

1.	23CV1663	SULLIVAN v. WAGON WHEEL MOBILE HOME PARK
Attorney Withdrawal		

Counsel for the Plaintiff has filed a motion to be relieved as counsel pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 284(2) and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362.

A declaration on Judicial Council Form MC-052 accompanies the motion, as required by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362, stating that there is a conflict of interest between attorney and client that precludes further representation.

Code of Civil Procedure § 284(2) and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362 allow an attorney to withdraw after notice to the client. Proof of service of the motion on the Plaintiff at their last known address and on counsel for Defendants was filed on March 6, 2026.

There is a motion for terminating sanctions scheduled for 6/26/26 which is not listed in the proposed Order. A revised proposed order that includes the upcoming hearing date(s) will be required in compliance with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362(e).

TENTATIVE RULING #1:

ABSENT OBJECTION, THE MOTION IS GRANTED. COUNSEL IS DIRECTED TO SERVE A COPY OF THE SIGNED ORDER (FORM MC-053) ON THE CLIENT AND ALL PARTIES THAT HAVE APPEARED IN THE CASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT, RULE 3.1362(e).

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

2.	25CV1511	WILHARM v. GENERAL MOTORS LLC et al
Motion for Attorney's Fees		

The Notice does not comply with Local Rule 7.10.05. Repeated violations will be grounds for sanctions under Local Rule 7.12.13.

Plaintiff retained counsel on June 5, 2025, and they filed the Complaint on June 10, 2025. The case settled on December 10, 2025. Plaintiff is the prevailing party and is entitled to recovery of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

The hourly rate charged by Kimberli Zazzi and LaDawna Fleckenstein was \$500.00 per hour, and the rate was \$150.00 per hour for paralegals and administrative assistants. (Exh. 1; Zazzi Decl., ¶ 2). Plaintiff claims that these attorneys' rates are in line with those in this field in and around this geographical area but fails to establish the rates are in line with those prevailing in the community for similar services, as quoted in their reply. Plaintiff references an award in San Bernadino County, which is not comparable. The Court finds that an hourly rate of \$350.00 for attorneys and \$100 for paralegals and administrative assistants is reasonable.

Plaintiff's counsel claims a 1.5 enhancement, for a standard lemon law case. The Court is not convinced based on the facts of this case and the amount of time and work needed to resolve it, that an enhancement is warranted under the standard in *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal. App.4th 1122, 1123, (citing *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 25, 49).

Without the enhancement, counsel requests \$22,400 in fees for attorney tasks completed, \$3,480 for paralegal and administrative assistance, and \$993.74 in costs. Counsel further requests \$5,000 in anticipated costs. Plaintiff argues that an attorney fee award should "include compensation for all hours reasonably spent, including those necessary to establish and defend the fee claim" (*Serrano v. Unruh* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 621, 639). While the Court agrees, it will not make an award based on anticipated time spent.

Defendant opposes the hourly rate, the enhancement and several billing entries. The Court has addressed the hourly rate and the enhancement, above. In terms of the billing entries that Defendant disputes, the Court agrees that 13.4 hours for drafting the fee motion is excessive and unreasonable. It is a 13-page motion, with 9 pages that are mostly or completely boilerplate language. The Court will award 6 hours for drafting the fee motion and accompanying documents, including review of the opposition and preparation of the reply.

The Court further finds that 2.7 hours of attorney time to "redact out atty client and work product from the time and status sheet" is excessive and unreasonable, especially considering that there are no redactions. This entry is stricken entirely.

May 1, 2026
Dept. 9
Tentative Rulings

Reducing the entries addressed above brings the attorneys' time down to 34.7 hours at a rate of \$350/hour for a total of \$12,145. The paralegal and administrative time is reduced to \$2,320 using a rate of \$100/hour. The total award for fees is \$14,465 and \$993.74 in costs.

TENTATIVE RULING #2: PLAINTIFF IS AWARDED \$14,465 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES AND \$993.74 IN COSTS, TO BE PAID BY DEFENDANT WITHIN 14 BUSINESS DAYS OF THE SIGNED ORDER.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

3.	25CV3075	PATEL et al v. ARVO SOLAR et al
Set Aside Default		

Motion to Set Aside Default of Jason Craine

Defendant Jason Craine filed this motion requesting the Court to set aside the default entered on February 27, 2026.

