursuant to Family Code § 2030.

Petitioner asks that Respondent be ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation with an expert of Petitioner's choosing. She agrees to advance the cost of the evaluation, subject to reallocation. She is requesting the court reserve jurisdiction on the issue of support and set a review hearing for receipt of the evaluator's report. Should the court move forward with temporary support orders, Petitioner asks that Respondent be imputed with income consistent with his actual earning capacity and background or, at least, full-time minimum wage. She asks that the court decline to set arrears due to the significant

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

amount of voluntary payments she has made or, at least, apply a credit towards arrears. Petitioner further requests an order directing Respondent to take over all payments of all community expenses that she has paid on his behalf. She further requests she be allowed to deduct half of all the remaining community expenses from her monthly support obligations to account for her paying the entirety of these debts. She opposes the request for attorney fees.

The request for a vocational evaluation is granted. Respondent is ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation with an expert of Petitioner's choosing. The evaluation shall be done at Petitioner's cost, subject to reallocation. The court is setting a review hearing on 12/11/2025 at 8:30 AM in department 5 for receipt and review of the evaluator's report and reassessment of spousal support orders. The parties are ordered to file updated Income and Expense Declarations and Supplemental Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

In the interim, the court is adopting the Xspouse and *Ostler/Smith* Bonus Table attached hereto. Utilizing the figures as contained therein, the court finds that spousal support is \$9,539 per month. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent \$9,539 per month as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of September 1, 2025. In addition to her monthly support obligation, Petitioner is to pay Respondent a true up of any overtime earned in accordance with the attached *Ostler/Smith* table no later than fourteen days from the date the overtime payment is received. The court reserves jurisdiction to amend support back to September 1, 2025 depending on the results of the vocational evaluation.

Respondent's request for arrears is denied. The court finds that Petitioner's payment of all of Respondent's expenses since separation has fulfilled her support obligation to date.

Commencing September 1, 2025, Respondent is ordered to assume payments on his Capital One Visa card, his Chase Ink Visa, his AT&T bill, and half of the monthly mortgage payments.

The court is reserving on Respondent's request to be named as the sole beneficiary on Petitioner's life insurance policies until the time of trial. Likewise, the court is reserving on the requests regarding the 2023 and 2024 taxes until the time of trial. It appears there is a fundamental dispute as to the use of the refund money and whether it went to pay

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

community property debts. This dispute requires extrinsic evidence which is more properly addressed at trial.

Regarding attorney's fees, the request is granted in part. 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. It "is not the redistribution of money from the greater income party to the lesser income party," but rather "parity." *Alan S. v. Sup. Ct.*, 172 Cal. App. 4th 238, 251 (2009). 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). This determination is to be made in consideration of the assets, debts, earning ability, ability to pay, and the age and health of each party. In *re Marriage of McLain*, 212 Cal. Rptr. 3d 537 (2017).

In the matter at hand, there is a clear disparity in current income. That is inarguable. However, there is a significant amount of debt, most of which appears to be community property debt that Petitioner is paying in its entirety. Additionally, this matter is in its infancy and on the face of it, the court does not see any reason to deem this to be a complex case that would warrant such a large upfront payment of attorney's fees. As such, Respondent's request for attorney's fees is granted, but only in the amount of \$19,500. Petitioner is ordered to pay Respondent's attorney \$19,500. This amount may be made in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$1,950. Payments are to commence on September 15th and they are to continue on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately 10 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE REQUEST FOR A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION IS GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO UNDERGO A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION WITH AN EXPERT OF PETITIONER'S CHOOSING. THE EVALUATION SHALL BE DONE AT PETITIONER'S COST, SUBJECT TO REALLOCATION. THE COURT IS SETTING A REVIEW HEARING FOR 12/11/2025 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5 FOR RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF THE EVALUATOR'S REPORT AND REASSESSMENT OF SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDERS. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO FILE UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

AND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

IN THE INTERIM, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE XSPOUSE AND *OSTLER/SMITH* BONUS TABLE ATTACHED HERETO. UTILIZING THE FIGURES AS CONTAINED THEREIN, THE COURT FINDS THAT SPOUSAL SUPPORT IS \$9,539 PER MONTH. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT \$9,539 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT, PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2025. IN ADDITION TO HER MONTHLY SUPPORT OBLIGATION, PETITIONER IS TO PAY RESPONDENT A TRUE UP OF ANY OVERTIME EARNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED *OSTLER/SMITH* TABLE NO LATER THAN FOURTEEN DAYS FROM THE DATE THE OVERTIME PAYMENT IS RECEIVED. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION TO AMEND SUPPORT BACK TO SEPTEMBER 1, 2025 DEPENDING ON THE RESULTS OF THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION.

RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR ARREARS IS DENIED. THE COURT FINDS THAT PETITIONER'S PAYMENT OF ALL OF RESPONDENT'S EXPENSES SINCE SEPARATION HAS FULFILLED HER SUPPORT OBLIGATION TO DATE.

COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 1, 2025, RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO ASSUME PAYMENTS ON HIS CAPITAL ONE VISA CARD, HIS CHASE INK VISA, HIS AT&T BILL, AND HALF OF THE MONTHLY MORTGAGE PAYMENTS.

THE COURT IS RESERVING ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST TO BE NAMED AS THE SOLE BENEFICIARY ON PETITIONER'S LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. LIKEWISE, THE COURT IS RESERVING ON THE REQUESTS REGARDING THE 2023 AND 2024 TAXES UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY \$19,500. THIS AMOUNT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$1,950. PAYMENTS ARE TO COMMENCE ON SEPTEMBER 15TH AND THEY ARE TO CONTINUE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 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.

