

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. MARK BECKER V. LILLIAN BECKER

25FL0559

On May 4, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking to compel further responses to form interrogatories and compliance with Family Code § 2107. He concurrently filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support thereof. All required documents were 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. Respondent has knowledge of the requests pending before the court and chose not to file a response. The court finds good cause to treat her lack of response as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious.

Petitioner is requesting an order directing Respondent to produce her completed preliminary and final declarations of disclosure, file a fully executed FL-141 with the court, and serve full and complete responses to Form Interrogatories – Family Law. He requests monetary sanctions pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2030.290(c), Family Code § 2107(c) in the amount of \$1,500, and Family Code § 271 in the amount of \$1,000.

Family Code sections 2104 and 2105 impose on each party the obligation of making preliminary and final disclosures of assets within the specified timeframes. Where a party fails to comply with their disclosure requirements, 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...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).

In addition to the general disclosure requirements as set forth in Family Code §§ 2104 and 2105, the parties may also conduct formal discovery in accordance with the Civil Discovery Act. Pursuant to the Civil Discovery Act, “[t]he party to whom interrogatories have been propounded shall respond in writing under oath separately to each interrogatory...” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.210(a). Generally speaking, responses to interrogatories are due within 30 days of the date of service. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.260. If a party fails to provide timely responses, that party waives any right to object to the interrogatories. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2030.290 (a). Monetary sanctions may also be imposed for failure to submit to an

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

authorized form of discovery pursuant to Civil Procedure § 2023.030 & § 2023.010 so long as the imposition of the sanctions is not unjust. Civ. Pro. § 2023.030(a).

In keeping with the above, Petitioner's requests to compel Respondent's compliance with her disclosure and discovery obligations are granted. Respondent is ordered to serve full and complete verified responses, without objections, to Form Interrogatories – Family Law no later than September 21, 2026. Respondent is further ordered to serve her full and complete preliminary and final declarations of disclosure, with any required attachments, no later than September 21, 2026. She is ordered to file her fully executed FL-141 with the court immediately after service of her preliminary and final declarations of disclosure.

Turning to the issue of sanctions, after reviewing Respondent's July 20, 2026 Income and Expense Declaration, the court is concerned that the imposition of monetary sanctions may cause undue hardship to Respondent. That said, there is the possibility that sanctions may be paid out of any equalization or property interest at the time of trial depending on the assets of the parties. Accordingly, the court is reserving jurisdiction on the issue of monetary sanctions until the time of trial.

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: RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO SERVE FULL AND COMPLETE VERIFIED RESPONSES, WITHOUT OBJECTIONS, TO FORM INTERROGATORIES – FAMILY LAW NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 21, 2026. RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ORDERED TO SERVE HER FULL AND COMPLETE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSURE, WITH ANY REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS, NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 21, 2026. SHE IS ORDERED TO FILE HER FULLY EXECUTED FL-141 WITH THE COURT IMMEDIATELY AFTER SERVICE OF HER PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSURE.

THE COURT IS RESERVING JURISDICTION ON THE ISSUE OF MONETARY SANCTIONS UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL.

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

September 10, 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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

2. JENNIFER DAIGNAULT-KREBS V. TODD KREBS

25FL0807

On June 22, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking bifurcation of the issue of marital status. It was served the same day along with all required documents.

Respondent filed and served his Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 26, 2026.

Petitioner is requesting an order to bifurcate the issue of marital status, terminate the marriage, and restore both parties to the status of single persons. Respondent consents to terminating the marital status though he opposes the date of separation listed in Petitioner's moving papers.

Regarding the date of separation, there has been no request for the court to determine the date of separation. As such, the court is not ruling on that issue.

Turning to bifurcation, "[t]he 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). The party requesting bifurcation 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). Submission of a completed FL-315 is also required. Cal. Rule Ct. 5.390(a).

Here, Petitioner failed to file the required FL-315. Nevertheless, Respondent is stipulating to the bifurcation and Respondent did complete and file an FL-315. The only retirement plan appears to be a 401(k) which does not require joinder. Therefore, the court finds good cause to grant the bifurcation. The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

3. STEVE GIRDLESTONE V. ASHLEY A GIRDLESTONE

PFL20160763

On June 25, 2026, the parties appeared before the court for a hearing on five separate pending RFOs. At that time the court made orders regarding the minor's participation in cheerleading and ruled on the request for Section 271 sanctions. The court continued the issue of capping extracurricular costs to the present date.

