

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

1. ALANA J. BARBIERY V. DANIEL J. BARBIERY

23FL0609

On January 13, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking a review hearing. There is no Proof of Service for the RFO.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order wherein she indicates that she was not served with the moving papers and all other required documents. She therefore, objects to a hearing on the RFO. The Responsive Declaration was served on March 20th.

This matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER 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 PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

4. DANIEL STEVENSON V. MAUDENA STEVENSON

24FL0166

On January 16, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking spousal support orders. She filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. There is no Proof of Service for either of these documents and Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order waiving service. As such, this matter is dropped from calendar due to lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: THIS MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO LACK OF PROPER 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 PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

5. GINNY ANNE SILVER V. MICHAEL JAMES SILVER

24FL0997

On January 8, 2025, Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) and an accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support thereof. Both documents were served on January 9th, however Respondent did not serve a blank FL-320 or the Notice of Tentative Ruling. Petitioner filed and served her Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 17th.

Respondent brings his RFO seeking an order setting aside the judgment entered on October 31, 2024 on the grounds of mistake and excusable neglect. He argues that he was unrepresented when the Marital Settlement Agreement (MSA) was entered, and he was unaware that he was signing away half of his separate property home located on Oak Ave. He asks that the home be confirmed as his sole and separate property.

Petitioner opposes the request on the basis that Respondent failed to include the required statutory response. Respondent also states that the reference to the MSA, the Oak Ave. home, and the Memorandum of Points and Authorities all are inapplicable to the present matter.

The court has reviewed the filings and the Request for Entry of Default; it does not appear that there is an MSA attached and there is no default judgment. Additionally, it does not appear that the child support issue referenced in the Memorandum of Points and Authorities is applicable to this matter. As such, Respondent has failed to establish either mistake or excusable neglect as required by Civil Procedure § 437(b), therefore, the RFO is denied.

Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH EITHER MISTAKE OR EXCUSABLE NEGLECT AS REQUIRED BY CIVIL PROCEDURE § 437(B), THEREFORE, THE RFO IS DENIED. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

6. JACINTA LASHAE BADELITA V. BOGDANEL BADELITA

22FL0797

On March 4, 2025, Petitioner filed a request for an Order Shortening Time (OST) to be heard on a Request for Order (RFO) seeking various discovery sanctions. The OST was granted and the RFO was set to be heard on the present date. All required documents were electronically served on March 10th.

Respondent filed and electronically served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 20th.

Petitioner brings her RFO requesting the following: (1) Respondent be barred from testifying at trial pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2023.030(b) and 2025.450(h); (2) Respondent be barred from presenting any evidence, including witnesses, related to discovery requests made in the propounded Demand for Production of Documents and Special Interrogatories at trial pursuant to Civil Procedure §§ 2023.030(b) and 2025.450(h); (3) Respondent reimburse Petitioner \$766 in court reporter fees incurred for depositions that Respondent failed to attend; (4) Sanctions against Respondent in an amount of at least \$20,000 pursuant to Family Code § 271 and Civil Procedure §§ 2030.300(e), 2031.310(i), 2025.450(h), and 2023.010-030; and (5) any additional relief as justice requires.

Respondent opposes all of the aforementioned requests and asks that Petitioner be sanctioned pursuant to Family Code § 271 and Civil Procedure §§ 2030.300(e), 2031.310(i), 2025.450(h), and 2023.010-030.

The overriding philosophy of the Discovery Act is that discovery should be liberally construed in order to take the ‘game’ element out of trial preparation by enabling the parties to obtain evidence necessary to evaluate and resolve their dispute before a trial is necessary. Greyhound Corp. v. Sup. Ct. 56 al. 2d 355 at 391 (1961). Where, as here, one party has repeatedly engaged in semantics designed to obfuscate his duty to participate in the discovery process meaningfully and in good faith, allowing him to produce the very information he refused to disclose would fly in the face of the Civil Discovery Act as a whole. As such, Petitioner’s requests to bar Respondent’s testimony at trial, and bar the presentation of evidence and witnesses related to the written discovery are both granted as set forth below.

It is well established law that any party may obtain discovery by way of an oral deposition. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2019.010(a) & §2025.010. “The service of a deposition notice under Section 2025.240 is effective to require any deponent who is a party to the action or

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

an officer, director, managing agent, or employee of a party to attend and to testify, as well as to produce any document, electronically stored information, or tangible thing for inspection and copying.” Cal Civ. Pro. § 2025.280(a). Where a party fails to attend a properly noticed deposition, the noticing party may obtain an order compelling attendance. Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2025.450. Further, if a “...deponent then fails to obey an order compelling attendance, testimony, and production, the court may make those orders that are just, including the imposition of an issue sanction, an evidence sanction, or a terminating sanction...against that party deponent...” *Id.* At (h).

The facts at hand are quite simple and fall well within the purview of Section 2025.450. Respondent’s deposition was properly noticed for December 26, 2024. He did not appear. A motion to compel was filed and granted. Pursuant to the order compelling the deposition, Respondent was to appear for his deposition on February 5th and February 11th. Once again, Respondent failed to appear. Accordingly, in order to remove the game element from trial, Respondent should not be allowed to testify at trial where Petitioner was not first given the opportunity to exercise her right to depose him.

Respondent argues that Civil Procedure § 2025.450(h) allows exclusionary sanctions only when a party fails to comply with a court order compelling discovery. Respondent is correct in this assertion. And Respondent has failed to comply with court orders compelling his participation in his deposition. Thus, by Respondent’s own admission, exclusion under Section 2025.450 is warranted.

Likewise, where a party fails to obey court orders compelling further responses to interrogatories, or further responses to requests for production of documents, “the court may make those orders that are just, including the imposition of an issue sanction, and evidence sanction or a terminating sanction...” Cal. Civ. Pro. §§ 2030.300(e), 2032.310(i). Again, such is the case here.

Respondent argues that Petitioner is already in possession of the requested information “by virtue (*sic*) of all of the subpoenas that they’ve issued.” (Resp. Dec. p3:5-6). This irrelevant as each “party is permitted to use multiple methods of obtaining discovery and the fact that information was disclosed under one method is not, standing alone, proper basis for refusing to provide discovery under another method.” Irvington-Moore, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. 14 Cal. App. 4th 733 (1993).

