

1. VARVARO v. STATELINE BREWERY LLC, ET AL., 24CV0605**(A) Motion for Trial Preference****(B) Case Management Conference****Motion for Trial Preference**

On November 14, 2025, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 36, subdivision (d), plaintiff Dawn Varvaro (“plaintiff”) filed a motion for trial setting preference on the grounds that she suffers from stage IV breast cancer, as well as multiple sclerosis, raising substantial medical doubt of her survival beyond six months. Plaintiff is currently 57 years old and does not move for trial preference based on age under subdivision (a).

Code of Civil Procedure section 36 authorizes the court, in its discretion, to “grant a motion for preference that is accompanied by clear and convincing medical documentation that concludes that one of the parties suffers from an illness or condition raising substantial medical doubt of survival of that party beyond six months, and that satisfies the court that the interests of justice will be served by granting the preference.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 36, subd. (d).)

Plaintiff initially submitted medical documentation establishing she suffers from stage IV breast cancer and multiple sclerosis, as well as a declaration from her attorney indicating she is “concerned” for plaintiff’s health. On January 22, 2026, the court issued a tentative ruling stating plaintiff had not met her burden of proof. On January 23, 2026, the court adopted its tentative ruling as the order of the court and continued the matter to February 6, 2026, to allow plaintiff additional time to obtain further medical documentation.

On February 6, 2026, the court noted plaintiff had not submitted any further medical documentation. The court, on its own motion, continued the matter once more to February 27, 2026.

On February 17, 2026, plaintiff's attorney submitted a supplemental declaration. Attached to the declaration is a letter from plaintiff's medical provider, Terrence Grady, DO, PhD. Dr. Grady states he is currently treating plaintiff for stage IV metastatic breast cancer to the bones, which is a "fatal condition left to its natural progression without therapy." He also notes plaintiff's multiple sclerosis diagnosis. Dr. Grady further states that plaintiff will require "close monitoring and ongoing active therapy for at least four more years, followed by close surveillance on maintenance bone metastasis therapy."

On February 18, 2026, defendants Cecils LLC and Stateline Brewery LLC filed a further opposition.

While the court is sympathetic to plaintiff's medical issues, the court finds there is still no clear and convincing medical documentation raising substantial medical doubt of plaintiff's survival beyond six months. (Code Civ. Proc., § 36, subd. (d).) Dr. Grady does not opine there is substantial medical doubt plaintiff will survive beyond six months. In fact, Dr. Grady appears to be planning for at least four more years of active therapy. The court also notes that over three months have passed since plaintiff filed the instant motion claiming there was substantial medical doubt plaintiff would survive beyond six months. Because plaintiff has not met her burden, the motion for trial preference is denied.

TENTATIVE RULING # 1:

MOTION FOR TRIAL PREFERENCE: THE MOTION FOR TRIAL PREFERENCE IS DENIED. NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD (LEWIS v. SUPERIOR COURT (1999) 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247), UNLESS A NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR AND REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 573-3042 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF AN INTENT TO

APPEAR MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, CONTINUES THE CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE TO 11:30 A.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT 12.

2. PEOPLE v. FRAGRANICE, INC., 24CV2330

Status Conference

**TENTATIVE RULING # 2: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY,
FEBRUARY 27, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.**

3. DOE v. LAKE TAHOE UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST., ET AL., 25CV1318**Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Request for Production**

On January 14, 2026, plaintiff John Doe, a minor, by and through his guardian ad litem Jane Doe ("plaintiff") filed the instant motion to compel defendant Lake Tahoe Unified School District's ("defendant") further response to Request for Production (Set One) Numbers 29, 30, and 31, subject to a protective order. Defendant has identified (but not produced) the following documents that are responsive to these requests: (1) a May 8, 2024, message to the subject pupil's parents; (2) a May 9, 2024, assertive discipline/suspension record for the subject pupil; (3) a May 16, 2024, safety plan related to the subject pupil; and (4) the discipline history related to the subject pupil.

No party filed an opposition or objection to the motion. Plaintiff's motion states, "Defendant LTUSD does not oppose this motion so long as the documents are produced subject to a protective order and the SUBJECT PUPIL's parents are served with this motion but LTUSD requires an Order from the Court." (Mtn., 3:5–7.) Proof of service attached to the motion states it was electronically served upon the parents of the subject pupil (the subject pupil and his parents' names are omitted) on January 14, 2026.

On January 29, 2026, the court entered the parties' stipulated protective order.

Absent objection, the motion is granted.

TENTATIVE RULING # 3: ABSENT OBJECTION, MOTION GRANTED AS REQUESTED. DEFENDANT LAKE TAHOE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SHALL PRODUCE ALL RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION (SET ONE) NUMBERS 29, 30, AND 31, SUBJECT TO THE STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER ENTERED BY THIS COURT ON JANUARY 29, 2026, NO LATER THAN 30 DAYS AFTER NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER. NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD (*LEWIS v. SUPERIOR COURT* (1999) 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247), UNLESS A NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR AND REQUEST FOR

ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 573-3042 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF AN INTENT TO APPEAR MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

4. STEPHENS v. LAUB LAW PLLC, ET AL., 25CV1050

Default Judgment Prove-up Hearing

The court, on its own motion, continues the matter to March 6, 2026. The court apologizes to the parties for any inconvenience.

TENTATIVE RULING # 4: ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION, MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.

