

|                                                                  |          |                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| 1.                                                               | 22CV1598 | EUGENE BROWN VS. JEFF BROWN ET AL |
| MOTION TO ENFORCE THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDERS AND ISSUING SANCTIONS |          |                                   |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

Plaintiff/Cross-Defendant, Eugene Brown ("Plaintiff"), seeks an order to enforce the Court's prior Orders and for sanctions. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have refused to comply with the Court's Order, most recently issued on January 8, 2026 (the "Order").

Plaintiff asserts that Defendant has refused to turn over to the Court-appointed manager/bookkeeper, Carolyn Holtz, or to anyone, any requested bank and credit card statements, all check registers and copies, and all financial receipts and documents, relating to Brown Building LLC, whether titled as such or otherwise, in the possession of or under the control of Defendant.

Defendant has also refused to turn over any documents necessary for the Court-appointed manager to open up a bank account in the name of Brown Building LLC (which does not presently exist). Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's failure to comply with the Order has caused Carolyn Holtz the inability to review the numbers, including income and expenses, for trial.

Plaintiff requests the following orders:

1. Direct Defendant and Bank of America to turn over to Carolyn Holtz, the Court-appointed manager/bookkeeper designated to manage the properties of Brown Building LLC, all bank and credit card statements, all check registers and copies, and all financial receipts and documents, relating to Brown Building LLC, including but not limited to Defendant's Bank of America bank account number 0023 3900 0992, which he titled "Brown Building"; and
2. Direct Defendant to provide to Carolyn Holtz copies of his driver license and either a credit card or a utility bill in his name, as well as any such further documentation required by a financial institution to allow Carolyn Holtz to establish a bank account on behalf of Brown Building LLC to recognize the complete authority of Carolyn Holtz, as Manager of such Company, to establish such account or accounts.

Plaintiff seeks sanctions in the amount of \$3,150 for Defendant's failure to comply with two prior Court Orders and necessitating the filing of motions and attending hearings. Plaintiff does not provide the statutory basis for the imposition of sanctions.

No opposition has been filed.

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

Plaintiff's request for the abovementioned orders is granted. The Court reserves jurisdiction over Plaintiff's request for sanctions subject to proof.

**TENTATIVE RULING #1:**

**PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR ORDERS IS GRANTED AS IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE TENTATIVE RULING. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS SUBJECT TO PROOF.**

**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.                                                                                                          | 25CV1681 | JASON COLARUSSO VS. GENERAL MOTORS LLC, A<br>DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY |
| MOTION TO DETERMINE THE AMOUNT OF REASONABLE ATTORNEY'S FEES, COSTS AND<br>EXPENSES TO BE PAID BY DEFENDANT |          |                                                                                 |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

On June 24, 2026, Plaintiff, Jason Colarusso ("Plaintiff"), filed a Motion to Determine the Amount of Reasonable Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expenses to be Paid by Defendant. An Opposition was filed by Defendant, General Motors LLC ("Defendant"), on July 27, 2026.

The Parties entered into settlement agreement on May 29, 2026, on the merits of the matter, whereby Plaintiff agreed to dismiss the action against Defendant in exchange for the repurchase of the subject vehicle, plus Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and expenses. The settlement provides that, "[r]easonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 1794 of the Civil Code shall be determined by the court by way of a noticed motion," and that "Plaintiff is the prevailing party for purposes of said fee motion."

Plaintiff seeks an award of \$24,463.00 attorney's fees, \$993.72 in costs and expenses, for a total of \$25,456.72. The amounts claimed include:

- 1 hour at \$945/hour for Jon Jacobs
- 28 hours at \$495/hour for Christine Morano
- 28.5 hours at \$250/hour for paralegal time
- 5 hours at \$495/hour for additional wrap up fees

**Reasonable Rate and Retroactivity**

Ms. Morano's declaration provides that she was admitted to the California State Bar in May 2024 and assumed the role of Senior Attorney on January 1, 2026. Her current hourly rate is \$495/hour. Prior to assuming her new role and fee rate, Plaintiff's counsel indicates that her rate at \$450/hour was approved by multiple California courts, including this court. Ms. Morano indicates Jon Jacobs is the owner of the Law Offices of Jon Jacobs, was admitted to the California State Bar in December 1999, and has handled over 2,000 Lemon Law cases while practicing consumer law his entire career and exclusively "lemon law" since 2003. All paralegals charge \$250/hour.