On August 27, 2026, Petitioner filed and served a supplemental declaration.

Respondent's Supplemental Declaration was filed and served on August 31, 2026.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. PATRICK ADAM GROCHMAL V. YEKATERINA LVOVNA REYZIS

24FL1248

On June 24, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. All required documents were served on July 9th.

The parties attended Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) on July 30, 2026 and reached agreements on some issues. A report containing those agreements and recommendations was prepared and mailed to the parties on August 11, 2026.

Respondent filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 28th.

Petitioner is requesting joint legal custody and equal parenting time utilizing a 2-2-3 schedule. He also requests a holiday schedule and an order allowing the parties to take vacations with the children.

Respondent opposes the request for 50/50 custody and instead asks that Petitioner be ordered to undergo a Family Code § 3111 evaluation, at Respondent's expense, with either Deborah Barnes or Mikayla Van Dine, whichever is available earliest. She asks that the court maintain the status quo pending completion of the evaluation. Alternatively, she asks that the court institute a step-up plan and set a review hearing in 90 days. She further requests orders regarding the right of first refusal, exchanges, treatment recommendations, and communication via Talking Parents.

After reviewing the filings as outlined above, the court finds the agreements and recommendations contained in the August 11, 2026 CCRC report to be in the best interests of the minors and they are hereby adopted as the orders of the court. Respondent's request for a Section 3111 evaluation is denied without prejudice as the court does not find that such an evaluation would be in the best interests of the children at this time.

In addition to the foregoing, the court is ordering all communications regarding the children to be made utilizing the Talking Parents app.

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 #4: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE AUGUST 11, 2026 CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINORS AND THEY ARE HEREBY ADOPTED AS THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE COURT. RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR A SECTION 3111 EVALUATION IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS THE COURT DOES NOT FIND THAT SUCH AN EVALUATION WOULD BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN AT THIS TIME.

IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING, THE COURT IS ORDERING ALL COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THE CHILDREN TO BE MADE UTILIZING THE TALKING PARENTS APP.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. MICHAELA JOHNSON V. MATTHEW JOHNSON

22FL0137

On July 15, 2026, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) asking the court to adopt the arbitration decision and enter judgment. It was served on Petitioner on August 10, 2026, however there was no Notice of Tentative Ruling served. This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

On July 29, 2026, Petitioner filed a document entitled Request Hearing Re: Arbitration Award Matters. This follows her July 24th filing of two ADR-106 forms seeking to vacate the arbitration award. Petitioner did not utilize the FL-300 form, which is required pursuant to California Rule of Court, rule 5.92(B), as such, her request is dropped from calendar.

On August 10, 2026, Petitioner filed an RFO seeking to reassign Minor's Counsel. It was served on Respondent the same day however Petitioner failed to serve the required blank FL-320 and the Notice of Tentative Ruling. Furthermore, the court is weary of the veracity of the Proof of Service for the FL-300 as a portion of the listed documents are handwritten, in what appears to be Petitioner's handwriting, and it is unclear if the additional text was added before or after the document was signed. Additionally, there is no Proof of Service on Minor's Counsel. Given the defects in service, this matter is dropped from calendar.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on August 10, 2026. It was served on Respondent the same day.

On August 19, 2026, the court received a letter from Minor's Counsel indicating that he has a conflict and is unable to serve as Minor's Counsel in the present matter. He has asked that the position be reassigned.

In response to Mr. Dosh's August 19, 2026 letter, Mr. Dosh is excused from his position as Minor's Counsel in this matter. The court is assigning Rebecca Esty-Burke to act as Minor's Counsel moving forward.

On August 21st, Petitioner filed a document entitled "Supplemental Declaration Re: Matters Set Sept 10, 2026 Hearings (RFO Final Judgment, Petition to Vacate, Minors [sic] Counsel Vacatur [sic]). It was served on all parties the same day.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: RESPONDENT'S JULY 15, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. PETITIONER'S JULY 20, 2026 REQUEST FOR HEARING IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO FAILURE TO UTILIZE THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

September 10, 2026

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

REQUISITE FL-300. PETITIONER'S AUGUST 10, 2026 RFO IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. IN RESPONSE TO MR. DOSH'S AUGUST 19, 2026 LETTER, MR. DOSH IS EXCUSED FROM HIS POSITION AS MINOR'S COUNSEL IN THIS MATTER. THE COURT IS ASSIGNING REBECCA ESTY-BURKE TO ACT AS MINOR'S COUNSEL MOVING FORWARD.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. TIFFANY HENDERSON V. SAMUEL HENDERSON

24FL1253

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) along with an Oder Shortening Time (OST) on September 1, 2026, seeking orders as to the supervised visitation exchanges, appointing a new exchange facilitator, and any other orders necessary to ensure parenting time takes place for Respondent. Minors' Counsel filed a Responsive Declaration on September 1, 2026, consenting to the OST.

