

On January 7, 2022, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting this court dismiss the Petition for Dissolution as this court lacks jurisdiction. Petitioner was served via mail on January 11, 2022, with Proof of Service filed on the same date.

Respondent asserts that neither party is a resident of El Dorado County. The parties separated in August of 2020. Petitioner relocated to Lake County at that time. The marital home was sold per the parties August 3, 2020 agreement in April of 2021. In July of 2021 Respondent and the children relocated to Las Vegas, NV. Petitioner filed the Petitioner for Dissolution on October 5, 2021. At that time neither party had been a resident of El Dorado County for three months.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and Declaration from Adam Calvert on February 14, 2022. Respondent was served by overnight delivery on February 10, 2022 as well as electronically on February 10, 2022 with Proofs of Service filed on February 14, 2022. Petitioner asserts he currently resides in El Dorado County and has done so since April of 2021. Petitioner provided a copy of a room rental agreement for a home located within El Dorado County which indicates a month-to-month rental agreement. The declaration of Adam Calvert states the Petitioner rents a room in the home and residing there.

Based on the above filings, the court finds it does have jurisdiction in this matter. The petitioner resided in El Dorado County for more than three months prior to the filing of the petition. There are no other competing petitions in other states or counties. The court denies Respondent's request to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

Respondent to prepare and file Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: EL DORADO COUNTY HAS PROPER JURISDICTION OVER THE MATTER. THE COURT DENIES RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS. RESPONDENT TO PREPARE AND FILE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

16. ANGELA HURLEY V. IVAN RIVERA

PFL20200615

On January 12, 2022, Respondent filed an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt alleging Petitioner violated the parties' visitation order. Upon review of the file, the court finds that there is no proof of service indicating service of the contempt complaint on Petitioner. As such, the matter is dropped from the court's calendar.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: MATTER DROPPED FROM THE COURT'S CALENDAR

On January 18, 2022, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting a modification of child support orders. Respondent filed an Income and Expense Declaration on the same date. Petitioner was served via mail on February 2, 2022, with Proof of Service filed on February 7, 2022.

Respondent requests a modification of the June 17, 2021 child support order. Petitioner is currently ordered to pay Respondent \$124 per month, as and for child support.

On January 19, 2022 parties filed a stipulation for child custody and visitation with the court. The current agreement of the parties is for joint legal and physical custody of the minors.

Petitioner has filed neither a responsive declaration nor an Income and Expense Declaration.

The court continues the hearing to April 28, 2022 and orders Petitioner to file and serve an updated Income and Expense Declaration no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date. The court reserves on the modification of child support to the date of the filing of the RFO. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT CONTINUES THE MATTER TO APRIL 28, 2022. PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVED AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON THE MODIFICATION OF CHILD SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF FILING OF THE RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

19. COUNTY V. KEVIN YANEZ (OTHER PARTY: ROSA JIMENEZ (CORTES))

PFS20180138

On December 8, 2021, Other Party filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting a modification in child custody and parenting time. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on January 12, 2022. Respondent was personally served the RFO and referral to CCRC on December 11, 2021, with Proof of Service file on December 17, 2021.

On January 12, 2022, only Other Party attended the CCRC appointment. As such a single party participant CCRC report was issued with no recommendations. A copy of the report was mailed to parties on February 14, 2022. The parties are ordered to appear for hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR FOR HEARING.

On February 4, 2022, the parties appeared in court for Judgment and Sentencing regarding the court's prior finding of contempt against Respondent in January 2021. As Judge Bowers was not the judge who heard the contempt trial, the court continued the matter to February 24, 2022 and directed the clerk to contact Judge Pesce, the judge for the contempt trial, to see if and when she is available to hear the matter.

The court sets the matter on March 9, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. in Department 7 for Judgement and Sentencing to be heard by Judge Pesce. No appearances are required at the February 24, 2022 hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT SETS THE MATTER FOR MARCH 9, 2022 AT 1:00 PM IN DEPARTMENT 7 FOR JUDGEMENT AND SENTENCING. NO APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT THE FEBRUARY 24, 2022 HEARING.

On December 7, 2021 Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting the court modify custody, visitation, and child support. A referral to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) was made for parties to attend on January 10, 2022. Upon review of the file, the court was unable to locate a Proof of Service of the RFO on the Petitioner.

On January 10, 2022 the CCRC appointment was changed to January 12, 2022, due to a scheduling error. Parties were provided notice.

On January 12, 2022, Petitioner appeared at the CCRC appointment. Respondent called to state he was ill and would not attend. A CCRC report was issued on January 18, 2022 but makes no recommendations because only one party appeared. The CCRC report was mailed to parties on February 15, 2022.

The court has read and considered the above filings and finds that the court does not have proof Petitioner was served and received notice of Respondent's requests as required by law, Respondent RFO is denied in its entirety without prejudice. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS ARE DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR LACK OF SERVICE. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

On January 14, 2022, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) request the court modify child support. Petitioner concurrently filed an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent was served via mail on January 14, 2022 with Proof of Service filed the same day. Petitioner request the court modify the September 10, 2019 order for child support in the amount of \$1,458 per month as his current income from disability benefits is \$1,744.

Respondent has filed neither a responsive declaration nor an Income and Expense Declaration.

The court continues the hearing April 28, 2022 and orders Petitioner to file and serve an updated Income and Expense Declaration no later than 10 days prior to the next hearing date. The court reserves on the modification of child support to the date of the filing of the RFO. All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT CONTINUES THE MATTER TO APRIL 28, 2022. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO FILE AND SERVED AN UPDATED INCOME AND EXPENSE DECLARATION NO LATER THAN 10 DAYS PRIOR TO THE NEXT HEARING. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION ON THE MODIFICATION OF CHILD SUPPORT TO THE DATE OF FILING OF THE RFO. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.