Respondent argues that his written discovery responses were “timely and complete, in good faith and without any deficiencies” (Resp. Dec. p3:23-24) however such a determination is within the purview of the court and the court already ruled that the responses were deficient, hence the order compelling amended responses which was issued on July 11, 2024. It appears the “amended” responses were effectively the same as the initial responses and therefore were found to be deficient.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Respondent points to Petitioner's alleged failure to meet and confer prior to the filing of the Motion to Compel. Again, this issue was already ruled upon when the court ruled on the Motion to Compel. At that time, the court found the meet and confer efforts to be sufficient. Additionally, as of the time the amended responses were due, Respondent had in his possession not only the meet and confer emails from Petitioner's attorney but also the Separate Statement of Requests in Dispute which was attached to the Motion to Compel and set forth the deficiencies in each specific request.

Ultimately what this comes down to is the fact that Respondent cannot simply put his head in the sand in an attempt to avoid his discovery obligations. And while Respondent is correct that courts tend to "...favor less severe sanctions before excluding a party's testimony." (Resp. Dec. p4:11-12). Here, the court has done just that. Yet despite the orders to compel and the monetary sanctions previously ordered, Respondent has refused to comply and has thereby left the court with no lesser sanction other than to exclude his testimony and any and all evidence related to the propounded discovery which Respondent did not disclose. This is evidenced by the matter cited to by Respondent in his Responsive Declaration, Collisson & Kaplan v. Hartunian, 21 Cal. App. 4th 1611(1994). The court in that matter actually upheld the trial court's order to strike Defendant's answer stating the sanction was proper as "...a lesser sanction would have allowed defendants to benefit from their stalling." Collisson, 21 Cal. App. 4th at 1620. Such is the case here. Respondent was ordered to provide full and complete amended responses to interrogatories and requests for production of documents. He failed to do so. Respondent was ordered to attend his deposition. He failed to do so. Respondent was ordered to pay monetary sanctions. He failed to do so. Allowing him to testify at trial and present evidence that was not turned over in discovery would allow him to benefit from his wrongdoing.

In light of the foregoing, Petitioner's requests for evidentiary sanctions are granted. Respondent is barred from providing oral testimony at trial. Additionally, Respondent is barred from presenting evidence at trial, including witnesses, regarding information that was requested in Petitioner's Demand for Production of Documents – Set One and Special Interrogatories – Set One, *which was not included in the responses that were given*. For the avoidance of doubt, the court recognizes that Respondent did give some responses and amended responses to the requested discovery. The issue sanctions are with regard to the documents and information which were requested but which were *not* included in the responses.

Regarding the monetary sanctions, the court may award monetary sanctions "in lieu of or in addition to" evidentiary sanctions. Cal. Civ. Pro. §2030.290 (c) (interrogatories) & § 2031.300(c)(requests for production). In all other circumstances, the imposition of discovery sanctions is permissive. See Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.030 (the court *may* impose monetary sanctions for misuse of the discovery process). Conduct subject to discretionary

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

sanctions includes, but is not limited to, “(d) Failing to respond or submit to an authorized method of discovery...(f) Making an evasive response to discovery. [and] (g) Disobeying a court order to provide discovery.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 2023.010.

Where sanctions are awarded, the amount imposed is to include “...the reasonable expenses, including attorney’s fees, incurred by anyone as a result of...” the conduct of the party subject to sanction. Cal. Civ. Pro. 2023.030(a). A party requesting sanctions must establish that the amount requested is reasonable, was incurred as a result of discovery abuse, and the requesting party must already be liable for those expenses before the court can award the costs as sanctions. See *Tucker v. Pacific Bell Mobile Servs.*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 1548 (2010) (anticipated costs for future deposition could not be included in award of sanctions).

An award for attorney’s fees and sanctions may also be made pursuant to Family Code section 271 which states, in pertinent part, “...the court may base an award of attorney’s fees and costs on the extent to which the conduct of each party or attorney furthers or frustrates the policy of the law to promote settlement of litigation and, where possible, to reduce the cost of litigation by encouraging cooperation of the parties and attorneys. An award of attorney’s fees and costs pursuant to this section is in the nature of a sanction.” Fam. Code § 271(a).

Here, the court does find that Petitioner did incur the requested \$766 in court reporter fees for the depositions that Respondent refused to attend. Those fees were unavoidable to ensure the opportunity for Respondent to appear at the deposition, Petitioner and the court reporter were required to appear at the scheduled date and time as noticed. Had they not done so, Respondent could have easily made the argument that he would have appeared or did appear, but no one else did. Such is a common practice in preserving the record for the exact type of motion that is before the court. Accordingly, Respondent is ordered to pay Petitioner’s attorney \$766 dollars forthwith.

Regarding the additional requested sanctions, the court reserves on this request until the time of trial. Petitioner’s counsel is ordered to provide the court with billing documentation regarding amounts incurred which were directly related to Respondent’s failure to comply with the court’s discovery orders. Counsel may redact any privileged information contained in the billing statements.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: PETITIONER’S REQUESTS FOR EVIDENTIARY SANCTIONS ARE GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS BARRED FROM PROVIDING ORAL TESTIMONY AT TRIAL.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ADDITIONALLY, RESPONDENT IS BARRED FROM PRESENTING EVIDENCE AT TRIAL, INCLUDING WITNESSES, REGARDING INFORMATION THAT WAS REQUESTED IN PETITIONER'S DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS – SET ONE AND SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES – SET ONE, *WHICH WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE RESPONSES THAT WERE GIVEN*. FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT, THE COURT RECOGNIZES THAT RESPONDENT DID GIVE SOME RESPONSES AND AMENDED RESPONSES TO THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY. THE ISSUE SANCTIONS ARE WITH REGARD TO THE DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION WHICH WERE REQUESTED BUT WHICH WERE *NOT* INCLUDED IN THE RESPONSES. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO PAY PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY \$766 DOLLARS FORTHWITH. REGARDING THE ADDITIONAL REQUESTED SANCTIONS, THE COURT RESERVES ON THIS REQUEST UNTIL THE TIME OF TRIAL. PETITIONER'S COUNSEL IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH BILLING DOCUMENTATION REGARDING AMOUNTS INCURRED WHICH WERE DIRECTLY RELATED TO RESPONDENT'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S DISCOVERY ORDERS. COUNSEL MAY REDACT ANY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE BILLING STATEMENTS.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

7. KEITH HELLESVIG V. DANA HELLESVIG

PFL20040142

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on October 11, 2024, seeking orders as to Petitioner's retirement account. There is no Proof of Service, however, the court finds good cause to dispense with service as Respondent is deceased and her heirs have executed a waiver of all rights as to Petitioner's Cal Pers retirement account. This matter came before the court for hearing on January 16, 2025, at which time the court continued the matter and directed Petitioner to obtain notarized signatures to the waiver.