Craine was served the Summons and Complaint by mail on December 17, 2025, and he returned a signed Notice of Acknowledgement of Receipt on January 15, 2026. On February 27, 2026, Plaintiffs filed a Request for Entry of Default as to Defendant Craine, for a judgment in the amount of \$442,702.70.

Craine seeks to set aside the default pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b), for mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.

Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b) provides, in pertinent part:

The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Application for this relief shall be accompanied by a copy of the answer or other pleading proposed to be filed therein, otherwise the application shall not be granted, and shall be made within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months, after the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken.

Craine was served with the Summons and First Amended Complaint by mail on December 17, 2025, along with a Notice of Acknowledgment of Receipt Form. This manner of service would not have been adequate unless the Notice of Acknowledgment of Receipt form as signed and returned, and so Plaintiff's counsel emailed Craine on January 15, 2026, "stating the legal consequences of failing to acknowledge service." Declaration of Howard Garfield, dated April 3, 2026, ("Garfield Declaration"), para. 2 and Exhibit B. The legal consequences referenced by counsel were that Plaintiff would move for service by publication and request reimbursement of those "significant costs of publication and any additional process server fees" from the Court. Id. Craine signed and returned the form, without being aware that the signature would start the clock running the deadline for filing an Answer in the case. Declaration of Jason Craine, dated March 16, 2026, ("Craine Declaration"), para. 4. At the time that he signed the form in mid-January, 2026, he understood from the owner of co-Defendant Phillip Horton, owner of co-Defendant Arvo Solar, that that Defendant Arvio Solar's 's Answer would also be filed on behalf of Craine. Id. at para. 3.

May 1, 2026
Dept. 9
Tentative Rulings

Soon after he returned the Notice of Acknowledgement Arvo Solar informed Craine that he would not be represented by Arvo's counsel, due to a potential conflict of interest. Accordingly, he sought legal counsel, but had not yet retained an attorney when Plaintiff filed for a default against him as soon as the time had run for filing an Answer.

The grounds for the motion are 1) Craine's mistake in not understanding that signing the Notice of Acknowledgement form created a deadline for filing an Answer within 30 days of signing, and 2) reasonable reliance on his co-Defendants' representation that he would be included in the Answer that they filed until their position changed just before his own Answer would be due.

Plaintiff argues that Craine serves as an agent for service of process for other entities and so should be charged with knowledge of the deadline to file an Answer, and that a Notice of Acknowledgement form has the same legal effect as service. However, serving as agent for service of process for business entity does not convert a person into a litigation attorney or require any knowledge of the substance of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff argues that the email exchange in which Craine was informed of applicable statutes and threatened with legal costs of service if he did not return the form constituted notice of the deadline to Answer, but that email exchange does not cite statutes relevant to responsive pleadings or otherwise address the deadline to file an Answer. Further, at that time Craine of that correspondence thought he would be represented by Arvo's counsel.

[B]ecause the law strongly favors trial and disposition on the merits, any doubts in applying section 473 must be resolved in favor of the party seeking relief from default (*Waite v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1923) 192 Cal. 467, 470-471 [221 P. 204]; *Carli v. Superior Court* (1984) 152 Cal.App.3d 1095, 1099 [199 Cal.Rptr. 583] [in the context of deemed admissions § 473 should be applied liberally "so cases can be tried on the merits"]; *Flores v. Board of Supervisors, supra*, 13 Cal.App.3d at p. 483.) . . . A motion seeking such relief lies within the sound discretion of the trial court, and the trial court's decision will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion. (*Weitz v. Yankosky* (1966) 63 Cal.2d 849, 854 [48 Cal.Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700]; *Martin v. Cook* (1977) 68 Cal.App.3d 799, 807 [137 Cal.Rptr. 434].)

Elston v. City of Turlock, 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233 (1985).