Fixed Shares	Husband	Wife	Monthly figures	Cash Flow	Guideline	Proposed
#of children	0	0	2025			
% time with NCP	0.00 %	0.00 %		Comb. net spendable	23847	23847
Filing status	MFJ->	<-MFJ	GUIDELINE	Percent change	0%	0%
# exemptions	1 *	1	Nets(adjusted)	Husband		
Wages+salary	0	34338	Husband	0		
Self-employed income	0	0	Wife	23847	9539	9539
Other taxable income	0	192	Total	23847	9539	9539
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support		0	0
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	40%	40%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	0	0%	0%
401(k) employee contrib	0	1731	Alameda SS	9539	0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	9539	0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-	# withholding allowances	0w	0w
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed	Net wage paycheck	0	0
Health insurance	0	630		Wife		
Other medical expense	0	0		Payment cost/benefit	-9539	-9539
Property tax expense	0	725		Net spendable income	14308	14308
Ded interest expense	0	2211	Proposed	Change from guideline	0	0
Contribution deduction	0	0	Tactic 9	% of combined spendable	60%	60%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	0	0%	0%
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	9539		
Required union dues	0	0	Total	9539	10053	10053
Mandatory retirement	0	0		Dep. exemption value	0	0
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving	0	0	0
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	0	21246	21246
Child care expenses	0	0				

Wife pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

Annual Bonus Income

Wife

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
 - Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
 - R = recipient of support
- Annual bonus paid to Husband: 0
- Prior relationship(s): OFF

Additional Cost to Wife						
Child Support			Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
Wife's Bonus	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
49,000	0.00	0	24.51	12,011	0	126,478
49,500	0.00	0	24.49	12,121	0	126,588
50,000	0.00	0	24.46	12,231	0	126,699
50,500	0.00	0	24.44	12,342	0	126,809
51,000	0.00	0	24.42	12,452	0	126,919
51,500	0.00	0	24.39	12,562	0	127,030
52,000	0.00	0	24.37	12,673	0	127,140
52,500	0.00	0	24.35	12,783	0	127,250
53,000	0.00	0	24.33	12,893	0	127,361
53,500	0.00	0	24.31	13,004	0	127,471
54,000	0.00	0	24.28	13,114	0	127,581
54,500	0.00	0	24.26	13,224	0	127,691
55,000	0.00	0	24.24	13,334	0	127,802
55,500	0.00	0	24.22	13,445	0	127,912
56,000	0.00	0	24.21	13,555	0	128,022
56,500	0.00	0	24.19	13,665	0	128,133
57,000	0.00	0	24.17	13,776	0	128,243
57,500	0.00	0	24.15	13,886	0	128,353
58,000	0.00	0	24.13	13,996	0	128,464
58,500	0.00	0	24.11	14,107	0	128,574
59,000	0.00	0	24.10	14,217	0	128,684
59,500	0.00	0	24.08	14,327	0	128,794
60,000	0.00	0	24.06	14,437	0	128,905
60,500	0.00	0	24.05	14,548	0	129,015
61,000	0.00	0	24.03	14,658	0	129,125
61,500	0.00	0	24.01	14,768	0	129,236
62,000	0.00	0	24.00	14,879	0	129,346
62,500	0.00	0	23.98	14,989	0	129,456
63,000	0.00	0	23.97	15,099	0	129,567
63,500	0.00	0	23.95	15,210	0	129,677
64,000	0.00	0	23.94	15,320	0	129,787
64,500	0.00	0	23.92	15,430	0	129,897
65,000	0.00	0	23.91	15,540	0	130,008
65,500	0.00	0	23.89	15,651	0	130,118
66,000	0.00	0	23.88	15,761	0	130,228
66,500	0.00	0	23.87	15,871	0	130,339
67,000	0.00	0	23.85	15,982	0	130,449
67,500	0.00	0	23.84	16,092	0	130,559
68,000	0.00	0	23.83	16,202	0	130,670
68,500	0.00	0	23.81	16,313	0	130,780
69,000	0.00	0	23.80	16,423	0	130,890
69,500	0.00	0	23.79	16,533	0	131,000
70,000	0.00	0	23.78	16,643	0	131,111
70,500	0.00	0	23.76	16,754	0	131,221
71,000	0.00	0	23.75	16,864	0	131,331

Annual Bonus Income

Wife

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
- Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
- R = recipient of support