On March 3, 2025, Petitioner filed the aforementioned signed and notarized waivers. As such, Petitioner's request is granted. Petitioner is awarded the entirety of his CALPERS retirement account.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: PETITIONER'S REQUEST IS GRANTED. PETITIONER IS AWARDED THE ENTIRETY OF HIS CALPERS RETIREMENT ACCOUNT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

8. MICHELLE MASTERS V. GUY SORBER

22FL0424

On January 9, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) and an accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities. Both documents, and all other required documents, were mail served on March 6th.

Respondent filed and served a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order on March 26th. The court finds this to be late filed pursuant to Civil Procedure section 1005(b) which states all responsive papers are to be filed no later than nine court days before the hearing date. Section 12c states, “[w]here any law requires an act to be performed no later than a specified number of days before a hearing date, the last day to perform that act shall be determined by counting backward from the hearing date, *excluding the day of the hearing* as provided by Section 12.” Cal. Civ. Pro. § 12c. Section 1005(b) in conjunction with Section 12c would have made March 21st the last day for filing. Therefore, this document is late filed and has not been read or considered.

On March 27th, Petitioner filed and served an Objection & Request to Strike Respondent’s Responsive Declaration. Petitioner objects to the Responsive Declaration and accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities as untimely. For the reasons stated above, the objection is sustained, the court has not read or considered the Responsive Declaration, or the Memorandum of Points and Authorities attached thereto.

Petitioner brings her RFO requesting the court issue an order designating Petitioner’s personal representatives, Madeline Sorber and Michael Anthony Sorber, as beneficiaries to Petitioner’s life insurance policy. Alternatively, Petitioner asks that the court issue an order freezing the life insurance proceeds pending a final resolution in this matter. At the time of Petitioner’s death, Respondent was the beneficiary, and this designation was not changed by Petitioner due to the ATROs.

It is a longstanding tenant of the law that the court shall divide the community estate of the parties equally. Cal. Fam. Code 2550. Inherent in the court’s authority to ensure that community assets are divided equally, the court holds broad discretion to “...make any orders [it] considers necessary...” Fam. Code § 2553. In furtherance of these powers, the court is ordering the insurance proceeds from Petitioner’s Fidelity & Guaranty Life Insurance policy to be placed in an interest bearing client trust account with Petitioner’s attorney until a final determination on the division of assets has been made.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TENTATIVE RULING #8: PETITIONER'S OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED. THE COURT HAS NOT READ OR CONSIDERED THE RESPONSIVE DECLARATION OR THE MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ATTACHED THERETO. THE COURT IS ORDERING THE INSURANCE PROCEEDS FROM PETITIONER'S FIDELITY & GUARANTY LIFE INSURANCE POLICY TO BE PLACED IN AN INTEREST BEARING CLIENT TRUST ACCOUNT WITH PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY UNTIL A FINAL DETERMINATION ON THE DIVISION OF ASSETS HAS BEEN MADE. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

9. NICOLE SMITH V. BRANDON CORNS

24FL0194

On January 21, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking child support. She filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith. Both documents were mail served on the same day however Petitioner did not serve a Notice of Tentative Ruling. Respondent has not filed a Responsive Declaration to Request for Order.

Where a party fails to timely file opposition papers the court, in its discretion, may treat said failure "as an admission that the motion or other application is meritorious." El Dorado County, Local Rule 7.10.02(C). Here, it appears the RFO was properly served on Respondent. He had notice of the pending request and chose not to file an opposition to the RFO. As such, the court finds good cause to treat his failure to do so as an admission that the claims made in the RFO are meritorious and that Petitioner's estimate of Respondent's income is correct.

Petitioner is requesting guideline child support back to the date of filing the petition. She also requests an order directing Respondent to provide health insurance for the children.

Petitioner's request for guideline child support is granted, however the court is not inclined to award support going all the way back to the filing of the petition in February of last year. That said, the court is adopting the DissoMaster report attached to the RFO as Exhibit 8 and orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$1,686 per month as and for child support payable on the 1st of the month until further order of the court or legal termination. This order is effective as of February 1, 2025.

The court finds the above order results in arrears in the amount of \$5,058 through and including April 1, 2025. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$421.50 on the 15th of each month commencing on April 15, 2025 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 13 months). If any payment is late or missed the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

Petitioner's request for health insurance for the children is also granted. Respondent is ordered to obtain health insurance for the children forthwith.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

**TENTATIVE RULING #9: THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE DISSOMASTER REPORT
ATTACHED TO THE RFO AS EXHIBIT 8 AND ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER**

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

\$1,686 PER MONTH AS AND FOR CHILD SUPPORT PAYABLE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR LEGAL TERMINATION. THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 2025.

THE COURT FINDS THE ABOVE ORDER RESULTS IN ARREARS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,058 THROUGH AND INCLUDING APRIL 1, 2025. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$421.50 ON THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH COMMENCING ON APRIL 15, 2025 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 13 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS LATE OR MISSED THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE CHILDREN IS ALSO GRANTED. RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO OBTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE CHILDREN FORTHWITH.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

11. THOMAS LUTZ V. KAREN LUTZ

23FL1270

On February 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) seeking property control orders. It was mail served on February 11th.

Respondent filed a Declaration on February 14, 2025 with an assortment of financial records. There is no Proof of Service for this document therefore the court has not considered it.

On February 20th, Petitioner filed and served an RFO for spousal support orders. He filed an Income and Expense Declaration concurrently therewith.

On March 19th, Respondent filed two Responsive Declarations to Request for Order as well as an Income and Expense Declaration. These documents were personally served on March 19th.

On March 19th Petitioner filed and served a Declaration of John R. Hughes in Support of Petitioner's Request for Sanctions (Attorney's Fees).

Petitioner is requesting Respondent be ordered to return the following separate property items: (1) 2008 Toyota Solara; (2) 2001 Jaguar XK8; and (3) an antique heirloom watch which he inherited from his mother. He also requests the court change the current spousal support order which was put in place in December of 2024. He requests that Respondent be imputed with full time minimum wage at \$20 per hour. Finally, he asks that the court issue a Gavron warning. Petitioner is also requesting \$600 as sanctions pursuant to Family Code § 271 for the appearance of his attorney at the March 13th hearing.

Respondent opposes the spousal support request and asks that the court maintain the current order for payments in the amount of \$2,500 a month. She states she has been applying for jobs but has not found one yet. She also opposes the property control orders as she states there is no 2008 Toyota Solara, there is a 2007 Toyota Yaris. She also states the watch and the Jaguar are no longer in her possession as they have been stolen.