Motion to Set Aside Default of Golden Gate Electric Service Partnership, Golden Gate Electric Service, Inc., Joel Rosas Martinez and Roberto Diaz Villanueva

On April 27, 2026, Plaintiffs filed a Request for Dismissal with Prejudice as to all of the above-named Defendants, rendering their motion to set aside default moot.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT AS TO DEFENDANT JASON CRAINE IS GRANTED. THE MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT AS TO DEFENDANTS GOLDEN GATE ELECTRIC SERVICE PARTNERSHIP, GOLDEN GATE ELECTRIC SERVICE, INC., JOEL ROSAS MARTINEZ AND ROBERTO DIAZ VILLANUEVA IS MOOT AND IS TAKEN OFF CALENDAR.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

4.	25CV0403	PONY EXPRESS TAX v. CHALAIRE
Motion for Leave		

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §473, the Plaintiffs Tax Related Services, a General Partnership of Richard D. Mason and Joyce B. Mason, Richard D. Mason and Joyce Mason individuals dba Tax Related Services (“Plaintiffs”) move the Court for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint in the form attached as Exhibit 1 to the accompanying Declaration of Karen Pine.

Most of the requested changes are not significant, aside from requesting leave to add a cause of action for financial elder abuse. At the time the Plaintiffs filed this case in February 2025, they claim they wanted to avoid the harshness of a financial elder abuse cause of action hoping the matter could get resolved without the situation escalating. Plaintiffs argue that not including the cause of action at the time of the initial filing is excusable.

Defendant opposes, arguing that the Motion is untimely, as it has been over a year since the filing of the Complaint and even the First Amended Complaint, 9 months since trial was set, about 5 months before trial and 4 months before the discovery cut off. Defendant further argues that the Motion is in bad faith because it was brought only in retaliation of Defendant filing counter-claims, serving written discovery, and not making a settlement offer. Defendant argues that Plaintiff fails to plead the cause of action, which is grounds for denial. Lastly, Defendant argues that amendment is likely to prejudice Defendant because it necessitates additional discovery, possibly additional law and motion practice and would lead to a delay in trial.

Plaintiff’s Reply addresses Defendant’s arguments regarding pleading defects but does not further address the reasonableness of the delay or the prejudice to Defendant.

The leave to amend is liberally permitted by the courts, but it is not without its limits. California Rules of Court 3.1324(b)(3) and (4) require a declaration to accompany any such motion stating when the facts that give rise to the amendment were discovered, and justification for why the amendment was not sought earlier. There is no justification given in the Declaration of Richard Mason or Karen Pine. A lack of justification is grounds for denial of a motion for leave to amend. Further, Courts have found that an unmeritorious delay of over 12 months was grounds for denial, *Johnson v. Johnson* (1933) 134 Cal.App. 460, 461; *Vogel v. Thrifty Drug Co.* (1954) 43 Cal.2d 184, 189. When a plaintiff failed to use ample opportunities to pursue an amendment, it was not an abuse of discretion for the court to deny amendment. *Mayer v. Beondo* (1948) 83 Cal.App.2d 665, 671.

While there is a liberal policy in allowing amendment, in this case, the additional cause of action was well known to Plaintiffs at the time of filing and every stage since then. Plaintiffs state that they “wanted to avoid the harshness of a financial elder abuse cause of action hoping the

matter could get resolved without the situation escalating...[but] the litigation escalated with Chalaire filing a cross-complaint.” (Motion, p. 7, lines 2-6). However, the Cross-Complaint was filed a year ago. There is no other reason given for the delay and the Court finds the delay in bringing the additional cause of action unreasonable and prejudicial.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT IS DENIED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

5.	25CV2946	CAPITAL ONE v. COTTLE
Motion to Set-Aside		

The Court entered judgment on January 13, 2026, in the amount of \$4,520.83. Defendant filed a Motion to Set-Aside on March 18, 2026, on the grounds of inadvertence, surprise, mistake or excusable neglect under CCP § 473(b). Defendant complied with the requirements of CCP §473 in filing a proposed Answer.

[B]ecause the law strongly favors trial and disposition on the merits, any doubts in applying section 473 must be resolved in favor of the party seeking relief from default (*Waite v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1923) 192 Cal. 467, 470-471 [221 P. 204]; *Carli v. Superior Court* (1984) 152 Cal.App.3d 1095, 1099 [199 Cal.Rptr. 583] [in the context of deemed admissions § 473 should be applied liberally “so cases can be tried on the merits”]; *Flores v. Board of Supervisors, supra*, 13 Cal.App.3d at p. 483.) . . . A motion seeking such relief lies within the sound discretion of the trial court, and the trial court's decision will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion. (*Weitz v. Yankosky* (1966) 63 Cal.2d 849, 854 [48 Cal.Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700]; *Martin v. Cook* (1977) 68 Cal.App.3d 799, 807 [137 Cal.Rptr. 434].)