Annual bonus paid to Husband:0

Prior relationship(s):OFF

Additional Cost to Wife						
Child Support			Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
Wife's Bonus	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
71,500	0.00	0	23.74	16,974	0	131,442
72,000	0.00	0	23.73	17,085	0	131,552
72,500	0.00	0	23.72	17,195	0	131,662
73,000	0.00	0	23.71	17,305	0	131,773
73,500	0.00	0	23.69	17,416	0	131,883
74,000	0.00	0	23.68	17,526	0	131,993
74,500	0.00	0	23.67	17,636	0	132,103
75,000	0.00	0	23.66	17,746	0	132,214
75,500	0.00	0	23.65	17,857	0	132,324
76,000	0.00	0	23.64	17,967	0	132,434
76,500	0.00	0	23.63	18,077	0	132,545
77,000	0.00	0	23.62	18,188	0	132,655
77,500	0.00	0	23.61	18,298	0	132,765
78,000	0.00	0	23.60	18,408	0	132,876
78,500	0.00	0	23.59	18,518	0	132,986
79,000	0.00	0	23.58	18,629	0	133,096
79,500	0.00	0	23.57	18,739	0	133,206
80,000	0.00	0	23.56	18,849	0	133,317
80,500	0.00	0	23.55	18,960	0	133,427
81,000	0.00	0	23.54	19,070	0	133,537
81,500	0.00	0	23.53	19,180	0	133,648
82,000	0.00	0	23.53	19,291	0	133,758
82,500	0.00	0	23.52	19,401	0	133,868
83,000	0.00	0	23.51	19,511	0	133,979
83,500	0.00	0	23.50	19,621	0	134,089
84,000	0.00	0	23.49	19,732	0	134,199
84,500	0.00	0	23.48	19,842	0	134,309
85,000	0.00	0	23.47	19,952	0	134,420
85,500	0.00	0	23.47	20,063	0	134,530
86,000	0.00	0	23.46	20,173	0	134,640
86,500	0.00	0	23.45	20,283	0	134,751
87,000	0.00	0	23.44	20,394	0	134,861
87,500	0.00	0	23.43	20,504	0	134,971
88,000	0.00	0	23.43	20,614	0	135,082
88,500	0.00	0	23.42	20,724	0	135,192
89,000	0.00	0	23.41	20,835	0	135,302
89,500	0.00	0	23.40	20,945	0	135,412
90,000	0.00	0	23.39	21,055	0	135,523
90,500	0.00	0	23.39	21,166	0	135,633
91,000	0.00	0	23.38	21,276	0	135,743
91,500	0.00	0	23.37	21,386	0	135,854
92,000	0.00	0	23.37	21,497	0	135,964
92,500	0.00	0	23.36	21,607	0	136,074
93,000	0.00	0	23.35	21,717	0	136,185
93,500	0.00	0	23.34	21,827	0	136,295

Annual Bonus Income

Wife

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
 - Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
 - R = recipient of support
- Annual bonus paid to Husband:0
Prior relationship(s):OFF

Additional Cost to Wife						
Child Support			Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
Wife's Bonus	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
94,000	0.00	0	23.34	21,938	0	136,405
94,500	0.00	0	23.33	22,048	0	136,515
95,000	0.00	0	23.32	22,158	0	136,626
95,500	0.00	0	23.32	22,269	0	136,736
96,000	0.00	0	23.31	22,379	0	136,846
96,500	0.00	0	23.31	22,489	0	136,957
97,000	0.00	0	23.30	22,600	0	137,067
97,500	0.00	0	23.29	22,710	0	137,177
98,000	0.00	0	23.29	22,820	0	137,288
98,500	0.00	0	23.28	22,930	0	137,398
99,000	0.00	0	23.27	23,041	0	137,508
99,500	0.00	0	23.27	23,151	0	137,618
100,000	0.00	0	23.26	23,261	0	137,729
100,500	0.00	0	23.26	23,372	0	137,839
101,000	0.00	0	23.25	23,482	0	137,949
101,500	0.00	0	23.24	23,592	0	138,060
102,000	0.00	0	23.24	23,703	0	138,170
102,500	0.00	0	23.23	23,813	0	138,280
103,000	0.00	0	23.23	23,923	0	138,391
103,500	0.00	0	23.22	24,033	0	138,501
104,000	0.00	0	23.22	24,144	0	138,611
104,500	0.00	0	23.21	24,254	0	138,721
105,000	0.00	0	23.20	24,364	0	138,832
105,500	0.00	0	23.20	24,475	0	138,942
106,000	0.00	0	23.19	24,585	0	139,052
106,500	0.00	0	23.19	24,695	0	139,163
107,000	0.00	0	23.18	24,806	0	139,273
107,500	0.00	0	23.17	24,911	0	139,378
108,000	0.00	0	23.17	25,020	0	139,487
108,500	0.00	0	23.16	25,129	0	139,597
109,000	0.00	0	23.15	25,238	0	139,706
109,500	0.00	0	23.15	25,348	0	139,815
110,000	0.00	0	23.14	25,452	0	139,919
110,500	0.00	0	23.13	25,561	0	140,029
111,000	0.00	0	23.13	25,670	0	140,138
111,500	0.00	0	23.12	25,780	0	140,247
112,000	0.00	0	23.11	25,889	0	140,356
112,500	0.00	0	23.10	25,993	0	140,460
113,000	0.00	0	23.10	26,102	0	140,570
113,500	0.00	0	23.09	26,211	0	140,679
114,000	0.00	0	23.09	26,321	0	140,788
114,500	0.00	0	23.08	26,430	0	140,897
115,000	0.00	0	23.07	26,534	0	141,002
115,500	0.00	0	23.07	26,643	0	141,111
116,000	0.00	0	23.06	26,753	0	141,220

Annual Bonus Income

Wife

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
 - Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
 - R = recipient of support
- Annual bonus paid to Husband:0
Prior relationship(s):OFF