Petitioner's request for spousal support orders is denied. The prior order is from December 19, 2024. The RFO was filed just two months later in February of 2025. Petitioner has not established any new or different circumstances which would warrant the court changing its prior order. He argues that his work is seasonal, and he will not begin earning income until May, which is next month. As such, the request for spousal support is denied.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

Petitioner's request for a *Gavron* Warning is granted. Respondent is advised that it is the goal of the State of California that both parties shall become and remain self-supporting to the best of their ability. Respondent is further advised that, at some future date, should she fail to become self-supporting, Petitioner may argue that her failure to become self-supporting is a factor which may be considered by the court to modify a spousal support order or terminate the court's jurisdiction to order spousal support. Respondent is further advised that if she voluntarily terminates employment, the court can impute income to her without application of the ability and opportunity requirement and the court can deny a modification of support. In *Re Marriage of Gavron*, 203 Cal.App.3d 705 (1988). Respondent is further advised that mismanagement of her estate may result in a reduction of the court's order of support, termination of the court's ability to continue spousal support or imputation of income on property.

The parties are ordered to appear on the issue of the Toyota, the Jaguar, and the watch.

The court is continuing to reserve jurisdiction on Petitioner's request for sanctions pursuant to Section 271 as the court is concerned with Respondent's ability to pay for the time being.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #11: PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDERS IS DENIED. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A GAVRON WARNING IS GRANTED.

RESPONDENT IS ADVISED THAT IT IS THE GOAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT BOTH PARTIES SHALL BECOME AND REMAIN SELF-SUPPORTING TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY. RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ADVISED THAT, AT SOME FUTURE DATE, SHOULD SHE FAIL TO BECOME SELF-SUPPORTING, PETITIONER MAY ARGUE THAT HER FAILURE TO BECOME SELF-SUPPORTING IS A FACTOR WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED BY THE COURT TO MODIFY A SPOUSAL SUPPORT ORDER OR TERMINATE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ORDER SPOUSAL SUPPORT. RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ADVISED THAT IF SHE VOLUNTARILY TERMINATES EMPLOYMENT, THE COURT CAN IMPUTE INCOME TO HER WITHOUT APPLICATION OF THE ABILITY AND OPPORTUNITY REQUIREMENT AND THE COURT CAN DENY A MODIFICATION OF SUPPORT. IN RE MARRIAGE OF GAVRON, 203 CAL.APP.3D 705 (1988). RESPONDENT IS FURTHER ADVISED THAT MISMANAGEMENT OF HER ESTATE MAY RESULT IN A REDUCTION OF THE COURT'S ORDER OF SUPPORT, TERMINATION OF THE COURT'S ABILITY TO CONTINUE SPOUSAL SUPPORT OR IMPUTATION OF INCOME ON PROPERTY.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR ON THE ISSUE OF THE TOYOTA, THE JAGUAR, AND THE WATCH.

THE COURT IS CONTINUING TO RESERVE JURISDICTION ON PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 271 AS THE COURT IS CONCERNED WITH RESPONDENT'S ABILITY TO PAY FOR THE TIME BEING.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

12. VELEN AMBROSE V. JUSTUS AMBROSE

24FL0097

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on September 5, 2024, requesting the court make child and spousal support orders as well as a request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Petitioner did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration, though one was filed on August 30th.

Upon review of the court file, there is no Proof of Service showing Respondent was properly served with the RFO or the August 30th Income and Expense Declaration.

On November 7, 2024, parties submitted a Stipulation and Order to continue the hearing from January 2, 2025 to February 6, 2025. The court signed and adopted the stipulation and order. On February 3rd, the parties once again stipulated to continue the matter, a hearing was set for the present date.

Petitioner filed an updated Income and Expense Declaration on December 2, 2024. Proof of Service shows Respondent was mail served the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration and Income and Expense Declaration on January 24, 2025. Petitioner was electronically served the same day. Respondent filed an Amended Responsive Declaration on January 27, 2025. Petitioner was electronically served the same day.

On March 26th, the Reply Declaration of Petitioner Velen Ambrose was filed and served along with an updated Income and Expense Declaration.

Petitioner is seeking guideline child and temporary spousal support along with \$20,000 in Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees. Respondent consents to guideline child and spousal support and has included a proposed DissoMaster. Respondent however, objects to Petitioner's request for attorney's fees, as Respondent asserts Petitioner withdrew \$24,583 from the joint checking account and has refused to disclose where the funds have gone.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds good cause to proceed with Petitioner's RFO, despite that lack of Proof of Service, as Respondent has filed a Responsive Declaration, and has not objected to service as improper. Therefore, the court deems that the objection is waived. The court also finds good cause to proceed despite Petitioner's failure to concurrently file and serve an Income

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

and Expense Declaration at the time of the filing of the RFO. Respondent has not raised any objection to this defect; therefore, the court deems it to be waived.

The court is adopting the proposed DissoMaster attached as Exhibit A to the Reply Declaration of Petitioner filed on March 26th. The court finds guideline child support to be \$700 per month payable from Respondent to Petitioner and guideline spousal support per the Alameda formula to be \$447 per month. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$1,147 per month as and for guideline spousal support and child support effective September 5, 2024. Payments are due on the 1st of each month until further order of the court or termination by operation of law.

The court finds this results in an arrears balance of \$8,029 for the months of September 5, 2024 through March 31, 2025. The court orders Respondent to pay Petitioner \$8,029 forthwith as and for arrears for base child and spousal support.

The court also finds that both parties earn income in addition to their respective base salaries of \$13,704 per month for Petitioner and \$19,704 per month for Respondent. As such, the court is adopting the two-way bonus table which is attached as Exhibit F to Petitioner's Reply Declaration filed on March 26th. Commencing on January 1, 2025, the parties are to reconcile their bonus income in accordance with the bonus table on a quarterly basis. Parties are ordered to exchange paystubs for the quarter no later than 7 days after the end of the quarter. Bonus payments are due, if any, no later than 30 days from the end of each quarter.

Utilizing the two-way bonus table the court finds there to be an arrears balance in addition to the arrears on base salary of \$14,752 for child support and \$27,912 for spousal support. Respondent shall pay Petitioner \$1,777.67 as and for bonus arrears payments commencing on April 15, 2025 and continuing until paid in full (approximately 24 months). If any payment is missed or late, the entire amount shall become immediately due and payable with legal interest.

The parties are ordered to equally split the costs of piano and gymnastics for the minors as well as the costs of any other agreed upon extracurricular activities.