Elston v. City of Turlock, 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 695 P.2d 713 (1985).

TENTATIVE RULING #5: MOTION TO SET-ASIDE DEFAULT IS GRANTED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

6.	25CV3095	SCHOOLS FIRST FEDERAL CREDIT UNION v. MILLER et al
Set Aside Default		

This is an action to collect a credit card debt. Defendant Brittany Miller requests the Court to set aside a default based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b).

According to the motion and the Declarations of both defendants in support of the motion, both Defendants retained a debt resolution service to assist with this litigation, and the debt resolution service in turn hired a third-party service to draft the Answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint. The third-party service drafted the Answer on behalf of Defendant Lucas Miller but did not add Defendant Brittany Miller's name on the Answer.

Plaintiff filed a request for default as to Brittany Miller on February 19, 2026, and Defendant filed this motion on March 3, 2026. Although she did not include a proposed responsive pleading, she did request the Court to deem her name included with the Answer that was filed on behalf of Lucas Miller on December 3, 2025.

Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b) provides, in pertinent part:

The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Application for this relief shall be accompanied by a copy of the answer or other pleading proposed to be filed therein, otherwise the application shall not be granted, and shall be made within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months, after the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken.

Plaintiff opposes the motion, arguing first that there has been no showing of excusable neglect and that the motion was not brought within a reasonable time, given that the Answer was filed in December, 2025 and Defendant did not file this motion until March, 2026. The motion was filed a few weeks after the default was entered, which is well within the deadline set forth in the statute.

Plaintiff further argues that Defendant has not provided evidence of a meritorious defense. The statute requires that a responsive pleading be included with the motion, but does not require a determination of relative strength of the parties' substantive arguments. Plaintiff cites a 1969 case, Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd., 270 Cal. App. 2d 275 (1969), to the effect that "a meritorious defense" is a prerequisite to relief from a default, but that case, in turn, cites earlier cases that acknowledge that "hearing on the motion is not the occasion to try the merits (*Rauer's Law & Collection Co. v. Gilleran*, 138 Cal. 352, 71 P. 445; *Brasher v. White*, 53

Cal.App. 545, 554, 200 P. 657) unless it is made to appear that the defense is sham or frivolous.” Skolsky v. Magna Distribution Corp., 254 Cal. App. 2d 246, 252 (Ct. App. 1967) (Citations omitted.)

In this case, the Answer filed by Lucas Miller questions the lack of evidence of a contract, the lack of a chain of assignment showing plaintiff’s standing to collect the alleged debt, failure to comply with statutory prerequisites to debt collection and failure to mitigate damages. The moving party requests her name be added to the Answer in accordance with Defendants’ intentions. That is sufficient to meet the requirements of the statute that the motion propose a responsive pleading.

[B]ecause the law strongly favors trial and disposition on the merits, any doubts in applying section 473 must be resolved in favor of the party seeking relief from default (*Waite v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1923) 192 Cal. 467, 470-471 [221 P. 204]; *Carli v. Superior Court* (1984) 152 Cal.App.3d 1095, 1099 [199 Cal.Rptr. 583] [in the context of deemed admissions § 473 should be applied liberally “so cases can be tried on the merits”]; *Flores v. Board of Supervisors, supra*, 13 Cal.App.3d at p. 483.) . . . A motion seeking such relief lies within the sound discretion of the trial court, and the trial court's decision will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion. (*Weitz v. Yankosky* (1966) 63 Cal.2d 849, 854 [48 Cal.Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700]; *Martin v. Cook* (1977) 68 Cal.App.3d 799, 807 [137 Cal.Rptr. 434].)

Elston v. City of Turlock, 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233 (1985).

The Court finds that the motion for relief from default meets the statutory requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b).

TENTATIVE RULING #6: THE DEFAULT IS VACATED. DEFENDANT SHALL FILE AN AMENDED ANSWER THAT INCLUDES THE NAMES OF BOTH DEFENDANTS WITHIN TEN DAYS OF SERVICE OF THIS ORDER.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

May 1, 2026
Dept. 9
Tentative Rulings

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

7.	24CV2747	DEMEYER v. PALASHEWSKI
Motion to Strike/ Motion to Quash		

Motion to Strike Complaint

Defendant has filed a “Motion to Strike/Quash Legal Ethics Perspective, Filing Frivolous Cases, Factual Contentions, Sanctions Against Frivolous Filings and Malicious Prosecution”.