Additional Cost to Wife						
Child Support			Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
Wife's Bonus	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
116,500	0.00	0	23.06	26,862	0	141,329
117,000	0.00	0	23.05	26,971	0	141,438
117,500	0.00	0	23.04	27,075	0	141,543
118,000	0.00	0	23.04	27,185	0	141,652
118,500	0.00	0	23.03	27,294	0	141,761
119,000	0.00	0	23.03	27,403	0	141,870
119,500	0.00	0	23.02	27,512	0	141,979
120,000	0.00	0	23.01	27,616	0	142,084
120,500	0.00	0	23.01	27,726	0	142,193
121,000	0.00	0	23.00	27,835	0	142,302
121,500	0.00	0	23.00	27,944	0	142,411
122,000	0.00	0	22.99	28,053	0	142,521
122,500	0.00	0	22.99	28,158	0	142,625
123,000	0.00	0	22.98	28,267	0	142,734
123,500	0.00	0	22.98	28,376	0	142,843
124,000	0.00	0	22.97	28,485	0	142,953
124,500	0.00	0	22.97	28,594	0	143,062
125,000	0.00	0	22.96	28,699	0	143,166
125,500	0.00	0	22.95	28,808	0	143,275
126,000	0.00	0	22.95	28,917	0	143,384
126,500	0.00	0	22.95	29,026	0	143,494
127,000	0.00	0	22.94	29,135	0	143,603
127,500	0.00	0	22.93	29,240	0	143,707
128,000	0.00	0	22.93	29,349	0	143,816
128,500	0.00	0	22.92	29,458	0	143,926
129,000	0.00	0	22.92	29,567	0	144,035
129,500	0.00	0	22.92	29,677	0	144,144
130,000	0.00	0	22.91	29,781	0	144,248
130,500	0.00	0	22.90	29,890	0	144,358
131,000	0.00	0	22.90	29,999	0	144,467
131,500	0.00	0	22.90	30,109	0	144,576
132,000	0.00	0	22.89	30,218	0	144,685
132,500	0.00	0	22.88	30,322	0	144,789
133,000	0.00	0	22.88	30,431	0	144,899
133,500	0.00	0	22.88	30,540	0	145,008
134,000	0.00	0	22.87	30,650	0	145,117
134,500	0.00	0	22.87	30,759	0	145,226
135,000	0.00	0	22.86	30,863	0	145,331
135,500	0.00	0	22.86	30,972	0	145,440
136,000	0.00	0	22.85	31,082	0	145,549
136,500	0.00	0	22.85	31,191	0	145,658
137,000	0.00	0	22.85	31,300	0	145,767
137,500	0.00	0	22.84	31,404	0	145,872
138,000	0.00	0	22.84	31,514	0	145,981
138,500	0.00	0	22.83	31,623	0	146,090

Annual Bonus Income

Wife

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
- Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
- R = recipient of support

Annual bonus paid to Husband:0

Prior relationship(s):OFF

Additional Cost to Wife						
Child Support			Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
Wife's Bonus	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
139,000	0.00	0	22.83	31,732	0	146,199
139,500	0.00	0	22.83	31,841	0	146,308
140,000	0.00	0	22.82	31,945	0	146,413
140,500	0.00	0	22.81	32,055	0	146,522
141,000	0.00	0	22.81	32,164	0	146,631
141,500	0.00	0	22.81	32,273	0	146,740
142,000	0.00	0	22.80	32,382	0	146,850
142,500	0.00	0	22.80	32,487	0	146,954
143,000	0.00	0	22.79	32,596	0	147,063
143,500	0.00	0	22.79	32,705	0	147,172
144,000	0.00	0	22.79	32,814	0	147,281
144,500	0.00	0	22.78	32,917	0	147,385
145,000	0.00	0	22.77	33,016	0	147,483
145,500	0.00	0	22.76	33,119	0	147,586
146,000	0.00	0	22.75	33,222	0	147,689
146,500	0.00	0	22.75	33,325	0	147,793
147,000	0.00	0	22.74	33,428	0	147,896
147,500	0.00	0	22.73	33,527	0	147,994
148,000	0.00	0	22.72	33,630	0	148,097
148,500	0.00	0	22.72	33,733	0	148,201
149,000	0.00	0	22.71	33,836	0	148,304
149,500	0.00	0	22.70	33,940	0	148,407
150,000	0.00	0	22.69	34,038	0	148,505

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

10. JEFFREY SHASKY V. KATHARINE SHASKY

PFL20210259

On May 1, 2024, Respondent filed and served a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders as well as child support. She filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently with the RFO. This is a post-judgment request for modification and therefore the RFO was required to be served on Petitioner personally. However, despite the defect in service, Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on May 24, 2024. He filed and served his Income and Expense Declaration on June 13th. Given that Petitioner filed a substantive response to the RFO, the court finds that any defect in service has been waived.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 6th. The parties were able to reach agreements on some issues therefore a report memorializing the agreements, and setting forth additional recommendations, was prepared on June 19th and mailed to the parties on June 21st.

Respondent brings her RFO requesting primary physical custody of both children. She asks that the children have visits with Petitioner at their discretion or, in the alternative, Wednesday dinner visits and visits every other Saturday from 10:00 am to 5:00 pm. She asks that child support be updated based off the new timeshare.

Petitioner is asking that the parties maintain joint legal and physical custody consistent with their marital settlement agreement. He asks that the court order either a 2-2-5-5 or a 2-2-3 parenting schedule. If a 2-2-5-5 schedule is implemented then he requests Monday and Tuesday as his parenting time. He requests parenting time immediately as he has not seen the minors since April 16, 2024. Finally, he is requesting the parties be ordered to participate in family therapy to address the concerns of the minors.

According to CCRC, there were two active temporary restraining orders filed in Sacramento County on May 23, 2024.

Parties appeared for the hearing on July 25, 2024. The court found good cause to continue the custody and parenting plan portion of the hearing, due to the Sacramento County Restraining order request pending trial. The court made child support orders and set the matter for a review hearing on January 16, 2025.

The parties submitted an Agreement and Order to continue the review hearing from January 16, 2025 to August 14, 2025.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on July 31, 2025. Respondent was served on July 31, 2025. Petitioner asserts in his declaration that there are no restraining orders in place and requests the court order the parties to share joint legal custody, order immediate family therapy between Petitioner and the minors, order Respondent to cooperate with the family therapy and reunification counseling, order Petitioner to have one family dinner per week, on Wednesdays from 5:00 pm to 8:30 pm, and set a review hearing in three months to determine a new parenting plan.