Defendant argues that on February 26, 2026, this Court determined Plaintiff's counsel's hourly rates were reasonable at \$850/hour for Jon Jacobs and \$450/hour for Christine Morano,

and \$250/hour for paralegals (Case No. 25CV0626), yet now seeks a 10% increase with no meaningful explanation why such a significant increase over such a short period of time is reasonable or justified. Additionally, Defendant argues that Ms. Morano has just recently completed her second full year of practice and by gaining a title of “Senior Attorney” does not justify an elevated billing rate. Defendant requests the court reduce the hourly rates to \$550 for Attorney Jacobs, \$300 for Attorney Morano, and \$150 for paralegals. In the alternative, Defendant requests the Court to adhere to the rates it approved less than six months ago—\$850 for Attorney Jacobs, \$450 for Attorney Morano, and \$250 for paralegals.

Plaintiff further requests the Court apply her \$495/hour rate to all compensable time incurred in the matter. Defendant argues that Plaintiff’s request to retroactively apply the increased rates to work performed in both 2025 and 2026 is unsupported.

A trial court is also justified in reducing a claim if it believes the billing is unjustly inflated. (*Center for Biological Diversity v. County of San Bernardino*, *supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 616, 115 Cal.Rptr.3d 762.) Because the “ ‘ ‘experienced trial judge is the best judge of the value of professional services rendered in his court,’ ” the trial court has broad discretion to adjust a fee downward if it determines the fee is unreasonable. (*Ketchum v. Moses*, *supra*, 24 Cal.4th at p. 1132, 104 Cal.Rptr.2d 377, 17 P.3d 735.) *Save Our Uniquely Rural Community Environment v. County of San Bernardino* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 1179, 1186.0

The Court is unpersuaded that a 10% increase in hourly fee rates for both attorneys without justification aside from Ms. Morano’s promotion to “Senior Attorney” is reasonable. The mere passage of a few months from this Court’s previous ruling in February 2026 without meaningful evidence of changed market conditions, increased skill, difference in novelty, or difficulty of the issues does not support a finding that the rate increase is reasonable.

Plaintiff’s reliance on *Robles v. Employment Dev. Dep’t* (2019) 38 Cal.App.5th 191, 205 for her request that her current hourly rate of \$495 should be applied to all compensable time incurred is flawed. In *Robles*, the court ordered that current prevailing hourly rates should be used due to the lengthy delay in obtaining a fee award, which spanned nearly a decade. *Id.* Here, the Complaint was filed on June 30, 2025, and a settlement was reached on May 29, 2026, less than a year later - vastly distinct from *Robles*.

The Court finds that the reasonable hourly fee rate is \$850 for Jon Jacobs, \$450 for Christine Morano, and \$250 for paralegals and reduces the fee award to be consistent with these rates.

#### **Number of Hours Claimed**

Plaintiff identified 57.9 hours of work spent by attorneys and paralegals in the matter. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an additional 5 hours’ worth of fees for “additional wrap up,” for a total of 62.9 hours.

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

Defendant argues the requested fees must be reduced because Plaintiff's counsel and paralegals billed excessive time for numerous routine tasks, double billed, and billed at attorney rates for work that should have been performed by paralegals, resulting in further overcharges.

The Court has reviewed the billing statements provided by Plaintiff and has made the following reductions:

- The Court agrees that 96 paralegal .2 entries could be reduced to .1 hours for a total reduction of 9.6 hours (\$2,400).
- The Court agrees that 5 paralegal .3 entries could be reduced to .1 hours for a total reduction of 1 hour (\$250).
- The Court agrees that 2 paralegal .3 entries are duplicative and could be reduced to 1 paralegal .1 entry for a total reduction of .3 hours (\$75).
- The Court agrees that 6 paralegal .2 entries are duplicative and could be reduced to 3 paralegal .1 entries for a total reduction of .6 hours (\$150).
- The Court agrees that 33 Christine Moreno .2 entries at a rate of \$450/hour could be reduced to .1 hours for a total reduction of 3.3 hours (\$1,485).

The Court further agrees that the anticipated billing hours should be reduced to 4 hours at a rate of \$450/hour, for a reduction of \$450.

Accordingly, the Court orders Defendant to remit to Plaintiff attorney's fees in the amount of \$18,355, and costs and expenses in the amount of \$933.72, for a total of \$19,288.72, to be paid within 30 calendar days from the date of service of this order.