Regarding the request for attorney's fees, the public policy of Family Code section 2030 is to provide "at the outset of litigation, consistent with the financial circumstances of the parties, parity between spouses in their ability to obtain effective legal representation." In re Marriage of Keech, 75 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866 (1999). This assures each party has access

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. In the face of a request for attorney's fees and costs, the court is to make findings on "whether there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel, and whether one party is able to pay for legal representation of both parties." Fam. Code § 2030(a)(2).

Family Code section 2032 works in tandem with Section 2030 to ensure that any award of costs and fees is just and reasonable. Fam. Code § 2032. "In determining what is just and reasonable under the relative circumstances, the court shall take into consideration the need for the award to enable each party, to the extent practical, to have sufficient financial resources to present the party's case adequately." *Id.* at (b).

The court finds that while there is a disparity in income, that has been improved by the support award. Further, after the support payment, the court finds Respondent's ability to pay for both his, as well as Petitioner's counsel is significantly lowered. As such, the court denies Petitioner's request for Family Code section 2030 attorney's fees.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #12: THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE PROPOSED DISSOMASTER ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A TO THE REPLY DECLARATION OF PETITIONER FILED ON MARCH 26TH.

THE COURT FINDS GUIDELINE CHILD SUPPORT TO BE \$700 PER MONTH PAYABLE FROM RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER AND GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT PER THE ALAMEDA FORMULA TO BE \$447 PER MONTH. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$1,147 PER MONTH AS AND FOR GUIDELINE SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND CHILD SUPPORT EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 5, 2024. PAYMENTS ARE DUE ON THE 1ST OF EACH MONTH UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR TERMINATION BY OPERATION OF LAW.

THE COURT FINDS THIS RESULTS IN AN ARREARS BALANCE OF \$8,029 FOR THE MONTHS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2025. THE COURT ORDERS RESPONDENT TO PAY PETITIONER \$8,029 FORTHWITH AS AND FOR ARREARS FOR BASE CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT.

THE COURT ALSO FINDS THAT BOTH PARTIES EARN INCOME IN ADDITION TO THEIR RESPECTIVE BASE SALARIES OF \$13,704 PER MONTH FOR PETITIONER AND \$19,704 PER MONTH FOR RESPONDENT. AS SUCH, THE COURT IS ADOPTING THE

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

TWO-WAY BONUS TABLE WHICH IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT F TO PETITIONER'S REPLY DECLARATION FILED ON MARCH 26TH. COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 2025, THE PARTIES ARE TO RECONCILE THEIR BONUS INCOME IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BONUS TABLE ON A QUARTERLY BASIS. PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EXCHANGE PAYSTUBS FOR THE QUARTER NO LATER THAN 7 DAYS AFTER THE END OF THE QUARTER. BONUS PAYMENTS ARE DUE, IF ANY, NO LATER THAN 30 DAYS FROM THE END OF EACH QUARTER.

UTILIZING THE TWO-WAY BONUS TABLE THE COURT FINDS THERE TO BE AN ARREARS BALANCE IN ADDITION TO THE ARREARS ON BASE SALARY OF \$14,752 FOR CHILD SUPPORT AND \$27,912 FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT. RESPONDENT SHALL PAY PETITIONER \$1,777.67 AS AND FOR BONUS ARREARS PAYMENTS COMMENCING ON APRIL 15, 2025 AND CONTINUING UNTIL PAID IN FULL (APPROXIMATELY 24 MONTHS). IF ANY PAYMENT IS MISSED OR LATE, THE ENTIRE AMOUNT SHALL BECOME IMMEDIATELY DUE AND PAYABLE WITH LEGAL INTEREST.

THE PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO EQUALLY SPLIT THE COSTS OF PIANO AND GYMNASTICS FOR THE MINORS AS WELL AS THE COSTS OF ANY OTHER AGREED UPON EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES.

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES IS DENIED.

PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

13. AARON LUKIANOW V. CINDY LUKIANOW

23FL0373

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 15, 2025, requesting a wage assignment order as well as clarification of prior orders. Petitioner was served by mail on January 21, 2025. Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on February 21, 2025. Respondent was mail served on the same day.

Respondent asserts Petitioner has failed to make payments to her in a timely manner. Respondent also seeks clarification of the orders made as to the parties' tax refund and the division of the 401K. Petitioner is opposed to a wage garnishment order.

The court orders parties to appear.

TENTATIVE RULING #13: PARTIES ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS
DEPARTMENT 5
April 3, 2025
8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

14. AMANDA RENFROE V. ANDREW RENFROE

PFL20160677

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 15, 2025, seeking to change the minor, Violet's school. On January 17, 2025, Petitioner filed a Declaration in Support. Respondent was served on January 31, 2025.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 27, 2025, which was served on March 25, 2025. The court finds this to be late filed and therefore, has not considered it.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds Petitioner has failed to set forth how the requested change would be in Violet's best interest. The court recently granted Petitioner and the minor's request to change schools. It appears the issues Violet was experiencing at her prior high school have continued at the new school. The court cannot find that changing schools a second time in the same academic year is in the minor's best interest. Further, it is unclear whether Violet has been enrolled in the counseling services that were previously ordered. The court recognizes that high school is a challenging time for many children. As such, counseling services are imperative. The court finds that the current orders remain in the minor's best interest.

Petitioner's request for modification is denied. All prior orders remain in full force and effect. Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #14: THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SET FORTH HOW THE REQUESTED CHANGE WOULD BE IN VIOLET'S BEST INTEREST. THE COURT RECENTLY GRANTED PETITIONER AND THE MINOR'S REQUEST TO CHANGE SCHOOLS. IT APPEARS THE ISSUES VIOLET WAS EXPERIENCING AT HER PRIOR HIGH SCHOOL HAVE CONTINUED AT THE NEW SCHOOL. THE COURT CANNOT FIND THAT CHANGING SCHOOLS A SECOND TIME IN THE SAME ACADEMIC YEAR IS IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. FURTHER, IT IS UNCLEAR WHETHER VIOLET HAS BEEN ENROLLED IN THE COUNSELING SERVICES THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY ORDERED. THE COURT RECOGNIZES THAT HIGH SCHOOL IS A CHALLENGING TIME FOR MANY CHILDREN. AS SUCH, COUNSELING SERVICES ARE IMPERATIVE. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION IS DENIED. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

15. AMBER COOKE V. DAVID WEST

22FL0126

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 22, 2025, seeking a modification of parenting time orders as well as clarification of the court's prior orders. Respondent was served by mail on January 29, 2025.

Respondent filed a RFO on February 7, 2025, seeking modification of child custody and parenting plan orders, as well as enforcement of the December 12, 2024, and January 21, 2025 orders. Petitioner was served on February 11th.