Respondent has not filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court on its own motion finds good cause to refer the parties back to CCRC, as it has been more than a year since they attended. The court is unaware of what orders were made in Sacramento County at the conclusion of the restraining order trial. The court finds it is in need of that information prior to making any new orders. The court is directing that the minors are to be interviewed by the CCRC counselor. Parties are to attend CCRC on 9/11/25 at 9:00 AM with Michaela Murphy and return for a review hearing on 10/30/2025 at 8:30 AM in Department 5. Any Supplemental Declarations are due at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

The court continues to reserve jurisdiction to retroactively modify child support to May 1, 2024. Parties are directed to file updated Income and Expense Declarations at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

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 ON ITS OWN MOTION FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO REFER THE PARTIES BACK TO CCRC, AS IT HAS BEEN MORE THAN A YEAR SINCE THEY ATTENDED. THE COURT IS UNAWARE OF WHAT ORDERS WERE MADE IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE RESTRAINING ORDER TRIAL. THE COURT FINDS IT IS IN NEED OF THAT INFORMATION PRIOR TO MAKING ANY NEW ORDERS. THE COURT IS DIRECTED THAT THE MINORS ARE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY THE CCRC COUNSELOR. PARTIES ARE TO ATTEND CCRC ON 9/11/2025 AT 9:00 AM AND RETURN FOR A REVIEW HEARING ON 10/30/25 AT 8:30AM. ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE DUE AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. THE COURT CONTINUES TO RESERVE JURISDICTION TO RETROACTIVELY MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT TO MAY 1, 2024. PARTIES ARE DIRECTED TO FILE UPDATED INCOME AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

EXPENSE DECLARATIONS AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. 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 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. MICHAEL SOUDERS V. DONNA SOUDERS

25FL0270

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 27, 2025, seeking temporary guideline spousal support, Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees, as well as equal division of the 2024 state and federal tax returns. 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 on June 23, 2025, with the RFO, the Income and Expense Declaration, and the Declaration of Counsel.

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

The court finds Petitioner was not properly served with all the required documents, including the blank Responsive Declaration form, the blank Income and Expense Declaration, and the Notice of Tentative Ruling. Therefore, the court drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. LINDA SUBIDO V. JAMES SUBIDO

PFL20160697

On March 5, 2025, Petitioner filed and served a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a variety of orders as stated therein. On March 4th she filed and served her Income and Expense Declaration.

This RFO is filed on the heels of Petitioner's ex parte request to prohibit Respondent from liquidating, transferring or otherwise disposing of any funds in his Fisher Investment account until further order of the court and for Respondent to provide Petitioner with the name, location and account information necessary to issue a summons and joinder. The ex parte requests were granted.

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration Re: Motion to Compel was filed and served on May 15th.

On May 29, 2025, the court adopted its tentative ruling continuing the hearing to August 14, 2025.

The court signed the parties' QDRO on June 6, 2025.

Petitioner filed a Supplemental Declaration on July 28, 2025. Respondent was served on July 26th. Petitioner asserts the only remaining issue is her request for attorney's fees. Petitioner is seeking 50% of her attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code section 3452 as well as reservation of sanctions pursuant Family Code section 271.

Respondent filed a Proof of Service showing Petitioner was served with a Declaration of James Subido opposing the requests for attorney's fees on August 6, 2025.

The court finds Family Codes section 3452 does not apply under these circumstances. Family Code section 3452 applies to enforcement of child custody orders. Therefore, Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Family Code section 3452 is denied.

An award for attorney's fees and sanctions may be made 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." Fam. Code § 271(a). Here, Petitioner asserts she is not seeking sanctions pursuant to Family Code section 271, but rather for the court to reserve jurisdiction on such sanctions, should

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent violate or frustrate these proceedings in the future. That request is granted. The court reserves jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions.

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 #12: THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE SECTION 3452. THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS. 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. GEORGIA WANLAND V. DONALD WANLAND

PFL20190812

Joshua Fabian, counsel for Petitioner, filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and his supporting declaration on May 23, 2025. While the declaration indicates service on Petitioner by mail, there is no Proof of Service and no listed date of service. Furthermore, there is no Proof of Service on the opposing party. As such, this matter is continued to 9/18/25 at 8:30am in Department 5. Counsel is ordered to properly serve the motion on all parties and file Proofs of Service with the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 9/18/2025 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5. COUNSEL IS ORDERED TO PROPERLY SERVE THE MOTION ON ALL PARTIES AND FILE PROOFS OF SERVICE WITH THE COURT.

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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. ANADEE WEAVER V. JARROD WEAVER

25FL0318

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 22, 2025, seeking various orders including child custody and parenting time, child and spousal support, property control, Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees, reinstatement of health insurance, and Family Code section 271 sanctions. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 5, 2025, and a review hearing on August 14, 2025. Petitioner was served on June 9, 2025.

On July 24, 2025, Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration. Petitioner had previously filed an Income and Expense Declaration on June 24, 2025. Respondent was served with both on July 21, 2025. Petitioner consents to the agreements reached at CCRC. Petitioner consents to guideline child support and temporary guideline spousal support to begin September 1, 2025. Petitioner requests an imputation of income to Respondent. Petitioner objects to retroactivity. Petitioner objects to the request for property control, as well as the request for attorney's fees. Last, Petitioner asserts insurance was never cancelled for Respondent, and therefore, there is no need to reinstate it.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on August 5, 2025. It was served on the same day. Respondent also requests the court confirm the parties' agreements as to custody and parenting time as its orders. Respondent seeks exclusive use and control of the former marital home and agrees to pay the mortgage. Respondent renews his request for support to the date of the filing of the petition. Respondent agrees to quarterly true ups. Respondent objects to any imputation of income.

Custody and Parenting Time

Parties attended CCRC on June 5, 2025 and reached a full agreement. The court finds the agreements of the parties to be in the best interest of the minors and adopts them as its order.