**TENTATIVE RULING #2:**

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DETERMINE THE AMOUNT OF REASONABLE ATTORNEY'S FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES TO BE PAID BY DEFENDANT IS GRANTED, AND THAT DEFENDANT SHALL REMIT TO PLAINTIFF ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$18,355, AND COSTS AND EXPENSES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$933.72, FOR A TOTAL OF \$19,288.72, TO BE PAID WITHIN 30 CALENDAR DAYS FROM THE DATE 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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil 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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

|                                                                          |          |                                                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.                                                                       | 26CV1352 | CITY OF PLACERVILLE VS. AMERIGAS PROPANE, L.P., A<br>DELAWARE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP ET AL |
| MOTION FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION/MOTION FOR TAX COLLECTOR CERTIFICATION |          |                                                                                         |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

On June 5, 2026, Plaintiff, City of Placerville, filed a complaint seeking to obtain certain real property by means of eminent domain. Plaintiff moves pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.010 for an order for prejudgment possession of the subject real property after allegedly depositing with the State Treasury the probable amount of compensation, based on an appraisal, that will be awarded in the instant proceeding. Plaintiff further seeks an order directing the County Tax Collector to certify the specific information enumerated in Code of Civil Procedure, § 1260.250(c).

Notice

“(b) The plaintiff shall serve a copy of the motion on the record owner of the property and on the occupants, if any. The plaintiff shall set the court hearing on the motion not less than 60 days after service of the notice of motion on the record owner of unoccupied property. If the property is lawfully occupied by a person dwelling thereon or by a farm or business operation, service of the notice of motion shall be made not less than 90 days prior to the hearing on the motion.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.410(b).)

“...The motion shall include a statement substantially in the following form: “You have the right to oppose this motion for an order of possession of your property. If you oppose this motion you must serve the plaintiff and file with the court a written opposition to the motion within 30 days from the date you were served with this motion.” If the written opposition asserts a hardship, it shall be supported by a declaration signed under penalty of perjury stating facts supporting the hardship.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.410(a).)

The notice of motion includes a statement in substantially the same form as mandated in Section 1255.410(a).

The proofs of service in the court’s file declare: on June 5, 2026, notice of the hearing and the moving papers were served by mail to AmeriGas Propane, LP, Bank of America, and Stewart Title Guaranty Company. An amended notice was filed on June 10, 2026, declaring service was effectuated on the same date to AmeriGas Propane, LP, Bank of America, and Stewart Title Guaranty Company.

“(c) Not later than 30 days after service of the plaintiff's motion seeking to take possession of the property, any defendant or occupant of the property may oppose the motion in writing by serving the plaintiff and filing with the court the opposition. If the written opposition asserts a hardship, it shall be supported by a declaration signed under penalty of perjury stating facts supporting the hardship. The plaintiff shall serve and file any reply to the opposition not less than 15 days before the hearing.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.410(c).)

There is no opposition to the motion in the court's file.

### **Prejudgment Possession**

“(a) At the time of filing the complaint or at any time after filing the complaint and prior to entry of judgment, the plaintiff may move the court for an order for possession under this article, demonstrating that the plaintiff is entitled to take the property by eminent domain and has deposited pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 1255.010) an amount that satisfies the requirements of that article. ¶ The motion shall describe the property of which the plaintiff is seeking to take possession, which description may be by reference to the complaint, and shall state the date after which the plaintiff is seeking to take possession of the property. ...” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.410(a).)

“(a) At any time before entry of judgment, the plaintiff may deposit with the State Treasury the probable amount of compensation, based on an appraisal, that will be awarded in the proceeding. The appraisal upon which the deposit is based shall be one that satisfies the requirements of subdivision (b). The deposit may be made whether or not the plaintiff applies for an order for possession or intends to do so.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.010(a).)

“(b) Before making a deposit under this section, the plaintiff shall have an expert qualified to express an opinion as to the value of the property (1) make an appraisal of the property and (2) prepare a written statement of, or summary of the basis for, the appraisal. The statement or summary shall contain detail sufficient to indicate clearly the basis for the appraisal, including, but not limited to, all of the following information: ¶ (A) The date of valuation, highest and best use, and applicable zoning of the property. ¶ (B) The principal transactions, reproduction or replacement cost analysis, or capitalization analysis, supporting the appraisal. ¶ (C) If the appraisal includes compensation for damages to the remainder, the compensation for the property and for damages to the remainder separately stated, and the calculations and a narrative explanation supporting the compensation, including any offsetting benefits.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.010(b).)