The court notes each party initially filed their requests as ex parte applications.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration on March 20th. Petitioner also filed a Reply to Respondent's Responsive Declaration on March 25th. Respondent was served on March 20th and 25th respectively.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 13. Petitioner was served on March 14th.

The court has read and considered the filings as set forth above. The court notes there are excessive attachments included in each of Petitioner's filings, some exceeding 70 pages. This is a common practice for Petitioner. Petitioner is strongly encouraged to refrain from including such attachments in the future. The court finds the current orders remain in the minor's best interest. Neither party has set forth a change in circumstances since the court's previous orders were made. Nor has either party set forth how their requested orders would be in the minor's best interest. The court finds there is no need for clarification of its prior orders. The prior orders are clear.

All prior orders remain in full force and effect.

Petitioner shall prepare the Findings and Orders for the RFO filed on January 22nd. Respondent shall prepare the Findings and Orders for the RFO filed on February 7th.

TENTATIVE RULING #15: THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS REMAIN IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. NEITHER PARTY HAS SET FORTH A CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES SINCE THE COURT'S PREVIOUS ORDERS WERE MADE. NOR HAS EITHER PARTY SET FORTH HOW THEIR REQUESTED ORDERS WOULD BE IN THE MINOR'S BEST INTEREST. THE COURT FINDS THERE IS NO NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF ITS PRIOR ORDERS. THE PRIOR ORDERS ARE CLEAR. ALL PRIOR ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

ORDERS FOR THE RFO FILED ON JANUARY 22ND. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS FOR THE RFO FILED ON FEBRUARY 7TH.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

16. CHRISTOPHER LARSON V. KELLY NEUMAN

24FL0750

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) requesting a modification of child custody, parenting time, and child support orders, on October 29, 2024. Respondent did not concurrently file an Income and Expense Declaration. Respondent concurrently filed a Declaration containing one of the minor's IEP. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on November 22, 2024, and a review hearing on January 23, 2025. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served by mail on October 31, 2024.

Both parties attended the CCRC appointment and were able to reach a full agreement. A report with the parties' agreement was filed with the court on January 14, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

Respondent appeared for the hearing on January 23, 2025, and requested the parties be rereferred to CCRC. The court granted the request and made additional orders including that Petitioner enroll the minors in counseling by no later than February 13th. The court adopted its tentative ruling, denying Respondent's request for child support. Respondent failed to file and serve an Income and Expense Declaration as required.

Both parties and the minors participated in the CCRC appointment on February 6th. A report with further recommendations was filed with the court on March 18, 2025. Copies were mailed to the parties on March 25th.

Neither party has filed a Supplemental Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the March 18th CCRC report to be in the minors' best interests. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #16: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 18TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

17. DALE SCHAFFER V. MARIAN FRY

24FL0800

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 21, 2025, seeking a division of community property. Respondent was mail served on February 11, 2025. Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 13 and 20, 2025. Petitioner was served on March 19, 2025. There is no Proof of Service for the Responsive Declaration filed March 20th. The court notes the declarations appear to be identical. Petitioner filed a Reply Declaration on March 25, 2025. Respondent was served the same day. Petitioner seeks what he asserts is a community share of Respondent's private disability insurance. Respondent asserts the benefit is her separate property.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds, when disability insurance is purchased during the marriage with community funds, benefits received after separation are separate property insofar as they were intended by the parties to replace the insured spouse's lost earnings in the event of disability and are community property insofar as they were intended to provide retirement income. In re Marriage of Saslow 40 C3d 848, 860 (1985). Here, it is clear from the parties' filings the insurance policy was purchased for the former, in that the policy was used to replace Respondent's income during the marriage. It does not appear either party intended the policy to provide retirement income.

When disability premiums are paid, either in full or part, after separation, benefits received after separation are entirely separate property. In re Marriage of Elfmont 9 Cal. App.4th 1026 (1995). Petitioner asserts the date of separation is May 2, 2011, which Respondent confirms. Therefore, the court finds the disability insurance policy to be Respondent's separate property.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #17: FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE, THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO DIVIDE THE DISABILITY INSURANCE POLICY. THE COURT FINDS THE POLICY TO BE RESPONDENT'S SEPARATE PROPERTY.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

18. ESPERANZA WOOLEVER V. CHRISTOPHER WOOLEVER

PFL20180325

Respondent filed an ex parte application for emergency custody orders on February 10, 2025. The court conducted a hearing on February 11, 2025, and granted Respondent's request for sole legal and physical custody of the minors. The court set a further hearing for April 3, 2025. Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on February 11, 2025, making the same requests as set forth in the ex parte application. Petitioner was served on February 11, 2025.

Respondent filed a subsequent RFO on March 5, 2025, requesting Petitioner reinstate health insurance for Petitioner and the minors. Respondent is also seeking a court order that Petitioner provide her current physical address and that if she is to relocate that it be provided within seven days. Proof of services shows Petitioner was served on March 7, 2025.

Minors' Counsel filed a Statement of Issues and Contentions and Request for Orders (SIC) on March 14, 2025. The parties were served on March 13th.

Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration and Declaration on March 20, 2025. Proof of Service shows Respondent was personally served on March 20th.

Respondent filed a Reply Declaration on March 26, 2025. Proof of Service shows it was electronically served on March 27, 2025.

Petitioner filed another Responsive "Reply" Declaration on March 26, 2025. The court finds this to be late filed if it is a Responsive Declaration. If it is a "Reply Declaration" the court finds it to be a Sur-Reply, which Petitioner has not obtained leave of court to file. It therefore, has not been considered.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court is deeply concerned with the minors' well-being. The court finds the current orders are in the minors' best interests. The court is maintaining the current orders granting Respondent sole legal and physical custody of the minors. Petitioner shall have professionally supervised parenting time a minimum of two times per week for two hours each. The minors are to continue in therapeutic services with their current therapist at a frequency and duration as recommended by the therapist. The court direct Petitioner to provide Respondent with the minors' belongings, including but not limited to their clothing, school uniforms, backpacks, school supplies, and personal items. These items are to be provided on or before April 10, 2025. The parties are both admonished to cease discussing any and all court matters with

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

the minors. The court is ordering Petitioner to engage in individual counseling to address co-parenting issues, the impact of domestic violence on children, the impact of high conflict divorce on children, and any other topics deemed appropriate by the therapist. Petitioner shall complete an intake on or before May 3, 2025, and attend counseling at a frequency and duration as directed by the therapist, not to exceed one year. The parties are to enroll in co-parenting classes by no later than May 3, 2025. Parties are to enroll in and participate in co-parenting counseling on or before May 22, 2025. Respondent shall suggest the names of three co-parenting counselors who are available and taking on new clients to Petitioner by not later than April 17, 2025. Petitioner shall select one of the three and provide the name to Respondent by no later than April 24, 2025. Parties are to complete intakes and begin co-parenting counseling at the soonest available appointment, but not later than May 22, 2025.