Child and Spousal Support

Utilizing the figures provided by the parties through their Income and Expense Declarations, the court finds guideline child support to be \$1,477 per month payable from Petitioner to Respondent (see attached X-Spouse). The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$1,477 per month as and for guideline child support effective June 1, 2025,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

and payable on the first of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$4,431 for the months of June through August inclusive. The court is ordering Petitioner to pay Respondent \$4,434 as and for arrears. Payment may be made in one lump sum or in monthly payments of \$553.87 beginning September 15, 2025, and continuing until paid in full (approximately eight months).

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 finds temporary guideline spousal support per the Alameda formula to be \$1,048 per month payable from Petitioner to Respondent (See attached X-Spouse). The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$1,048 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support effective June 1, 2025, and payable until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$3,144 for the months of June through August inclusive. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$3,144 as and for arrears. Payment may be made in one lump sum or in monthly payments of \$393 beginning September 15, 2025, and continuing until paid in full (approximately 8 months).

The court further finds Petitioner routinely earns overtime and bonus income. The court orders Petitioner to provide Respondent her paystubs on a quarterly basis beginning June 1, 2025. The court directs Respondent to prepare and file the bonus table utilizing the figures the court used in the X-Spouse calculation attached to the tentative ruling. True up payment is to be made by no later than the 15th of the month following the close of the quarter.

Property Control

The court denies both parties' requests for exclusive use and control of the former marital residence. The court finds neither party has set forth sufficient grounds upon which the court could make such an order. The parties are jointly responsible for the home as they

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

continue to share the residence. The court reserves jurisdiction over this issue until the time of trial.

Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees

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).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. "In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party's case adequately." *Id.* at (b). Financial resources are only one factor to be considered though. *Id.* In addition to the parties' financial resources, the court may consider the parties' trial tactics. In Re Marriage of Falcone & Fyke, 203 Cal. App. 4th 964; 975 (2012).

The court finds there is a disparity between the parties even after the award of support. The court further finds that Petitioner has a greater access to funds and has the ability to pay for both her representation and Respondent's. The court grants the request of attorney's fees in the amount of \$5,000 payable directly to Respondent's counsel. The payment may be made in one lump sum, or in monthly payments of \$500, beginning September 1, 2025, and continuing on the first of each month until paid in full (approximately 10 months).

Reinstatement of Health Insurance

The court finds this issue to be moot, as there have been no changes in Respondent's insurance coverage. Both parties are reminded that the Automatic Temporary Restraining Orders (ATROs) remain in full force and effect.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Family Code section 271 Sanctions

Family Code section 271 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).

The court reserves on Respondent's request for Family Code section 271 sanctions until the time of trial. The court reminds both parties of the public policy of Family Code section 271 to reduce the costs of litigation and promote settlement.

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.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS AND ADOPTS THEM AS ITS ORDER. THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$1,477 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$1,477 PER MONTH AS AND FOR GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2025, AND PAYABLE ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$4,431 FOR THE MONTHS OF JUNE THROUGH AUGUST INCLUSIVE. THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$4,434 AS AND FOR ARREARS. PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$553.87 BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 15, 2025, AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY EIGHT MONTHS).

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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

THE COURT FINDS TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA TO BE \$1,048 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$1,048 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2025, AND PAYABLE UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$3,144 FOR THE MONTHS OF JUNE THROUGH AUGUST INCLUSIVE. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$3,144 AS AND FOR ARREARS. PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$393 BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 15, 2025, AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 8 MONTHS).

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS PETITIONER ROUTINELY EARNS OVERTIME AND BONUS INCOME. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PROVIDE RESPONDENT HER PAYSTUBS ON A QUARTERLY BASIS BEGINNING JUNE 1, 2025. THE COURT DIRECTS RESPONDENT TO PREPARE AND FILE THE BONUS TABLE UTILIZING THE FIGURES THE COURT USED IN THE X-SPOUSE CALCULATION ATTACHED TO THE TENTATIVE RULING. TRUE UP PAYMENT IS TO BE MADE BY NO LATER THAN THE 15TH OF THE MONTH FOLLOWING THE CLOSE OF THE QUARTER.

THE COURT DENIES BOTH PARTIES' REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND CONTROL OF THE FORMER MARITAL RESIDENCE. THE COURT FINDS NEITHER PARTY HAS SET FORTH SUFFICIENT GROUNDS UPON WHICH THE COURT COULD MAKE SUCH AN ORDER. THE PARTIES ARE JOINTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HOME AS THEY CONTINUE TO SHARE THE RESIDENCE. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THIS ISSUE UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST OF ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000 PAYABLE DIRECTLY TO RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL. THE PAYMENT MAY BE MADE IN ONE LUMP SUM, OR IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS OF \$500, BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 1, 2025, AND CONTINUING ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 10 MONTHS).

THE COURT RESERVES ON RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. THE COURT REMINDS BOTH

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

PARTIES OF THE PUBLIC POLICY OF FAMILY CODE SECTION 271 TO REDUCE THE COSTS OF LITIGATION AND PROMOTE SETTLEMENT.

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.

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.