“(d)(1) If the motion is not opposed within 30 days of service on each defendant and occupant of the property, the court shall make an order for possession of the property if the court finds each of the following: ¶ (A) The plaintiff is entitled to take the property by eminent domain. ¶ (B) The plaintiff has deposited pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 1255.010) an amount that satisfies the requirements of that article. ¶ (2) If the motion is

opposed by a defendant or occupant within 30 days of service, the court may make an order for possession of the property upon consideration of the relevant facts and any opposition, and upon completion of a hearing on the motion, if the court finds each of the following: ¶ (A) The plaintiff is entitled to take the property by eminent domain. ¶ (B) The plaintiff has deposited pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 1255.010) an amount that satisfies the requirements of that article. ¶ (C) There is an overriding need for the plaintiff to possess the property prior to the issuance of final judgment in the case, and the plaintiff will suffer a substantial hardship if the application for possession is denied or limited. ¶ (D) The hardship that the plaintiff will suffer if possession is denied or limited outweighs any hardship on the defendant or occupant that would be caused by the granting of the order of possession.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1255.410(d).)

Several declarations were submitted in support of the motion. Melissa Savage, P.E., declares the Project involves construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on Placerville Drive between Armory Drive and US Highway 50 undercrossing, as well as the construction of sidewalk and bicycle facilities on Green Valley Road from Placerville Drive to Mallard Lane (Declaration of Melissa Savage in Support of Motion for Prejudgment Possession, paragraph 4). In order for Plaintiff to construct the proposed sidewalk behind the curb and gutter and along the property frontage, Plaintiff requires a fee acquisition of 2,356 square feet. *Id.* at paragraph 5. At the driveway to the larger parcel, Plaintiff requires a temporary construction easement of 3,310 square feet to perform driveway conforming paving to match grades on the larger parcel. *Id.*

The proposed public sidewalk on Green Valley Road will fix a gap in the existing sidewalk which currently terminates at the corner of Green Valley Road and Mallard Lane. *Id.* at paragraph 6. This piece of sidewalk is critical to ensure that there is no gap left in the public sidewalk and to alleviate public safety concerns that a gap would create. *Id.* It will provide one continuous sidewalk path of travel without forcing pedestrians to cross the street and will therefore improve pedestrian and traffic safety. *Id.* Failure to build this segment of sidewalk on the frontage would deem the Project out of compliance with the approved scope of work for the Project funding, and the Project would not comply with the scope of work or purpose and need of the approved environmental document. *Id.* This would ultimately be contrary to the public safety concerns that the Project seeks remedy. *Id.*

William T. Chisum declares that the City Council authorized the institution of these proceedings by adoption of a Resolution of Necessity, Resolution No. 9518, on April 14, 2026. (Declaration of William T. Chisum in Support of Motion for Prejudgment Possession, paragraph 4, Exhibit C). The City Council found and the Resolution established that: (1) the public interest and necessity require the proposed Project; (2) the proposed Project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury; (3) the subject property and interests therein are necessary for the proposed Project; and (4) prior to making the above findings and determinations the offer required by Section 7267.2 of

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

the Government Code was made to the owners of record of the subject property and interests therein. *Id.* at Exhs. B and C. Through the Resolution of Necessity's findings, the City has conclusively established items 1 through 3, and evidence of the required offer letter was presented to the City Council at the time of the Resolution of Necessity hearing. *Id.*

The notice of deposit of the probable compensation with the State Treasurer in the amount of \$21,400.00 was filed on June 5, 2026. The proof of service declares that on June 5, 2026, the notice of deposit was served by mail AmeriGas Propane, LP, Bank of America, and Stewart Title Guaranty Company.

Under the totality of the circumstances presented it appears appropriate to grant the motion. The Court finds the declarations in support of the motion establish the following: Plaintiff is entitled to take the property by eminent domain; and the Plaintiff has deposited pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 1255.010) an amount that satisfies the requirements of that article.

**Tax Certification**

“(a) In a county where both the auditor and the tax collector are elected officials, the court shall by order give the auditor or tax collector the legal description of the property sought to be taken and direct the auditor or tax collector to certify to the court the information required by subdivision (c), and the auditor or tax collector shall promptly certify the required information to the court. In all other counties, the court shall by order give the tax collector the legal description of the property sought to be taken and direct the tax collector to certify to the court the information required by subdivision (c), and the tax collector shall promptly certify the required information to the court.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1260.250(a).)