On September 2, 2026, the court granted the OST, setting the hearing on the RFO for September 10, 2026. The court directed Respondent to serve Petitioner and Minors' Counsel on September 2, 2026. The court set September 8, 2026, as the date for filing of any Responsive Declarations. Proof of Service shows Petitioner and Minors' Counsel were served on September 2, 2026.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. KRISTEN REIMAN V. SCOTT REIMAN

25FL0453

On May 4, 2026, Minor's Counsel filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking custody and visitation orders. The parties appeared for the hearing on June 18th at which time the court set the matter for trial on the issue of custody and visitation, added an additional 2 days of parenting time and set the matter for a review hearing on the present date.

On July 16, 2026, Counsel for the minor filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to be Relieved as Counsel. There is no Proof of Service for the Request for Order, however both parties clearly have actual knowledge of the pending motion as evidenced by Petitioner's September 4th declaration. As such, the court finds good cause to reach the matter on its merits as addressed in further detail below.

Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of Attorney on September 4, 2026. Respondent has not filed a supplemental declaration.

Petitioner acknowledges the tardiness of her declaration but asks that the court find good cause to consider it. She further requests the following: (1) Enter the agreements reached by counsel as reflected in the stipulation attached to the declaration and incorporate those agreements into the tentative ruling; (2) Grant Minor's Counsel's request to be relieved as counsel and appoint a replacement; and (3) Order the parties and counsel to meet and confer regarding trial dates to include availability of the newly appointed Minor's Counsel and appear at the hearing for setting/resetting the hearing.

Given that Petitioner's declaration was filed late due to counsel's unavailability during trial and given that the requests made therein have all already been stipulated to, the court does find good cause to consider the declaration and grant the requests made therein. Accordingly, per the stipulation of the parties, Ms. Cordero is hereby relieved as Minor's Counsel. The court appoints Kelly Bentley as Minor's Counsel effective forthwith.

The trial dates which are currently set for November 16-18 and December 1-2 are vacated. The parties are to meet and confer with Minor's Counsel to select new trial dates. The review hearing and the October 22nd hearing on Petitioner's Request for Order are both continued to December 3, 2026 at 8:30am in Department 5.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: MS. CORDERO IS HEREBY RELIEVED AS MINOR'S COUNSEL. THE COURT APPOINTS KELLY BENTLEY AS MINOR'S COUNSEL EFFECTIVE FORTHWITH.

THE TRIAL DATES WHICH ARE CURRENTLY SET FOR NOVEMBER 16-18 AND DECEMBER 1-2 ARE VACATED. THE PARTIES ARE TO MEET AND CONFER WITH MINOR'S COUNSEL TO SELECT NEW TRIAL DATES. THE REVIEW HEARING AND THE OCTOBER 22ND HEARING ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORDER ARE BOTH CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 3, 2026 AT 8:30AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. RYAN RICHARDS V. JENNIFER RICHARDS

23FL0665

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on May 18, 2026. The court granted the request on May 19, 2026, and awarded Petitioner temporary sole legal and physical custody of the minors. The court set an emergency Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment for June 2, 2026, and a review hearing on July 2, 2026. Respondent was mail served on May 27, 2026. This is a post-judgement request for modification, and as such, Family Code section 215 applies. Petitioner has not provided address verification in accordance with Family Code section 215.

Only Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was filed with the court on June 2, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on June 3, 2026.

Petitioner filed and served a supplemental declaration on June 22, 2026. Petitioner subsequently filed and served a corrected Exhibit 1 to the supplemental declaration on June 25, 2026.

Petitioner appeared for the hearing on July 2nd and requested a continuance which was granted and the matter was continued to the present date.

Several documents were personally served on July 25, 2026, though this was after the date for the emergency set CCRC appointment and no FL-320 was served.