5. CARTER-CAMPOS v. DAYS INN BY WYNDHAM, 23CV2201

OSC Re: Dismissal

On February 2, 2026, plaintiff filed a notice of settlement of entire case, indicating that a request for dismissal would be filed within 45 days after the date of settlement, which occurred on December 31, 2025. To date, there is no request for dismissal in the court's file.

TENTATIVE RULING # 5: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.

6. BUKOFSKY v. RYAN, 22CV1794**Motion to Compel**

On February 13, 2026, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 2025.450 and 2030.010, et seq., plaintiff Mark Bukofsky (“plaintiff”) filed the instant motion to compel defendant Steve Ryan (“defendant”) to produce documents requested in plaintiff’s notice of deposition issued October 27, 2025. Plaintiff also seeks a monetary sanction of \$1,240.00 against defendant’s attorney. Plaintiff’s counsel declares that, prior to filing the instant motion, he met and conferred with defense counsel under Code of Civil Procedure section 2016.040. (Hartsfeld Decl., ¶¶ 3–5, Ex. 2.)

On February 13, 2026, defendant filed a timely opposition. Plaintiff filed no reply.

1. Background

On October 27, 2025, plaintiff served a notice of deposition, including a request for production of documents, on defendant. It is the court’s understanding that the deposition took place as scheduled on November 20, 2025. However, defendant failed to produce any of the requested documents or serve a valid objection.

2. Legal Principles

“If, after service of a deposition notice, a party to the action ..., without having served a valid objection under Section 2025.410, fails to appear for examination, or to proceed with it, or to produce for inspection any document, electronically stored information, or tangible thing described in the deposition notice, the party giving the notice may move for an order compelling the deponent’s attendance and testimony, and the production for inspection of any document, electronically stored information, or tangible thing described in the deposition notice.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 2025.450, subd. (a).) “The motion shall set forth specific facts showing good cause justifying the [requested] production.” (*Id.*, subd. (b)(1).)

If the motion is granted, the court shall impose a monetary sanction in favor of the party who noticed the deposition and against the party-deponent. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2025.450, subd. (g)(1).)

3. Discussion

Defendant's opposition argues: (1) plaintiff cites irrelevant Code sections as grounds for the instant motion; (2) the deposition notice does not include any request for documents; and (3) plaintiff does not set forth specific facts showing good cause justifying the requested production.

The court acknowledges that plaintiff's citation to Code of Civil Procedure section 2030.010, which relates to "written discovery," is inapplicable here. However, plaintiff's motion also cites Code of Civil Procedure section 2025.450, which does apply.

Defendant's next argument is that the notice of deposition does not include any document requests. Indeed, the request for documents is separate from the notice of deposition with a separate proof of service. However, both documents share the same title, "Plaintiff's Notice of Taking Deposition of Steve Ryan; Request for Production of Documents," and were served concurrently. The court deems the request for production of documents to be attached to the notice of deposition.

Lastly, defendant argues plaintiff has not set forth specific facts showing good cause justifying the requested production. Plaintiff's motion sets forth the following facts: "On January 27, 2021, Plaintiff Mark Bukofsky, was a properly restrained passenger in Defendant Steve Ryan's vehicle. Defendant was driving too fast for conditions and caused his vehicle to slide off the road before colliding with a snow bank and rolling over. Plaintiff suffered numerous vertebrae disc tears and three displaced rib fractures as a result of the collision." (Mtn. at 3:3–6.) The court finds these facts sufficiently justify the requested production.

The motion to compel is granted. Having read and considered the declaration from plaintiff's counsel, the court finds that \$840.00 is a reasonable sanction under the Civil

Discovery Act, representing 2.1 hours of legal work at \$400.00 per hour (the court notes that plaintiff did not file a reply, as anticipated in counsel's declaration). The court imposes this monetary sanction against defendant's attorney of record, only.

TENTATIVE RULING # 6: THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED. DEFENDANT SHALL PRODUCE THE DOCUMENTS REQUESTED IN THE DEPOSITION NOTICE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER. ADDITIONALLY, DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY OF RECORD SHALL PAY PLAINTIFF A MONETARY SANCTION OF \$840.00 WITHIN 30 DAYS OF NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER. NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD (*LEWIS v. SUPERIOR COURT* (1999) 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247), UNLESS A NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR AND REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 573-3042 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF AN INTENT TO APPEAR MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

7. MATTER OF TRISLER, 25CV2713**OSC Re: Name Change**

Petitioner Adrian Greary petitions to change the name of his minor child. The matter was continued from December 12, 2025, to allow petitioner additional time to serve proof of service on the other parent and file proof of publication.

“If a petition has been filed for a minor by a parent and the other parent, if living, does not join in consenting thereto, the petitioner shall cause, not less than 30 days before the hearing, to be served notice of the time and place of the hearing or a copy of the order to show cause on the other parent pursuant to [Code of Civil Procedure] Section 413.10, 414.10, 415.10, or 415.40.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 1277, subd. (a)(4).)

To date, there is still no proof of personal service on the other parent in the court’s file. There is also no proof of publication. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1277, subd (a)(2)(A).)

TENTATIVE RULING # 7: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.

8. MATTER OF BAKER, 26CV0116**OSC Re: Name Change**

The court notes that the petition for name change is incomplete; it does not identify the petitioner's date of birth, place of birth, sex, or current residence address. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1276, subd. (a)(2); see Petn., ¶ 7.) To date, there is also no California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System ("CLETS") report or proof of publication in the court's file. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1277, subd. (a)(2)(A), 1279.5, subd. (f).)

TENTATIVE RULING # 8: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.