New Case

2025 Guideline Summary Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares

Number of children	0	2
Percent time with NCP	49.99%	0.00%
Filing status	MFSIN	MFSIN
Number of exemptions	2	2
Wages and salary	5165	15301
Self employed income	0	0
Other taxable income	0	0
TANF CS received	0	0
Other nontaxable income	0	0
New spouse income	0	0
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0
Health insurance	176	89
Other medical expenses	0	0
Property tax expenses	0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0
Contribution deduction	0	0
Misc tax deductions	0	0
Qualified business income deduction	0	0
Required union dues	0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0
Hardship deduction	0	0
Other GDL deductions	0	60
Child care expenses	0	0

Father Mother**Monthly Figures
2025****Nets (adjusted)**

Father	4108
Mother	10299
Total	14407
Support	
Addons	0
Guideln CS	1477
Alameda SS	1048
Total	2525

Cash Flow

Combined net spendable 14407

Father

Payment cost/benefit	2460
Net spendable income	6633
Federal income tax	283
Federal employment tax	395
State income tax	140
State employment tax	62
Total taxes	881
Federal filing status	MFSIN
State filing status	MFSIN

Mother

Payment cost/benefit	-2427
Net spendable income	7774
Federal income tax	2653
Federal employment tax	1132
State income tax	884
State employment tax	184
Total taxes	4853
Federal filing status	MFSIN
State filing status	MFSIN

FC 4055 checking: **ON****Per Child Information**

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		50 - 50	0	0	0 Father	1,477 Mother	1,477 Mother
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	554 Mother	554 Mother
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	923 Mother	923 Mother

Superior Court of California
County of El Dorado

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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. CHRISTINA ACEVEDO V. JAVIER SAAVEDRA

25FL0327

Petitioner filed a Petition to Establish a Parental Relationship on April 8, 2025. A Summons was issued the same day. Petitioner concurrently filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court make child custody orders. Proof of Service shows Respondent was served with the Petition and Summons on April 14, 2025. There is no Proof of Service showing the RFO was properly served on Respondent.

Nevertheless, Respondent filed a Response and Responsive Declaration on April 23, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for these documents.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on April 28, 2025, which includes the minor's birth certificate as an attachment. Respondent was mail served on April 28, 2025. The court notes Respondent is listed as the minor's parent.

On May 22, 2025, the court adopted its tentative ruling, finding good cause to proceed, despite the defects in service. The court noted the parties had not been referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC), as paternity had not been established. The court found Respondent to be the parent of the minor, based on the birth certificate. The court found good cause to refer the parties to CCRC and set a further review hearing for August 14, 2025 at 1:30 PM in Department 5. The court directed that any Supplemental Declarations were to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

The parties attended CCRC on June 18, 2025. The parties were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on July 31, 2025 and mailed to the parties on August 1, 2025.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the July 31, 2025 CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the judgment of parentage as well as the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE JULY 31, 2025 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE JUDGMENT OF PARENTAGE AS WELL AS THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. MELYNDA DEPRIEST V. STEVEN MCGREADY

PFL20130856

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on May 19, 2025. On May 20, 2025, the court denied the ex parte request. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 20, 2025, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders as well as child support orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 16, 2025, and a review hearing on August 14, 2025. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

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

The court drops the matter from calendar due to Petitioner's failure to properly serve Respondent. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE COURT DROPS THE MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY SERVE RESPONDENT. 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. SARAH GROVE V. LUIS VEGA

24FL0009

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 28, 2025, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 26, 2025 and a review hearing on August 14, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on June 14, 2025, in accordance with Family Code section 215.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment on June 26, 2025. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on June 26, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 30th.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. BRITTANY JONES V. SEAN O'BRIEN

PFL20200514

Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt on May 27, 2025, asserting one count of contempt. Respondent was personally served on June 2, 2025.

The parties are ordered to appear for arraignment.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. AMANDA KIRKLAND V. CRYSTAL SANDY-KIRKLAND

24FL1287

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 28, 2025, seeking temporary guideline support, as well as reinstatement of medical insurance through Petitioner, and return of personal property items. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Petitioner was served by mail on July 16, 2025.

Respondent filed a Declaration on July 16, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, the court has not considered it.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on July 28, 2025. Respondent was mail served on July 28, 2025. Petitioner opposes the request for temporary guideline spousal support, and asserts Respondent is self-supporting. Petitioner requests that if temporary guideline support is ordered, then Respondent be imputed with full time income at a rate of \$20 per hour. Petitioner also opposes the request for reinstatement of medical insurance, and asserts Respondent requested to be removed from Petitioner's insurance in October of 2024. Although Petitioner states there is an Exhibit G containing text messages from Respondent making the request, no such exhibit is attached. Last, Petitioner is not opposed to Respondent retrieving personal property items, but requests a civil standby, as there have been violence issues between the parties in the past. Additionally, Petitioner requests Respondent return personal property items belonging to Petitioner which she believes are in the possession of Respondent.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. Utilizing the figures from the parties Income and Expense Declarations, and with an imputation of full-time employment at \$20 per hour to Respondent, the court finds guideline temporary spousal support to be \$1,470 per month payable from Petitioner to Respondent (see attached X-spouse). The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$1,470 per month as and for temporary guideline spousal support effective June 1, 2025, and payable on the 1st of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this order results in an arrears balance of \$4,410 for June through August inclusive. The court orders Petitioner to pay Respondent \$490 per month as and for arrears effective August 15, 2025 and payable on the 15th of each month until paid in full (approximately nine months).

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner is ordered to reinstate Respondent on her health insurance. The court finds the Automatic Temporary Restraining Orders (ATROS) are in place and removal of Respondent from insurance is a violation of the ATROS.

Last, the court is ordering Respondent to retrieve her personal property items from Petitioner. Respondent and Petitioner are to exchange lists of the items to be exchanged by no later than August 16, 2025 at 5:00 PM. Respondent shall have three hours on August 23, 2025, between the hours of 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM to retrieve her belongings. Respondent shall bring with her the items in her possession that belong to Petitioner. Parties may arrange a civil standby if so desired.

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 #20: THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE TEMPORARY SPOUSAL SUPPORT TO BE \$1,470 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM PETITIONER TO RESPONDENT (SEE ATTACHED X-SPOUSE). THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$1,470 PER MONTH AS AND FOR TEMPORARY GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2025, AND PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS ORDER RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$4,410 FOR JUNE THROUGH AUGUST INCLUSIVE. THE COURT ORDERS PETITIONER TO PAY RESPONDENT \$490 PER MONTH AS AND FOR ARREARS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 15, 2025 AND PAYABLE ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY NINE MONTHS).

PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO REINSTATE RESPONDENT ON HER HEALTH INSURANCE. THE COURT FINDS THE AUTOMATIC TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS (ATROS) ARE IN PLACE AND REMOVAL OF RESPONDENT FROM INSURANCE IS A VIOLATION OF THE ATROS.

LAST, THE COURT IS ORDERING RESPONDENT TO RETRIEVE HER PERSONAL PROPERTY ITEMS FROM PETITIONER. RESPONDENT AND PETITIONER ARE TO EXCHANGE LISTS OF THE ITEMS TO BE EXCHANGED BY NO LATER THAN AUGUST 16, 2025 AT 5:00 PM. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE THREE HOURS ON AUGUST 23, 2025, BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 10:00 AM AND 3:00 PM TO RETRIEVE HER BELONGINGS. RESPONDENT SHALL BRING WITH HER THE ITEMS IN HER POSSESSION THAT BELONG TO PETITIONER. PARTIES MAY ARRANGE A CIVIL STANDBY IF SO DESIRED.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

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 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. MARY MCQUINN V. MICHAEL MCQUINN

PFL20170332

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 20, 2025¹, seeking modification of the child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 20, 2025 and a review hearing on August 14, 2025. Respondent was personally served on May 28, 2025. Minors' Counsel was served by mail on May 22, 2025.

Only Petitioner appeared at the June 20th CCRC appointment. As such, a single parent report was filed with the court on June 20, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 24, 2025.

Neither Respondent nor Minors' Counsel have filed a Responsive Declaration. The court deems the failure to do so as an admission that Petitioner's moving papers have merit. See El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C).

The court grants the request as stated in the RFO. Petitioner shall have sole legal and physical custody of the minors. Respondent shall have professionally supervised parenting time the 3rd weekend of the month for a total of 12 hours in El Dorado County. The court grants the request that Family Time Visitation Center, located at 3300 Coach Lane Suite B in Cameron Park, CA shall provide the supervision. Respondent shall be responsible for the costs of supervision. The minors are not to be transported to the visit unless the visit has been confirmed by the visitation agency. The court grants the request to limit phone calls/Facetime calls to one time per week on Sunday at 6:30 PM Pacific time. Neither parent is allowed to record or monitor the calls. The parties shall continue to use Talking Parents for all communication.

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 #21: PETITIONER SHALL HAVE SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED PARENTING TIME THE 3RD WEEKEND OF THE MONTH FOR A TOTAL OF 12 HOURS IN EL DORADO COUNTY. THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST THAT FAMILY TIME VISITATION CENTER, LOCATED AT 3300 COACH LANE SUITE B IN CAMERON PARK, CA SHALL PROVIDE THE SUPERVISION. RESPONDENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE

¹ The court notes the file endorsement date on the document states March 20, 2025. This is a clerical error. The signature date of the court shows 5/20/2025.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

COSTS OF SUPERVISION. THE MINORS ARE NOT TO BE TRANSPORTED TO THE VISIT UNLESS THE VISIT HAS BEEN CONFIRMED BY THE VISITATION AGENCY. THE COURT GRANTS THE REQUEST TO LIMIT PHONE CALLS/FACETIME CALLS TO ONE TIME PER WEEK ON SUNDAY AT 6:30 PM PACIFIC TIME. NEITHER PARENT IS ALLOWED TO RECORD OR MONITOR THE CALLS. THE PARTIES SHALL CONTINUE TO USE TALKING PARENTS FOR ALL COMMUNICATION. 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
August 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

22. DEBRA STANLEY V. ROBERT STANLEY

PFL20210202

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking enforcement of child support orders, on May 13, 2025. Respondent, Minors' Counsel, and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) were all mail served on June 16, 2025.

DCSS filed a Responsive Declaration on July 2, 2025. Parties were served on July 10, 2025. DCSS requests the matter be set for a hearing in Department 10 to be heard by the child support Commissioner in accordance with Family Code section 4250.

Petitioner filed a Declaration with exhibits as well as an Income and Expense Declaration on July 29, 2025. Parties were served on July 29th.

Neither Respondent nor Minors' Counsel have filed Responsive Declarations.

The court continues this matter to be heard on 9/22/2025 at 8:30 AM Department 10.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING 22: THE COURT CONTINUES THIS MATTER TO BE HEARD ON 9/22/2025 AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 10. 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

23. MARIA VARGAS-COOK V. REILLY COOK

PFL20180521

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 23, 2025, seeking modification of permanent spousal support. Respondent concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner has been served.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #23: 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 14, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

24. SIERRA WALLACE V. BRYCE WALLACE

25FL0412

On May 22, 2025, the court granted Petitioner a two-year Domestic Violence Restraining Order. The court made orders as to custody and parenting time and referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 23, 2025, and a review hearing on August 14, 2025 in Department 5. The court also set the request for child and spousal support to be heard on August 14, 2025.

The parties attended CCRC on June 23, 2025, and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on August 1, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on August 4th.

Neither party has filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the August 1st CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as its orders.

The court denies the requests for child and spousal support as Petitioner has failed to file an Income and Expense Declaration as required.

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 #24: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE AUGUST 1ST CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS ITS ORDERS. THE COURT DENIES THE REQUESTS FOR CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT AS PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION AS REQUIRED. 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 14, 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.**