The parties are ordered to appear for the hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR THE HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. ROSS SCROGGINS V. RANDY SCROGGINS

25FL0877

On June 29, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support and property division orders. She filed her Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There are two Proofs of Service, both of which indicate only an “FL-300” was served. Respondent’s attorney was served on July 16th, prior to the filing of the RFO. Respondent himself was served on July 30th. Petitioner did not serve the Notice of Tentative Ruling or a blank FL-320.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on September 3, 2026. However there is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not read or considered it. Furthermore, this document is late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which 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 August 27th the last day for filing the responsive declaration therefore it is late filed and has not been read or considered by the court.

Despite the fact that Petitioner is the moving party, she also filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order, and an additional declaration on September 8, 2026. Assuming either of these documents was to be considered a reply declaration, reply papers are to be filed at least five court days before the hearing date therefore these documents are late filed and have not been read or considered.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #9: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

September 10, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

September 10, 2026

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

11. KENNETH CROMPTON V. DAYNA CROMPTON

23FL0077

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on March 17, 2026, requesting a modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) with an appointment on April 16, 2026, and a review hearing on June 11, 2026. There is no Proof of Service showing Petitioner and Minors' Counsel were properly served.

Only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment. A single parent report was filed with the court on April 20, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Parties appeared for the originally scheduled hearing on June 11, 2026. Respondent requested the matter be continued to effectuate service.

The court granted the request and rereferred the parties to CCRC. The court set a further review hearing for September 10, 2026, at 1:30 PM in Department 5.

Once again only Respondent appeared at the CCRC appointment, despite Petitioner being present in court when the CCRC appointment was set and agreed to the date being available. A single parent report was prepared on July 23, 2026, and served on parties on July 24th.

Petitioner filed a Declaration on September 2, 2026. It was served on Minors' Counsel the same day. The court finds this to be late filed and not properly served, therefore, the court has not considered it.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service after the June 11, 2026 hearing showing Petitioner and Minors' Counsel were properly served.

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

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

ANY REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT WILL BE HEARD AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

September 10, 2026

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

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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. KRISTIN KAMINSKI-WADLE V. DANE WADLE

23FL0536

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on July 14, 2026, requesting a change in venue from El Dorado County to Placer County. Respondent was personally served in accordance with Family Code section 215, though it does not appear Respondent was served with a blank FL-320.

Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to the RFO.

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

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER SERVICE.

ANY REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT WILL BE HEARD AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. JOSLYNN MATHERS V. NICHOLAS PALLESCHI

26FL0658

Petitioner filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on July 17, 2026. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on July 20th. On July 20, 2026, the court denied the ex parte request and referred the parties to an emergency set Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) appointment on August 11, 2026, and a review hearing on September 10, 2026. Petitioner filed a Request for Order on July 20, 2026, mirroring the requests made in the ex parte application. Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served.

Nevertheless, both parties appeared at the CCRC appointment and were able to make some agreements. A report with the parties' agreements and further recommendations was prepared on August 26, 2026. Copies were mailed to the parties on August 27th.

Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration to the CCRC report on September 1, 2026. It was served on Respondent the same day. Petitioner points out the CCRC report is inconsistent between the body of the report and the recommendations regarding the parenting plan. Petitioner also asserts the recommendation that Respondent have sole physical custody is incongruent with the parenting plan outlined in the body of the report. Petitioner is seeking an order for joint legal custody. Petitioner requests Respondent's parenting time be consistent with Respondent's work schedule. Petitioner requests Respondent's parenting time be alternating weekends as well as a Tuesday evening dinner weekly.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the agreements of the parties as set forth in the August 26th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court is not adopting the recommendation as to parenting time. The parties are to share joint physical custody. Respondent shall have parenting time every other week on Thursday at 7:00 PM until Sunday at 9:00 AM. Respondent shall have parenting time with the minor every Tuesday from 5:00 PM until 9:00 PM. The court is adopting the remainder of the recommendations as set forth, as they are in the best interest of the minor.

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
September 10, 2026
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: THE COURT FINDS THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE AUGUST 26TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT IS NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION AS TO PARENTING TIME. THE PARTIES ARE TO SHARE JOINT PHYSICAL CUSTODY. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME EVERY OTHER WEEK ON THURSDAY AT 7:00 PM UNTIL SUNDAY AT 9:00 AM. RESPONDENT SHALL HAVE PARENTING TIME WITH THE MINOR EVERY TUESDAY FROM 5:00 PM UNTIL 9:00 PM. THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE REMAINDER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH, AS THEY ARE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR.

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.

ANY REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT WILL BE HEARD AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT 5.

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.