The court grants Respondent's request that health insurance be reinstated. The court notes the Automatic Temporary Restraining Orders (ALTROS) were put into place upon the service of the petition and summons, on October 29, 2018. Petitioner is restricted from making modifications to insurance until the judgment is entered or further order of the court. If Petitioner is unable to have Respondent reinstated to the insurance plan, Petitioner is ordered to pay for health insurance coverage that is the equivalent of the health insurance coverage Respondent was receiving. Petitioner is to immediately provide equivalent coverage in the event she cannot be covered by his insurance.

The court finds that Petitioner violated the ATROs by failing to maintain health insurance coverage for Respondent. Respondent was served with the summons on October 29, 2018, informing him of the ATROs. Further, the Petitioner was the moving party in the underlying dissolution proceedings, and therefore, was aware of the ATROs since the filing of the petition on April 25, 2018. The court reserves jurisdiction over the issue of the amount of sanctions against Petitioner for violating the ATROs to the time of trial.

As to Respondent's request that Petitioner keep him apprised of her residence, the court finds Petitioner's parenting time to be professionally supervised. As such, the court cannot find there is a need for Respondent to have Petitioner's physical address. However, if or when, Petitioner's parenting time is returned to unsupervised, the court finds that information will be necessary to Respondent. Therefore, the court is ordering Petitioner to provide Respondent with her physical address within seven days of Petitioner having unsupervised parenting time.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

All prior orders not in conflict with these orders remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #18: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT IS DEEPLY CONCERNED WITH THE MINORS' WELL-BEING. THE COURT FINDS THE CURRENT ORDERS ARE IN THE MINORS' BEST INTERESTS. THE COURT IS MAINTAINING THE CURRENT ORDERS GRANTING RESPONDENT SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY OF THE MINORS. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED PARENTING TIME A MINIMUM OF TWO TIMES PER WEEK FOR TWO HOURS EACH. THE MINORS ARE TO CONTINUE IN THERAPEUTIC SERVICES WITH THEIR CURRENT THERAPIST AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE THERAPIST. THE COURT DIRECT PETITIONER TO PROVIDE RESPONDENT WITH THE MINORS' BELONGINGS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THEIR CLOTHING, SCHOOL UNIFORMS, BACKPACKS, SCHOOL SUPPLIES, AND PERSONAL ITEMS. THESE ITEMS ARE TO BE PROVIDED ON OR BEFORE APRIL 10, 2025. THE PARTIES ARE BOTH ADMONISHED TO CEASE DISCUSSING ANY AND ALL COURT MATTERS WITH THE MINORS. THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO ENGAGE IN INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING TO ADDRESS CO-PARENTING ISSUES, THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON CHILDREN, THE IMPACT OF HIGH CONFLICT DIVORCE ON CHILDREN, AND ANY OTHER TOPICS DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY THE THERAPIST. PETITIONER SHALL COMPLETE AN INTAKE ON OR BEFORE MAY 3, 2025, AND ATTEND COUNSELING AT A FREQUENCY AND DURATION AS DIRECTED BY THE THERAPIST, NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR. THE PARTIES ARE TO ENROLL IN CO-PARENTING CLASSES BY NO LATER THAN MAY 3, 2025. PARTIES ARE TO ENROLL IN AND PARTICIPATE IN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING ON OR BEFORE MAY 22, 2025. RESPONDENT SHALL SUGGEST THE NAMES OF THREE CO-PARENTING COUNSELORS WHO ARE AVAILABLE AND TAKING ON NEW CLIENTS TO PETITIONER BY NOT LATER THAN APRIL 17, 2025. PETITIONER SHALL SELECT ONE OF THE THREE AND PROVIDE THE NAME TO RESPONDENT BY NO LATER THAN APRIL 24, 2025. PARTIES ARE TO COMPLETE INTAKES AND BEGIN CO-PARENTING COUNSELING AT THE SOONEST AVAILABLE APPOINTMENT, BUT NOT LATER THAN MAY 22, 2025.

THE COURT GRANTS RESPONDENT'S REQUEST THAT HEALTH INSURANCE BE REINSTATED. THE COURT NOTES THE AUTOMATIC TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS (ALTROS) WERE PUT INTO PLACE UPON THE SERVICE OF THE PETITION AND SUMMONS, ON OCTOBER 29, 2018. PETITIONER IS RESTRICTED FROM MAKING

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

MODIFICATIONS TO INSURANCE UNTIL THE JUDGMENT IS ENTERED OR FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT. IF PETITIONER IS UNABLE TO HAVE RESPONDENT REINSTATED TO THE INSURANCE PLAN, PETITIONER IS ORDERED TO PAY FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE THAT IS THE EQUIVALENT OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE RESPONDENT WAS RECEIVING. PETITIONER IS TO IMMEDIATELY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT COVERAGE IN THE EVENT SHE CANNOT BE COVERED BY HIS INSURANCE.

THE COURT FINDS THAT PETITIONER VIOLATED THE ATROS BY FAILING TO MAINTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT WAS SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS ON OCTOBER 29, 2018, INFORMING HIM OF THE ATROS. FURTHER, THE PETITIONER WAS THE MOVING PARTY IN THE UNDERLYING DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS, AND THEREFORE, WAS AWARE OF THE ATROS SINCE THE FILING OF THE PETITION ON APRIL 25, 2018. THE COURT RESERVES JURISDICTION OVER THE ISSUE OF THE AMOUNT OF SANCTIONS AGAINST PETITIONER FOR VIOLATING THE ATROS TO THE TIME OF TRIAL.

AS TO RESPONDENT'S REQUEST THAT PETITIONER KEEP HIM APPRISED OF HER RESIDENCE, THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S PARENTING TIME TO BE PROFESSIONALLY SUPERVISED. AS SUCH, THE COURT CANNOT FIND THERE IS A NEED FOR RESPONDENT TO HAVE PETITIONER'S PHYSICAL ADDRESS. HOWEVER, IF OR WHEN, PETITIONER'S PARENTING TIME IS RETURNED TO UNSUPERVISED, THE COURT FINDS THAT INFORMATION WILL BE NECESSARY TO RESPONDENT. THEREFORE, THE COURT IS ORDERING PETITIONER TO PROVIDE RESPONDENT WITH HER PHYSICAL ADDRESS WITHIN SEVEN DAYS OF PETITIONER HAVING UNSUPERVISED PARENTING TIME.

ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THESE ORDERS REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

19. JEFFREY JONES V. LACEY MARR-JONES

PFL20200249

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 28, 2025, requesting assets awarded to Petitioner in the judgment be sold to satisfy the judgment. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was mail served on January 29, 2025. The court notes this is a post-judgment request for modification. As such, Family Code section 215 applies to service.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court drops the matter from calendar due to the lack of proper service.

TENTATIVE RULING #19: THE MATTER IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR DUE TO THE LACK OF PROPER 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 PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

20. JENNIFER ODUM V. ROBERT ODUM

24FL0783

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 17, 2025, seeking an order waiving Respondent's preliminary and final declarations of disclosure. Respondent was mail served on January 24, 2025.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration as well as the FL-141 showing Petitioner was served with Respondent's preliminary declaration of disclosure on January 27, 2024. Proof of Service shows Petitioner was served on January 24, 2025.

Upon review of the filings as set forth above, the court finds Petitioner's request to waive Respondent's preliminary declaration of disclosure to be moot, as it has been served. That request is dropped from calendar. The court finds Petitioner's request to waive the final declaration of disclosure to be premature, therefore, that request is denied.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #20: THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO WAIVE RESPONDENT'S PRELIMINARY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE TO BE MOOT, AS IT HAS BEEN SERVED. THAT REQUEST IS DROPPED FROM CALENDAR. THE COURT FINDS PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO WAIVE THE FINAL DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE TO BE PREMATURE, THEREFORE, THAT REQUEST IS DENIED. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

21. TYLER MAIN V. KAITLYN MAIN

25FL0065

Petitioner filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 17, 2025, requesting the court make orders as to child custody and the parenting plan, as well as a request for Soberlink, and for an order for Respondent to immediately cease selling all community property and Petitioner's separate property items. Petitioner is requesting an opportunity to retrieve his personal belongings. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on February 10, 2025, and a review hearing on April 10, 2025. Respondent was served on January 27, 2025.

On January 27, 2025, the parties submitted a letter request to advance the April 10, 2025 hearing to April 3, 2025, due to the unavailability of Respondent's counsel on April 10th. The court granted the request and advanced the hearing one week.

Both parties attended CCRC on February 10, 2025, but were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on March 25, 2025, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Respondent filed a Responsive Declaration on March 27, 2025. Petitioner was served on the same day electronically. The court finds this to be late filed, and therefore, has not considered this filing.

Petitioner filed an objection to the court considering Respondent's Responsive Declaration on March 27th. The objection is granted. The court has not considered the Responsive Declaration.

The court has read and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the March 25th CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minors. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

The court denies Petitioner's request for Respondent to engage in Soberlink substance abuse testing. Petitioner has not established Respondent uses substances in a habitual manner. Further, the court finds Soberlink is not the least invasive manner of testing.

The court grants Petitioner's request Respondent cease selling all community property or Petitioner's separate property items. The Automatic Temporary Restraining Order (ATROS) have been in effect since January 27, 2025. Respondent is to immediately

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

remove all active listings and provide documentation to Petitioner for all items sold and the amount sold for to date.

The court grants Petitioner's request for a civil standby. Respondent shall provide three dates and times for which she is available between April 6, 2025, and April 13, 2025, by 5:00 PM on April 4, 2025. Petitioner shall select on by no later than noon on April 5, 2025. Petitioner shall have six hours on the date selected to remove his personal belongings.

Petitioner shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #21: THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED THE FILINGS AS OUTLINED ABOVE. THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 25TH CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINORS. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. THE COURT DENIES PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR RESPONDENT TO ENGAGE IN SOBERLINK SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING. PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED RESPONDENT USES SUBSTANCES IN A HABITUAL MANNER. FURTHER, THE COURT FINDS SOBERLINK IS NOT THE LEAST INVASIVE MANNER OF TESTING. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST RESPONDENT CEASE SELLING ALL COMMUNITY PROPERTY OR PETITIONER'S SEPARATE PROPERTY ITEMS. THE AUTOMATIC TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (ATROS) HAVE BEEN IN EFFECT SINCE JANUARY 27, 2025. RESPONDENT IS TO IMMEDIATELY REMOVE ALL ACTIVE LISTINGS AND PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION TO PETITIONER FOR ALL ITEMS SOLD AND THE AMOUNT SOLD FOR TO DATE. THE COURT GRANTS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A CIVIL STANDBY. RESPONDENT SHALL PROVIDE THREE DATES AND TIMES FOR WHICH SHE IS AVAILABLE BETWEEN APRIL 6, 2025, AND APRIL 13, 2025, BY 5:00 PM ON APRIL 4, 2025. PETITIONER SHALL SELECT ON BY NO LATER THAN NOON ON APRIL 5, 2025. PETITIONER SHALL HAVE SIX HOURS ON THE DATE SELECTED TO REMOVE HIS PERSONAL BELONGINGS. PETITIONER SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.

LAW & MOTION TENTATIVE RULINGS

DEPARTMENT 5

April 3, 2025

8:30 a.m./1:30 p.m.

22. VALERIE VALDEZ V. DUSTIN PEEK

24FL0105

Respondent filed a Request for Order (RFO) on January 28, 2025, seeking modification of the current child custody and parenting plan orders. The parties were referred to Child Custody Recommending Counseling (CCRC) for an appointment on February 5, 2025, and a review hearing set for April 3, 2025. Petitioner was personally served on January 30, 2025.

Both parties attended CCRC on February 5, 2025, and were unable to reach any agreements. A report with recommendations was filed with the court on March 21, 2025, and mailed to the parties the same day.

Petitioner has not filed a Responsive Declaration.

The court has reviewed and considered the filings as outlined above. The court finds the recommendations as set forth in the March 21st CCRC report to be in the best interest of the minor. The court adopts the recommendations as set forth.

All prior orders not in conflict with this order remain in full force and effect. Respondent shall prepare and file the Findings and Orders After Hearing.

TENTATIVE RULING #22: THE COURT FINDS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE MARCH 21ST CCRC REPORT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE MINOR. THE COURT ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS SET FORTH. ALL PRIOR ORDERS NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDER REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. RESPONDENT SHALL PREPARE AND FILE THE FINDINGS AND ORDERS AFTER HEARING.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY PHONE CALL TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6725 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 PHONE CALL OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07.