“(b) The court order shall be made on or before the earliest of the following dates: ¶ (1) The date the court makes an order for possession...” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1260.250(b)(1).)

“(c) The court order shall require certification of the following information: ¶ (1) The current assessed value of the property together with its assessed identification number. ¶ (2) All unpaid taxes on the property, and any penalties and costs that have accrued thereon while on the secured roll, levied for prior tax years that constitute a lien on the property. ¶ (3) All unpaid taxes on the property, and any penalties and costs that have accrued thereon while on the secured roll, levied for the current tax year that constitute a lien on the property prorated to, but not including, the date of apportionment determined pursuant to Section 5082 of the Revenue and Taxation Code or the date of trial, whichever is earlier. If the amount of the current taxes is not ascertainable at the time of proration, the amount shall be estimated and computed based on the assessed value for the current assessment year and the tax rate levied on the property for the immediately prior tax year. ¶ (4) The actual or estimated amount of taxes on the property that are or will become a lien on the property in the next succeeding tax year prorated to, but not including, the date of apportionment determined pursuant to Section 5082

of the Revenue and Taxation Code or the date of trial, whichever is earlier. Any estimated amount of taxes shall be computed based on the assessed value of the property for the current assessment year and the tax rate levied on the property for the current tax year. ¶ (5) The amount of the taxes, penalties, and costs allocable to one day of the current tax year, and where applicable, the amount allocable to one day of the next succeeding tax year, hereinafter referred to as the “daily prorate.” ¶ (6) The total of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1260.250(c).)

“(d) If the property sought to be taken does not have a separate valuation on the assessment roll, the information required by this section shall be for the larger parcel of which the property is a part.” (Code of Civil Procedure, § 1260.250(d).)

The Court having granted the motion for prejudgment possession, the Court will also direct the County Tax Collector to certify the information enumerated in Section 1260.250(c).

**TENTATIVE RULING #3:**

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION AND TAX COLLECTOR CERTIFICATION ARE 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.**

|                                                            |          |                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 4.                                                         | 26CV1652 | EL DORADO MOBILE VILLAGE LLC V. ESTATE OF RHONDA LITTEL |
| PETITION FOR JUDGMENT TO DECLARE ABANDONMENT OF MOBILEHOME |          |                                                         |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON SEPTEMBER 4, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

Petitioner, El Dorado Mobile Village, LLC ("Petitioner"), filed a Petition for Judgment to Declare Abandonment of Mobilehome, Damages, Attorney's Fees and Costs on June 11, 2026. This Petition relies upon Civil Code §798.61 regarding the procedures for declaring a mobile home abandoned. Petitioner owns a mobile home park ("park"). Respondent, Estate of Rhonda Little, owns a mobile home which is located at the park.

On May 5, 2026, Petitioner issued a 30-day Notice of Belief of Abandonment pursuant to Civil Code §798.61(b). On June 11, 2026, Petitioner filed this Petition pursuant to Civil Code §798.61(c).

The statute requires copies of the Petition to be served on the homeowner/registered owner, and upon any known person having a lien or security interest of record. The notice shall be mailed by registered or certified mail with a return receipt requested. There is no proof of service showing service of the Petition on Defendant or on the county tax collector.

Civil Code of Procedure §798.61(c)(2) requires:

(2) To dispose of an abandoned mobilehome pursuant to subdivision (f), the management shall do all of the following:

(A) Declare in the petition that the management will dispose of the abandoned mobilehome, and therefore will not seek a tax clearance certificate as set forth in Section 5832 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(B) Declare in the petition whether the management intends to sell the contents of the abandoned mobilehome before its disposal.

(C) Notify the county tax collector in the county in which the mobilehome park is located of the declaration that management will dispose of the abandoned mobilehome by sending a copy of the petition by first class mail.

(D) Declare in the petition that management intends to file a notice of disposal with the Department of Housing and Community Development and complete the disposal process consistent with the requirements of subdivision (f).

Petitioner has failed to comply with the requirements of § 798.61(c)(2).