The Complaint alleges Unfair Competition (Civil Code § 1770), Tortious Interference with Contract, Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage, and Defamation.

Defendant’s requested relief is to dismiss the Complaint as false. The legal basis for the motion include Code of Civil Procedure §§ 128.5 and 128.7 (frivolous pleadings), Government Code § 12650-12656 (False Claims Act), Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16 (SLAPP Act), California Rules of Professional Conduct and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure § 11.

Plaintiff opposes the motion on the basis of timeliness. First, motions to strike a pleading must be filed within the time provided for responding to the pleading. Code of Civil Procedure § 435(b)(1). A challenge to the Complaint was required to be filed within the time provided to file an Answer, which is 30 days following service of the Summons and Complaint. Code of Civil Procedure § 412.20. The Complaint was personally served on December 12, 2024, and Defendant’s motion was filed on March 20, 2026, long after the time for filing an Answer.

Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16(f) authorizes a motion to strike under that section to be brought within 60 days of the offending pleading. The time for challenging the December 12, 2024, Complaint under that section expired on February 10, 2025, and this motion was filed more than a year later.

Requesting sanctions for frivolous pleadings under Code of Civil Procedure §§ 128.5 and 128.7 requires a 21-day notice of intent to file such a request, which was not given in this case.

Plaintiff further argues that Defendant failed to meet and confer prior to filing the motion as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 435.5.

The Court further notes that the Federal Rules do not apply to this state court case, and the Rules of Professional Conduct are enforced by the California State Bar.

As to the allegations that the statements in the Complaint are false and violative of the False Claims Act (Government Code § 12650, *et seq.*), those statutes create a right to file a lawsuit addressing conduct that claims to be in violation of those statutes. Although Defendant has filed a Cross-Complaint, the Cross-Complaint does not include any allegation of statutory violations. Nor does the motion include any specific factual allegations of falsity. Instead, the

motion contains conclusory statements that the factual allegations of the Complaint are false and without merit.

In short, the Court has no basis for granting the motion.

Motion to Strike Amended Answer

On January 28, 2026, Plaintiff filed a motion to strike portions of the Answer filed by Defendant on December 19, 2025. That motion was scheduled for hearing on April 3, 2026, but was continued by the Court to May 1, 2026.

Defendant filed an amended Answer on March 30, 2026. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to strike portions of the December 19, 2025, Answer is moot.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE/QUASH THE COMPLAINT IS DENIED. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF DEFENDANT'S DECEMBER 19, 2025, ANSWER IS MOOT.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

8.	25CV0508	CAPITAL ONE v. RIDDLE
Motion to Deem Matters Admitted		

According to the Declaration of Gregory Parks, Plaintiff served Defendant by mail with Requests for Admissions on May 28, 2025, and no response has been received.

CCP § 2033.280 provides that if a party to whom requests for admissions have been directed fails to serve a timely response, that party thereby waives any objection to the requests, including one based on privilege or on the protection for work product under § 2018.010 et seq. It further provides that the requesting party may move for an order that the truth of any facts specified in the requests be deemed admitted. The court "shall" make this order unless it finds that the party to whom the requests for admission have been directed has served, before the hearing on the motion, a proposed response to the requests for admissions that is in substantial compliance with paragraph (1) of subdivision (f). "Shall" is mandatory. "Courts routinely construe the word 'may' as permissive and words like 'shall' or 'must' as mandatory." *Jones v. Catholic Healthcare West* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 300, 307 (citations omitted).

TENTATIVE RULING #8: MOTION FOR ORDER THAT MATTERS IN REQUEST FOR ADMISSION OF TRUTH OF FACTS BE DEEMED ADMITTED IS GRANTED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.

9.	25CV1503	U.S. BANK v. SCHILLER
Motion for Summary Judgment		

The Notice does not comply with Local Rule 7.10.05 – it contains language from the local rules of Placer County. Further, the first paragraph of the Notice indicates a hearing date of June 11, 2025. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.12.13, the motion is denied for failure to comply with local rules.

TENTATIVE RULING #9: MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS DENIED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 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 TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING.