

1. MATTER OF CREEKSIDE COMMERCIAL BUILDERS, INC., 26CV1215

Petition to Confirm Arbitration Award

TENTATIVE RULING # 1: ABSENT OBJECTION, PETITION GRANTED AS REQUESTED.

2. LAND HOME FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. v. BURKE, 25CV3470**(A) Motion to Compel Response to Form Interrogatories (Set One)****(B) Motion to Compel Response to Request for Production (Set One)****(C) Motion to Deem Matters Admitted****Motion to Compel Response to Form Interrogatories (Set One)**

On April 28, 2026, cross-complainant Gregory Burke (“cross-complainant”),¹ who is proceeding in pro per, filed the instant motion to compel cross-defendant Land Home Financial Services, Inc.’s (“cross-defendant”) verified response to Form Interrogatories (Set One) and requested the court to impose a monetary sanction for reasonable fees and costs incurred bringing the motion.

Cross-defendant filed no opposition.

The court grants the motion to compel and imposes a monetary sanction against cross-defendant in the amount of \$60.00, representing the filing fee for the motion. The court denies the request for attorney fees because, as a self-represented litigant, cross-complainant is not entitled to recover attorney fees as discovery sanctions. (*Argaman v. Ratan* (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th 1173, 1179 (“*Argaman*”).)

Motion to Compel Response to Request for Production (Set One)

On April 28, 2026, cross-complainant Gregory Burke (“cross-complainant”),² who is proceeding in pro per, filed the instant motion to compel cross-defendant Land Home Financial Services, Inc.’s (“cross-defendant”) verified response to Request for Production (Set One) and requested the court to impose a monetary sanction for reasonable fees and costs incurred bringing the motion.

¹ The body of the motion indicates that it is brought by Gregory Burke; the motion is also signed by Gregory Burke. It appears that cross-complainant inadvertently listed co-cross-complainant Griffin Burke’s information in the caption of the pleading.

² The body of the motion indicates that it is brought by Gregory Burke; the motion is also signed by Gregory Burke. It appears that cross-complainant inadvertently listed co-cross-complainant Griffin Burke’s information in the caption of the pleading.

Cross-defendant filed no opposition.

The court grants the motion to compel and imposes a monetary sanction against cross-defendant in the amount of \$60.00, representing the filing fee for the motion. The court denies the request for attorney fees because, as a self-represented litigant, cross-complainant is not entitled to recover attorney fees as discovery sanctions. (*Argaman, supra*, 73 Cal.App.4th at p. 1179.)

Motion to Deem Matters Admitted

A party served with requests for admission must serve a response within 30 days. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.250.) Failure to serve a response entitles the requesting party, on motion, to obtain an order that the genuineness of all documents and the truth of all matters specified in the requests for admission be deemed admitted. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.280, subd. (b).) When such a motion is made, the court must grant the motion and deem the requests admitted unless it finds that prior to the hearing, the party to whom the requests for admission were directed has served a proposed response that is in substantial compliance with the provisions governing responses. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.280, subd. (c); *St. Mary v. Superior Court* (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 762, 776, 778; see also *Demyer v. Costa Mesa Mobile Home Estates* (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 393, 395–396 [“two strikes and you’re out”].)

In opposition to the instant motion, cross-defendant Land Home Financial Services, Inc. submitted a declaration showing that it served its response to the requests for admission on July 6, 2026.

Therefore, the court denies the motion to deem matters admitted.

TENTATIVE RULING # 2:

MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE): THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART. CROSS-DEFENDANT LAND HOME FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. SHALL SERVE ITS VERIFIED RESPONSE WITHOUT

OBJECTIONS TO CROSS-COMPLAINANT GREGORY BURKE'S FORM INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE), AND PAY CROSS-COMPLAINANT A MONETARY SANCTION OF \$60.00, WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THE NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER.

MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION (SET ONE): THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART. CROSS-DEFENDANT LAND HOME FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. SHALL SERVE ITS VERIFIED RESPONSE WITHOUT OBJECTIONS TO CROSS-COMPLAINANT GREGORY BURKE'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION (SET ONE), AND PAY CROSS-COMPLAINANT A MONETARY SANCTION OF \$60.00, WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THE NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER.

MOTION TO DEEM MATTERS ADMITTED: THE MOTION 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.

3. MILLER v. HAEN CONSTRUCTORS, ET AL., 25CV2697**(A) Defendant Haen Constructors' Motion to Compel****(B) Defendant Thomas Haen's Motion to Compel****(C) Defendant Robert Haen's Motion to Compel**

On May 29, 2026, defendants Haen Constructors, Thomas Haen, and Robert Haen (collectively, "defendants"), each filed a separate motion to compel plaintiff Laura Miller's ("plaintiff") verified responses to each defendant's Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories, and Request for Production, all Set One. Each defendant's motion includes a request for monetary sanctions against plaintiff in the amount of \$1,025.00.

On June 26, 2026, plaintiff filed a notice of non-opposition to the motions to compel verified responses without objections; however, plaintiff requests that the court deny all requests for monetary sanctions.

Defendants filed no reply.

Based on plaintiff's non-opposition, the court will grant each of the three defendant's motions to compel. The court denies each of the requests for monetary sanctions.

TENTATIVE RULING # 3:

DEFENDANT HAEN CONSTRUCTORS' MOTION TO COMPEL: THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART. WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THE NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER, PLAINTIFF LAURA MILLER SHALL SERVE VERIFIED RESPONSES WITHOUT OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT HAEN CONSTRUCTORS' FORM INTERROGATORIES, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, ALL SET ONE. THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR A MONETARY SANCTION.

DEFENDANT THOMAS HAEN'S MOTION TO COMPEL: THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART. WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THE NOTICE OF

ENTRY OF ORDER, PLAINTIFF LAURA MILLER SHALL SERVE VERIFIED RESPONSES WITHOUT OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT THOMAS HAEN'S FORM INTERROGATORIES, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, ALL SET ONE. THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR A MONETARY SANCTION.

DEFENDANT ROBERT HAEN'S MOTION TO COMPEL: THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS GRANTED IN PART. WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THE NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER, PLAINTIFF LAURA MILLER SHALL SERVE VERIFIED RESPONSES WITHOUT OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT ROBERT HAEN'S FORM INTERROGATORIES, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, ALL SET ONE. THE COURT DENIES THE REQUEST FOR A MONETARY SANCTION.

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. MANGIE CORP. v. H&S ENERGY PRODUCTS, LLC, ET AL., 23CV1748**Motion to Consolidate**

On April 27, 2026, plaintiff MANGIE Corp. filed a motion to consolidate the instant case with *Durkin Tree Service, Inc. v. H&S Energy Products, LLC, et al.* (El Dorado Super. Ct., Case No. 24CV0520). Plaintiff states the motion is unopposed by all parties in both cases. To date, however, there is no proof of service of the motion in the court's file.

TENTATIVE RULING # 4: MOTION IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO THE LACK OF SERVICE. 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.

5. BUKOFSKY v. RYAN, 22CV1794**OSC Re: Dismissal After Notice of Settlement**

On March 19, 2026, plaintiff filed a notice of settlement of the entire case. The notice states that a request for dismissal would be filed by May 3, 2026. An order to show cause was set for May 22, 2026. However, there were no appearances. The court continued the matter to July 10, 2026, and stated it intended to dismiss the case upon that date if no good cause is found as to why the matter should remain active. Since then, no new filings have been submitted. Absent objection, the court's tentative ruling is to dismiss the matter with prejudice.

TENTATIVE RULING # 5: ABSENT OBJECTION, MATTER IS DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

6. MATTER OF LUQUIN, 26CV1341

OSC Re: Name Change

TENTATIVE RULING # 6: ABSENT OBJECTION, PETITION IS GRANTED.

7. MATTER OF EPSTEIN, 26CV1340

OSC Re: Name Change

TENTATIVE RULING # 7: ABSENT OBJECTION, PETITION IS GRANTED.

8. PEOPLE v. \$8,600.00 U.S. CURRENCY, 26CV0532**Status Conference**

This matter is before the court for a status hearing regarding the related criminal case, *People v. Miller* (El Dorado Super. Ct., Case No. 25CR1785). Under California state law, where, as here, forfeiture is contested, a judgment of forfeiture requires as a precondition that a defendant be convicted in an underlying or related criminal action of one of the offenses specified in Health and Safety Code section 11470, subdivisions (e) or (g), which offense occurred within five years before the seizure or the notification of intention to seek forfeiture.

The court's register of actions indicates the criminal case is set for hearing on claimant Stuart Miller's motion to dismiss on July 24, 2026. A trial setting conference is also set for the same date.

This court, on its own motion and in the interest of judicial economy, continues the status hearing in the instant case to July 31, 2026.

TENTATIVE RULING # 8: THE COURT, ON ITS OWN MOTION, CONTINUES THE STATUS HEARING TO 1:30 P.M., FRIDAY, JULY 31, 2026, IN DEPARTMENT FOUR.