**TENTATIVE RULING #4:**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

**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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

|                              |          |                                           |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| 5.                           | 26CV1756 | JASON A BOSTON VS. EDCA LIFE SKILLS ET AL |
| PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE |          |                                           |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON SEPTEMBER 4, 2026, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

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

On June 24, 2026, Petitioner, Jason Andrew Boston ("Petitioner"), filed a Petition for Judicial Review and Request for Extraordinary Writ of Mandate. Petitioner named Director of the California Department of Motor Vehicles, California Department of Motor Vehicles, El Dorado County Alcohol & Drug Program/EDCA Life Skills, and El Dorado County Office of the General Councile [sic] as Defendants. Petitioner also filed a Proof of Service indicating the un-filed pleadings were served by mail prior to filing to Respondents. The Proof of Service is unsigned.

On July 20, 2026, Petitioner filed a Proof of Service by Mail indicating California Department of Motor Vehicles, Office of the Director and Legal Affairs were served the filed pleadings. A Notice of Acknowledgment of Receipt by the California Department of Motor Vehicles/Legal Affairs is attached and is signed; however, it does not identify who was signing on behalf of the DMV, nor was the acknowledgment dated, thereby rendering service defective.

On July 20, 2026, Petitioner filed a Proof of Service by Mail indicating EDCA Lifeskills was served the filed pleadings. An unsigned/dated Notice and Acknowledgement of Receipt was attached, rendering service defective.

On July 21, 2026, Petitioner filed a Notice of Corrected Party Designation, designating EDCA Lifeskills Inc. as a Real Party in Interest.

On July 22, 2026, Petitioner dismissed California Department of Motor Vehicles, Office of the Director, California Department of Motor Vehicles, Legal Affairs Division, and El Dorado County Office of the General Counsel, leaving no Respondents and EDCA Lifeskills as the remaining Real Party in Interest.

A writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal corporation, board, or person to compel the performance of an act which the law specifically enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust or station. Code of Civil Procedure § 1085. In a mandate proceeding, the respondent is the party directed to perform the act, while a real party in interest is any person or entity whose interest will be directly affected by the proceeding.

*Redevelopment Agency v. Commission on State Mandates* (1996) 43 Cal.App.4th 1188, 1197.

//

By dismissing all Respondents, Petitioner's writ of mandate is procedurally defective.

**TENTATIVE RULING #5:**

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR PROCEDURAL DEFECTS AND DEFECTIVE 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 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.                           | 23CV1955 | SYNCHRONY BANK VS. TRICIA D. HAMERTON |
| MOTION FOR ENTERING JUDGMENT |          |                                       |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON SEPTEMBER 4, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

Plaintiff, Synchrony Bank, seeks an order to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant, Tricia Hamerton ("Defendant"), due to Defendant's default of the settlement agreement. No opposition has been filed.

An unsigned Proof of Service was filed by Plaintiff on June 10, 2026, rendering service defective.

**TENTATIVE RULING #6:**

**PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE DUE TO DEFECTIVE 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 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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

|                     |          |                                              |
|---------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------|
| 7.                  | 23CV1430 | DARSHAN PATEL ET AL VS. BENJAMIN LOSCH ET AL |
| ATTORNEY WITHDRAWAL |          |                                              |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

Counsel for Defendants, Daniel Scales and D Scales Construction, Inc., 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 deterioration of the working relationship with client.

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 Defendants at their last known was filed on July 16, 2026.

There is a Case Management Conference scheduled for December 15, 2026, which is not listed in the proposed Order. Counsel shall submit a revised Order that includes the upcoming hearing date as required by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362(e).

**TENTATIVE RULING #7:**

**ABSENT OBJECTION, THE MOTION IS GRANTED, CONTINGENT ON COUNSEL'S FILING OF A PROPOSED ORDER (FORM MC-053) THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT, RULE 3.1362(E). COUNSEL IS DIRECTED TO SERVE A COPY OF THE SIGNED ORDER 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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil 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.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

|               |          |                                   |
|---------------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| 8.            | 25CV2079 | CODY UPSON VS. NATHAN STAMM ET AL |
| CONSOLIDATION |          |                                   |

|               |          |                                  |
|---------------|----------|----------------------------------|
| 9.            | 26CV0473 | AMY FRANK VS. NATHAN STAMM ET AL |
| CONSOLIDATION |          |                                  |

**ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION DUE TO LACK OF JUDICIAL COVERAGE, THE COURT WILL HEAR THIS MATTER ON AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE. THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON AUGUST 7, 2026. SHOULD A PARTY WISH TO REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT, THE BELOW PROCEDURES REMAIN IN EFFECT.**

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

On June 10, 2026, Plaintiff, Amy Frank ("Plaintiff Frank"), filed a Motion to Consolidate Actions. Defendants, Nathan Stamm and Rachelle Stamm, joined Plaintiff Frank's Motion to Consolidate on June 22, 2026. Plaintiff, Cody Upson, joined Plaintiff's Frank Motion to Consolidate on July 1, 2026. Defendants, Candice Ortega and Brett Chesson, have not joined the motion.

