

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

1. BAMBI DESIREE BONAR V. CHRISTOPHER ROBIN BONAR

26FL0430

On May 5, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support, attorney's fees, and property control orders. All required documents were personally served on May 23, 2026, however, it says a completed Income and Expense Declaration was served, though it does not appear one was filed with the court.

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

Petitioner is requesting guideline spousal support and need-based attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,000. She further requests sole and exclusive use and control of the marital residence located on Turner Circle in Cameron Park. She asks that the home be sold as soon as possible and any proceeds from the sale be placed in her attorney's trust account until further court order.

Respondent asks the court to impute Petitioner with full-time minimum wage and asks the court to deny or significantly reduce any support due to Petitioner's failure to disclose her nursing license. He does not oppose the request to sell the community residence, though he asks that it be listed for sale forthwith and the funds be held in his attorney's trust account instead of Petitioner's. He does object to Petitioner's request for exclusive use and possession of the marital residence. If Petitioner is awarded exclusive use and possession, then Respondent asks that she also be ordered to pay the mortgage and utilities.

The requests for spousal support and attorney's fees are both denied. To request attorney's fees and costs, a party must complete, file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration and, among other things, a completed FL-158. Likewise, a party requesting support shall file and serve their Income and Expense Declaration with the initial moving papers. El Dorado Sup. Ct. Rule 8.03.01. Here, Petitioner has failed to file a completed Income and Expense Declaration and the FL-158 she filed is missing pages. Accordingly, the requests for spousal support and attorney's fees are denied.

The request for exclusive use, possession, and control of the marital residence is also denied. The court does not find such an order to be necessary to preserve the community asset or for either party's safety.

Finally, turning to the sale of the marital residence, that request is granted. The parties are ordered to place the home up for sale forthwith. Proceeds from the sale are to

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

be placed in Petitioner's attorney's trust account until further order of the court or written agreement of the parties.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE REQUESTS FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND ATTORNEY'S FEES ARE BOTH DENIED FOR FAILURE TO FILE THE REQUISITE PAPERWORK. THE REQUEST FOR EXCLUSIVE USE, POSSESSION, AND CONTROL OF THE MARITAL RESIDENCE IS ALSO DENIED. THE COURT DOES NOT FIND SUCH AN ORDER TO BE NECESSARY TO PRESERVE THE COMMUNITY ASSET OR FOR EITHER PARTY'S SAFETY. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO PLACE THE TURNER CIRCLE HOME UP FOR SALE FORTHWITH. PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE ARE TO BE PLACED IN PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR WRITTEN AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

2. KELSEY BROOKS V. NATHAN BROOKS

PFL20190875

On June 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The matter was originally filed ex parte, however, the court declined to make orders on an ex parte basis and instead referred the parties to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC). A review hearing was set for the present date.

The parties attended CCRC on July 7, 2026. They reached some agreements but could not agree on all issues. As such, a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on July 16th. It was mailed to the parties on July 17th.

Petitioner filed a supplemental declaration on July 27th along with a declaration of Wendy Cadei. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore the court has not read or considered them.

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

Petitioner is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minors pending further investigation by CPS. If the court is inclined to award visitation to Respondent, Petitioner asks that the visits be professionally supervised and for the court to make any additional orders as it deems fit to ensure the children's safety.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the July 16, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the children and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE JULY 16, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT.

PETITIONER IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

3. HOLLY CHARLES V. JOSEPH CHARLES

23FL0516

On May 4, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and orders to vacate, set aside, and stay enforcement of the court's prior support order and sanctions. He filed another RFO on June 16th again seeking to stay the court's support orders. In response to the ex parte request, Petitioner filed her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 10th. The ex parte was denied and the matter was set to be heard on the regular law and motion calendar on the present date.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 25, 2026. They reached some agreements but could not agree on all issues. A report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on June 26, 2026. It was mailed to the parties on June 29th.

There is no Proof of Service for the May 4th RFO, however, Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and her Income and Expense Declaration on July 20th and July 21st respectively.

Petitioner objects to the May 4th RFO on procedural grounds including the service of an unendorsed copy of the RFO, failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration, and failure to set forth facts sufficient to notify the other party of the moving party's contentions. Petitioner's objections are sustained. The May 4th RFO is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service, and failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent's June 16th RFO is also dropped due to his failure to file an Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner is requesting sanctions in the amount of \$5,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271. 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.*

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

Here, the court is inclined to award sanctions given Respondent's repeated filings on the same issues. That said, as indicated above, the court does not have a current Income and Expense Declaration from Respondent and the court is concerned that a sanction in the amount of \$5,000 would likely pose an unreasonable financial burden. Accordingly, Respondent is sanctioned \$1,000 as and for sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271. This amount is to be paid directly to Petitioner's attorney. Sanctions may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$100 commencing on September 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1st 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.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE MAY 4TH RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE, AND FAILURE TO FILE AND INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION. RESPONDENT'S JUNE 16TH RFO IS ALSO DROPPED DUE TO HIS FAILURE TO FILE AN INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION.

RESPONDENT IS SANCTIONED \$1,000 AS AND FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 271. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY. SANCTIONS MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$100 COMMENCING ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST 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.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

4. MICKEY DE MARTINI V. JESSICA THOMAS

26FL0003

On January 2, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to establish paternity, set aside the Voluntary Declaration of Paternity (VDOP), birth certificate amendment, and visitation orders. Concurrently therewith he filed a Request for Hearing and Application to Cancel (Set Aside) Voluntary Declaration of Parentage or Paternity. On March 6th, Respondent filed an RFO seeking to quash the request to set aside the VDOP and for sanctions. Hearing on both RFOs was held on June 11th at which time the request to set aside the VDOP was denied and the issue of sanctions was continued to the present date. The parties were ordered to file and serve updated Income and Expense Declarations no later than 10 days prior to the hearing.

Neither party has filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration since the June hearing date. As such, the request for sanctions is denied.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS IS DENIED. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING (FOAH); HOWEVER, THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE COURT'S ADOPTION OF THE TENTATIVE RULING AND IS NOT CONDITIONED ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FOAH.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

6. SARAH LESTER V. JASON LESTER

23FL1169

Order to Show Cause

On February 17, 2026, Petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt (OSC) alleging 51 counts of contempt for failure to pay court ordered child support. It was personally served on February 21st.

On May 7, 2026, the court found Respondent does not qualify for the services of the Public Defender. The court continued the matter to allow Respondent additional time to secure counsel. Respondent waived time to a speedy trial.

The parties appeared before the court for arraignment on the OSC on July 16, 2026. At that time the matter was continued to the present date.

The parties are ordered to appear for the arraignment.

Request for Order

On May 14, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support orders and requesting to clarify travel orders and modify travel costs. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. All required documents were served on May 20th.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 21st. It was served on Respondent only on July 19th and on Minor's Counsel on July 22nd. Petitioner has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

Respondent filed and served his reply declaration on July 28th.

Respondent is requesting termination of spousal support based on the fact that Petitioner is cohabiting with her significant other. He further asks that Petitioner be ordered to pay travel costs for Respondent's visits with the children and that these costs be deducted from child support. He is requesting 25 days' worth of make-up time for missed visits with the children and in the future, if Petitioner withholds the children visits, Respondent asks that make up time is to occur within 6 weeks of the missed visit.

Petitioner opposes the requests and she denies that Respondent has missed 25 visits with the minors.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

Regarding the request for 25 make-up visits, that request is denied as Respondent has failed to prove that he did in fact miss 25 visits. That said, moving forward Petitioner shall not unilaterally withhold the children from their visits with Respondent. If Petitioner unilaterally decides to withhold the children from their visit, then the parties are ordered to schedule make-up time within six weeks of the missed visit. All prior orders regarding payment of the costs for visits remain in full force and effect.

Regarding the request to modify spousal support, it is unclear to the court if Petitioner is actually cohabiting with her significant other or if she denies that allegation. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing on this issue.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE ARRAIGNMENT. THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF SUPPORT.

REGARDING THE REQUEST FOR 25 MAKE-UP VISITS, THAT REQUEST IS DENIED AS RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO PROVE THAT HE DID IN FACT MISS 25 VISITS. THAT SAID, MOVING FORWARD PETITIONER SHALL NOT UNILATERALLY WITHHOLD THE CHILDREN FROM THEIR VISITS WITH RESPONDENT. IF PETITIONER UNILATERALLY DECIDES TO WITHHOLD THE CHILDREN FROM THEIR VISIT, THEN THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO SCHEDULE MAKE-UP TIME WITHIN SIX WEEKS OF THE MISSED VISIT. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REGARDING PAYMENT OF THE COSTS FOR VISITS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

7. KATHRYN MCDONALD V. JOHN MCDONALD

PFL20210430

On April 23, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support orders. On May 1st he filed another RFO seeking custody orders. He filed a supplemental declaration in support of his May 1st RFO on May 7th. None of these documents has a corresponding Proof of Service.

On May 26th, Minor's Counsel filed an RFO seeking school enrollment orders for the minors. It was served on June 2nd. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 3rd.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 11th and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the agreements was prepared and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 9th. Minor's Counsel has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order but she did file a Statement of Issues and Contentions on July 13, 2026. It was served on July 12th.

In response to Respondent's April 23rd RFO, Petitioner filed her Income and Expense Declaration and a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 17th. She objects to the RFO as it was improperly served pursuant to Family Code § 215.

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

Respondent's RFOs are dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

Minor's Counsel is requesting an order to transfer the minors, Maverick and Michael, to Sutter Middle School and for CJ to attend Folsom High School. Petitioner does not oppose the request.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements stated in the June 11, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court with the following modification. Celia shall be enrolled in Folsom High School. Respondent is ordered to provide any documents or signatures necessary to complete the transfers.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #7: RESPONDENT'S RFOS ARE DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS STATED IN THE JUNE 11, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE ORDERS OF THE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION. CELIA SHALL BE ENROLLED IN FOLSOM HIGH SCHOOL. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE ANY DOCUMENTS OR SIGNATURES NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE TRANSFERS.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

8. MADISON L. MEXIA V. JOSEPH A. MEXIA

25FL0339

On May 12, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child and spousal support orders. He filed his Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either document therefore, the court drops this matter from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: THE COURT DROPS THIS MATTER FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

9. JEREMY NICHOLS V. OLIVIA NICHOLS

23FL1221

On May 12, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to bifurcate the issue of marital status. All required documents were electronically served on May 13th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on July 17, 2026, however she failed to fill out the hearing date therefore it is unclear which pending RFO this is in response to.

Petitioner's Reply in Support of Request for Order for Separate Trial to Terminate Marital Status was filed on July 28th; it was served on July 29th.

Petitioner asks the court to bifurcate the issue of marital status. He has filed the requisite FL-315 and states there are no community property retirement accounts.

Respondent opposes the request stating that there are unresolved financial and property issues. If the court does grant the bifurcation, Respondent asks that all appropriate statutory safeguards be put in place to preserve Respondent's rights to "property, support, retirement, insurance, credits, reimbursements, fees, and all other reserved issues."

"The court may separately try one or more issues before the trial of the other issues if resolution of the bifurcated issue is likely to simplify the determination of the other issues." Cal. Rules of Ct. Rule 5.390(c). In dissolution proceedings, the court may bifurcate the issue of the dissolution of the marriage and enter a status only judgment. *Id.* at (c)(7); Fam. Code § 2337. In fact, it is the public policy of the state to favor bifurcation where the dissolution of marriage would otherwise be postponed due to issues of property, support, custody or attorney's fees. *In re Marriage of Fink*, 54 Cal. App. 3d 357 (1976). In furtherance of that policy, the party moving for bifurcation need only show slight evidence in support of its motion. *Girons v. Sup. Ct.*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 786 (1988). In contrast, the party opposing the motion "must present compelling reasons for denial." *Id.* at 790. Of course, despite the general policy in favor of bifurcation, the moving party must ensure that "[a]ll pension plans that have not been divided by court order that require joinder ..." have been joined. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(d)(1). A party seeking bifurcation is to submit a completed FL-315 evidencing such. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(a).

After reviewing the filings of the parties, the court finds good cause to bifurcate the case and grant a separate trial on the issue of marital status only. The court orders parties to appear for hearing on the status-only judgment.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: AFTER REVIEWING THE FILINGS OF THE PARTIES, THE COURT FINDS GOOD CAUSE TO BIFURCATE THE CASE AND GRANT A SEPARATE TRIAL ON THE ISSUE OF MARITAL STATUS ONLY. THE COURT ORDERS PARTIES TO APPEAR FOR HEARING ON THE STATUS-ONLY JUDGMENT.

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 6, 2026

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

10. DONNA REGENNITTER V. ROBERT REGENNITTER

24FL0818

On May 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) to compel responses to form interrogatories. She served the RFO by mail the same day as filing, however she did not serve the Notice of Tentative Ruling nor a blank FL-320 as required.

On May 26th, Petitioner filed an RFO to compel Respondent's Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD) and an amended motion to compel form interrogatories. All required documents were served on June 11th.

On July 16th, Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support thereof.

Petitioner filed and served her reply declaration on July 29th.

According to Petitioner, she served Form Interrogatories – Family Law on February 9, 2026 thereby making responses due on March 16, 2026. She asks the court to compel Respondent to provide full and complete discovery responses and issue sanctions sufficient to deter future non-compliance. Likewise, she asks the court to order Respondent to serve an amended PDD and issue sanctions for non-compliance.

Respondent opposes the request to compel further disclosures on his PDD. He argues that his disclosures were sufficiently complete, Petitioner failed to meet and confer in good faith, and she failed to attach the PDD to her motion. He further opposes the request for sanctions arguing that he has acted with substantial justification.

Family Code section 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosure of assets within the timeframe specified. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). As with other law and motion matters, the moving party bears the burden of establishing the necessity for an order compelling further disclosures. See *Williams v. Sup. Ct.*, 3 Cal. 5th 531 (2017).

Here, Petitioner has failed to meet her burden. Petitioner attached only a copy of her meet and confer letter, however, she did not attach a copy of Respondent's PDD. Without that, the court is unable to make a determination regarding the sufficiency of the

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

responses. As such, the request for an order compelling further disclosures is denied. So too is the request for sanctions.

Turning to the request for further responses to form interrogatories, on receipt of responses to form interrogatories, the requesting party may move for an order compelling further responses where the initial responses are not in compliance with the Civil Discovery Act. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.300. A motion to compel further responses shall include a separate statement which complies with California Rules of Court rule 3.1345.

While Petitioner attaches her meet and confer letter which provides a summary of the responses she feels are inadequate, this is not in conformance with Rule 3.1345. The separate statement must include, among other things, the following information for each discovery request such that the reader need not refer to any other pleading: “(1) The text of the request...; (2) The text of each response, answer, or objection and any further responses or answers; (3) A statement of the factual and legal reasons for compelling further responses, answers, or production as to each matter in dispute...” Cal. Rule Ct. 3.1345(c). Petitioner’s summary of the alleged deficiencies does not provide the requisite information needed for the court to rule on the motion. Without the requisite separate statement, Petitioner has failed to establish the need for further responses and sanctions. The requests are therefore denied.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #10: THE REQUESTS FOR FURTHER FORM INTERROGATORIES AND SANCTIONS ARE DENIED. THE REQUESTS FOR FURTHER PRELIMINARY DISCLOSURES AND SANCTIONS ARE ALSO DENIED.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

11. MICHAEL GRANT THOMPSON V. LANETTE AMANDA CASTANEDA 26FL0185

On May 11, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders and a move away order. All required documents were served on May 20th.

Petitioner filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on June 30th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on June 26, 2026. They reached some agreements but could not agree on all issues therefore a report with the agreements and recommendations was prepared on July 21st; it was mailed to the parties on July 22nd.

Respondent's Reply Declaration to Petitioner's Responsive Declaration and Updating Declaration Regarding Custody was filed and served on July 28, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served his supplemental declaration on July 29th.

Respondent is requesting sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor and authorization to move the minor to Arizona.

Petitioner opposes the requests and instead he asks the court to order joint legal and joint physical custody. He requests weekly, unsupervised visits, and overnight visits with the minor with a step-up plan to equal parenting. He asks that exchanges take place at the Rocklin Target located at 5104 Commons Dr., in Rocklin. Finally, he asks the court to order a Family Code § 3111 evaluation at Respondent's expense.

At the time of filing the parties were pending a trial on Respondent's request for a Domestic Violence Restraining Order in case number 26FL0206. It appears hearing on that matter has been continued to March 10, 2027.

This matter is continued to join with the DVRO trial. All prior orders remain in full force and effect pending the DVRO trial.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED TO JOIN WITH THE DVRO TRIAL. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT PENDING THE DVRO TRIAL.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

12. STEFFI AHART V. TEDDY AHART

PFL20150560

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on May 11, 2026. Respondent filed a responsive declaration the same day. On May 12, 2026, the court granted the request in part, granting Petitioner temporary sole physical custody and maintaining the order for joint legal custody. The court modified the joint legal custody provisions to allow Petitioner final decision making authority. Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 12, 2026, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders as well as child support orders. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on July 13, 2026 and a review hearing on August 6, 2026. Respondent was personally served on May 12th and 14th.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and were able to reach some agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was filed with the court on July 21, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on July 22nd.

Respondent has not filed an Income and Expense Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing. Respondent is directed to bring a completed Income and Expense Declaration with him.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING. RESPONDENT IS DIRECTED TO BRING A COMPLETED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION WITH HIM.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

14. DANIEL FREIER V. NANCEY NIEMAN

25FL1234

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 20, 2026, seeking an order compelling Respondent to serve her Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure (PDD), monetary sanctions, a review hearing, as well as evidentiary sanctions. Respondent was mail-served on May 24, 2026.

Respondent has not filed a responsive declaration.

Family Code sections 2104 imposes on each party the obligation of making a preliminary disclosures of assets within the specified timeframes. For the party responding to a Petition for Dissolution, the disclosure is due either concurrently with the response or within 60 days of filing the same. Where a party fails to comply with Section 2104, the complying party may, among other things, file a motion to compel and seek sanctions against the noncomplying party. Fam. Code § 2107(b)(1). “[T]he court *shall*...impose monetary sanctions against the noncomplying party. Sanctions shall be in an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct, and *shall* include reasonable attorney’s fees, costs incurred, or both, unless the court finds that the noncomplying party acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust.” Fam. Code § 2107(c).

Here, Petitioner has complied with the law and served his PDD; as such he has standing to assert his demand for the same pursuant to Family Code Section 2107. Accordingly, Respondent is ordered to serve full and complete preliminary declarations of disclosure, with supporting documents, no later than September 6, 2026.

Respondent is sanctioned \$90 pursuant to Family Code § 2107. This amount is to be paid directly to Petitioner and may be paid in one lump sum or in monthly increments of \$10 commencing on September 1, 2026 and continuing on the 1st of each month thereafter until paid in full (approximately 9 months). If any payment is missed or late the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable.

Petitioner’s request for Section 271 sanctions 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). However,

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

where a party did not incur attorney's fees, such as is the case with a pro se litigant, that party cannot collect sanctions pursuant to Section 271. In Re Marriage of Erndt & Terhorst, 59 Cal. App. 5th 898 (2021). Because Petitioner is pro per, an award of sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 is improper and therefore, the request is denied.

The court reserves on Petitioner's request for further evidentiary and monetary sanctions. The court sets a further review hearing for October 8, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5. Supplemental Declarations are to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing. Updated Income and Expense Declarations are also to be filed and served at least 10 days prior to the review hearing.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #14: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE FULL AND COMPLETE PRELIMINARY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSURE, WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS, NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 6, 2026. RESPONDENT IS SANCTIONED \$90 PURSUANT TO FAMILY CODE § 2107. THIS AMOUNT IS TO BE PAID DIRECTLY TO PETITIONER AND MAY BE PAID IN ONE LUMP SUM OR IN MONTHLY INCREMENTS OF \$10 COMMENCING ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2026 AND CONTINUING ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH THEREAFTER UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 9 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE.

THE COURT RESERVES ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR FURTHER EVIDENTIARY AND MONETARY SANCTIONS. THE COURT SETS A FURTHER REVIEW HEARING FOR OCTOBER 8, 2026, AT 1:30 PM IN DEPARTMENT 5. SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING. UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATIONS ARE ALSO TO BE FILED AND SERVED AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE REVIEW HEARING.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

15. JAMIE HALL V. GEOFFREY HALL

25FL1140

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 28, 2026, seeking child custody and parenting plan orders, child and spousal support orders, as well as exclusive use and control of the family home. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration, as well as a Declaration in support of the RFO. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on February 18, 2026 and a review hearing on April 16, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Petitioner filed a request to reschedule on March 9, 2026. That request was granted and the matter was continued to June 4, 2026. Respondent was mail served with the FL-306 and FL-309 on March 9, 2026.

Both parties appeared at CCRC and were able to reach may agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was filed with the court on May 20, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on May 21st.

Respondent filed a request to reschedule on June 1, 2026 and again on June 2, 2026. The court granted the June 2nd request and rescheduled the hearing to August 6, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing the June 2nd FL-309 was served.