Plaintiff Frank requests an order pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1048(a) consolidating *Cody Upson v. Nathan Stamm, Rachelle Stamm*, Case No. 25CV2079 (the 'Lead Case') with *Amy Frank v. Nathan Stamm, Rachelle Stamm*, Case No. 26CV0473.

Code of Civil Procedure § 1048(a) provides: "When actions involving a common question of law or fact are pending before the court, it may order a joint hearing or trial of any or all the matters in issue in the actions; it may order all the actions consolidated and it may make such orders concerning proceedings therein as may tend to avoid unnecessary costs or delay."

Plaintiff Frank alleges that the actions involve common questions of fact in that both actions arise from the same December 7, 2024, motor vehicle collision and involve the same Defendants. Both Plaintiffs were passengers in the same vehicle at the time of the crash. The claims are based upon the same occurrence, will rely upon substantially the same witnesses and evidence, and concern recovery from a single insurance policy whose limits have already been tendered. As policy proceeds are limited and the main dispute concerns allocation of those proceeds, proceeding in separate actions creates a risk of inconsistent rulings and unnecessary duplication of judicial resources.

Plaintiff Frank further argues that consolidation would avoid unnecessary duplication of evidence, as well as unnecessary costs and duplication of evidence in deposing the same witnesses, treaters, experts, and doctors for each Plaintiff.

In considering a motion for consolidation, the Court considers the following:

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

1. Timeliness of the motion: i.e., whether granting consolidation would delay the trial of any of the cases involved, or whether *discovery* in one or more of the cases has proceeded without all parties present;
2. Complexity: i.e., whether joining the actions involved would make the trial too confusing or complex for a jury;
3. Prejudice: i.e., whether consolidation would adversely affect the rights of any party.

California Rules of Court, Rule 3.350 (Consolidation of Cases) provides further requirements for consolidation of cases:

(a) Requirements of motion

(1) A notice of motion to consolidate must:

- (A) List all named parties in each case, the names of those who have appeared, and the names of their respective attorneys of record;
- (B) Contain the captions of all the cases sought to be consolidated, with the lowest numbered case shown first; and
- (C) Be filed in each case sought to be consolidated.

(2) The motion to consolidate:

- (A) Is deemed a single motion for the purpose of determining the appropriate filing fee, but memorandums, declarations, and other supporting papers must be filed only in the lowest numbered case;
- (B) Must be served on all attorneys of record and all nonrepresented parties in all of the cases sought to be consolidated; and
- (C) Must have a proof of service filed as part of the motion.

Absent a stipulation to consolidate, a noticed and written motion to consolidate is required. *Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 495, 514.

The Court is not in receipt of the notice of motion in the Lead Case and the motion was not filed in the Lead case. The Court is inclined to grant Plaintiff Frank's motion to consolidate upon stipulation of all Parties or the filing of the notice of motion and motion in the Lead Case in compliance with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.350.

**TENTATIVE RULING #8 AND 9:**

**ABSENT A STIPULATION TO CONSOLIDATE BY ALL PARTIES, APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 AM IN DEPARTMENT NINE.**

**IF A PARTY OR PARTIES WISH TO APPEAR BY ZOOM, PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (530) 621-5867 AND MEETING INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED.**

August 7, 2026  
Dept. 9  
Civil Tentative Rulings

|                                                                                                     |                 |                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>10.</b>                                                                                          | <b>23CV1771</b> | <b>MADRONA VINEYARDS L.P. ET AL VS. JERRY VISMAN, AN<br/>INDIVIDUAL ET AL</b> |
| <b>MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST<br/>FOR PRODUCTION</b> |                 |                                                                               |

Pursuant to the Stipulation and Order entered on August 5, 2026, the Parties have stipulated to continue the hearing to August 28, 2026.

**TENTATIVE RULING #10:**

**MATTER CONTINUED TO AUGUST 28, 2026, AT 8:30 A.M. IN DEPARTMENT NINE.**