Petitioner filed a declaration on July 27, 2026. It was served the same day by mail.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and an Income and Expense Declaration on July 29, 2026. Civil Procedure section 1005(b) states all opposition papers are to be filed at least nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, "[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12." Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made July 24th the last day for filing a response to the RFO. Therefore, the declaration is late filed and has not been considered by the court.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing to address the issues surrounding service.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

16. MICHAELA JOHNSON V. MATTHEW JOHNSON

22FL0137

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) along with an Order Shortening Time (OST) on June 29, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on June 29, 2026. The court granted the OST on June 30, 2026. The parties were referred to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on July 14, 2026 and a review hearing on August 6, 2026. Respondent was served with some but not all the required documents on July 1, 2026. Respondent was served with the CCRC questionnaire on July 6, 2026.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on July 15, 2026. It was served the same day. Respondent requests the current custody schedule remain in place. Respondent also requests orders wholly unrelated to the RFO. The court finds Respondent's requests exceed the scope of the RFO therefore, the court declines to rule on it in accordance with California Rule of Court rule 5.92(g)(2), "unrelated relief must be sought by scheduling a separate hearing using *Request for Order* (form FL-300) ..." Cal. Rule Ct. § 5.92(g)(2). Upon review of the court file, Respondent has already done so and the RFO is pending a hearing. The court further notes Respondent does not raise the issue of incomplete service, as such the court deems the issue to be waived and proceeds on the merits.

Both parties attended CCRC and were able to reach many agreements. A report with the parties' agreements as well as further recommendations was filed with the court on July 21, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on July 22nd.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court grants Petitioner's request that the minor be enrolled at Twelve Bridges High School for the 2026-2027 school year. The court adopts the agreements of the parties as set forth in the July 21st CCRC report, as they are in the best interest of the minor. The court is not adopting the recommendations, with the exception of the minor being enrolled at Twelve Bridges High School. The court is maintaining the current parenting plan. Each party is to ensure the minor is transported to school in time for classes. Petitioner's request for Minor's Counsel is granted. The court appoints Aaron Dosh.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST THAT THE MINOR BE ENROLLED AT TWELVE BRIDGES HIGH SCHOOL FOR THE 2026-2027 SCHOOL YEAR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE JULY 21ST CCRC REPORT, AS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MINOR BEING ENROLLED AT TWELVE BRIDGES HIGH SCHOOL. THE COURT IS MAINTAINING THE CURRENT PARENTING PLAN. EACH PARTY IS TO ENSURE THE MINOR IS TRANSPORTED TO SCHOOL IN TIME FOR CLASSES. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR MINOR'S COUNSEL IS GRANTED. THE COURT APPOINTS AARON DOSH.

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

17. SYDNEY LEOS V. LAWRENCE PORCHIA

PFL20210592

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 20, 2026, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as child support order. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. The parties were not referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) as they last attended on April 17, 2026 and reached a stipulation which the court adopted as its order on April 21, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on July 23, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, it has not been considered.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on July 24, 2026. There is no Proof of Service for this document, therefore, it has not been considered.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #17: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

August 6, 2026

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

18. LINDSEY MOFFETT V. PETER MOFFETT

24FL1070

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on May 4, 2026, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on June 12, 2026 and a review hearing on July 30, 2026. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served on May 6, 2026.

On May 15, 2026, the parties submitted a letter request to modify the review hearing date to August 6th. The court granted the request.

Respondent filed a Supplemental Declaration on June 2, 2026. It was served the same day.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on June 11, 2026. It was served the same day. Petitioner opposes Respondent's requested changes to the current orders.

Both parties attended CCRC and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was initially filed with the court and provided to the parties on July 15, 2026. A corrected version was filed on July 16th and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on July 23, 2026.

Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on July 27, 2026.

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 6, 2026

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

19. JOANNE RUGGERI V. CHRISTOPHER RUGGERI

24FL1183

On March 11, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for a long cause trial. The parties reached agreements on all issues and agreed to set a review hearing for June 11, 2026.

On June 11, 2026, parties and counsel appeared for the hearing. Neither party had filed a Supplemental Declaration. Parties requested one further continuance as they had reached a full agreement which was reduced to writing and awaiting signatures. The court granted the request, however, cautioned that there would be no further continuances.

Respondent filed and served a Supplemental Declaration on July 28, 2026. The court finds that is less than 10 days prior to the hearing. Therefore, the court is not considering it.

The court drops the matter from calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE FAILURE TO FILE A TIMELY SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION.

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