

1. 23CV2009 ADOPTION PETITION OF CAVENDAR

Petition Hearing

Petitioner submitted a verified Petition requesting court authorization to inspect her original birth certificate.

Health & Safety Code § 102705 governs adoption records as follows:

All records and information specified in this article, other than the newly issued birth certificate, shall be available only upon the order of the superior court of the county of residence of the adopted child or the superior court of the county granting the order of adoption.

No such order shall be granted by the superior court unless a verified petition setting forth facts showing the necessity of the order has been presented to the court and good and compelling cause is shown for the granting of the order. The clerk of the superior court shall send a copy of the petition to the State Department of Social Services and the department shall send a copy of all records and information it has concerning the adopted person with the name and address of the natural parents removed to the court. The court must review these records before making an order and the order should so state. If the petition is by or on behalf of an adopted child who has attained majority, these facts shall be given great weight, but the granting of any petition is solely within the sound discretion of the court.

The name and address of the natural parents shall be given to the petitioner only if he or she can demonstrate that the name and address, or either of them, are necessary to assist him or her in establishing a legal right.

The Clerk of the court has forwarded the Petition to the State via email on March 4 and again on March 21, 2024, but has not yet received a response. The court is not able to approve the Petition prior to receipt of the requested documents from the State.

TENTATIVE RULING #1: THE MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 8:30 A.M. ON FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2024, IN DEPARTMENT NINE, IN ORDER TO ALLOW TIME TO RECEIVE A RESPONSE FROM THE STATE.

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

06-07-24
Dept. 9
Tentative Rulings

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

2. 21CV0313 SAMULEWSKI ET AL v. CYPHERS, ET AL

Motion to be Relieved as Counsel

Counsel for the Defendants 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 due to the long illness and ultimate death of the litigation attorney for the firm, Petitioner is closing the law firm and has taken employment with a defense firm, and so can no longer represent the Plaintiffs. Further, Plaintiff Janet Samulewski passed away on December 6, 2022.

Code of Civil Procedure § 284(2) and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362 allow an attorney to withdraw after notice to the client. Proof of service of the motion on the Defendants at their last known address and on counsel for Plaintiff was filed on May 3, 2024.

A Case Management Conference is currently scheduled on July 23, 2024, and the date is listed in the proposed Order as required by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1362(e).

TENTATIVE RULING #2: ABSENT OBJECTION, THE MOTION IS GRANTED. COUNSEL IS DIRECTED TO SERVE A COPY OF THE SIGNED ORDER (FORM MC-053) ON THE CLIENT AND ALL PARTIES THAT HAVE APPEARED IN THE CASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT, RULE 3.1362(e).

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999).

NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING. IF A PARTY OR PARTIES WISH TO APPEAR BY ZOOM PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (530) 621-5867 AND MEETING INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED.

3. 24CV0870 MATTER OF K. LEE

Expedited Approval of Compromise of Minor's Claim

This is a Petition to compromise a minor's claim. The minor's father was appointed guardian ad litem for the purpose of this hearing as of May 2, 2024. Petitioner requests the court authorize a compromise of the minor's claim against defendant/respondent in the gross amount of \$8,000.

The Petition states the minor sustained injuries to her neck, chest and right shoulder, as well as mental health consequences including feelings of anxiety, nightmares and fear resulting from an auto accident in 2022. There is no copy of the accident investigation report filed with the Petition, as required by Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12A(4).

The Petition states there are no reimbursable medical expenses that would be deducted from the settlement.

The Petition states that the minor has fully recovered and there are no permanent injuries. There is no doctor's report concerning the minor's condition and prognosis of recovery attached, as required by Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12A.(3).

The minor's attorney requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,000.00, which represents 25% of the gross settlement amount. The court uses a reasonable fee standard when approving and allowing the amount of attorney's fees payable from money or property paid or to be paid for the benefit of a minor or a person with a disability. (Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12A.(8); California Rules of Court, Rule 7.955(a)(1).) The Petition does not include a Declaration by the attorney as required by California Rules of Court, Rule 7.955(c).

The minor's attorney also requests reimbursement for costs in the amount of \$450. The amount of \$435 is attributed to court filing fees, and a copy of the check for the other \$15.00 is attached to substantiate the claimed costs attached to the Petition as required by Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12A.(6).

With respect to the \$5,550 due to the minor, the Petition requests that they be deposited into an insured account, subject to withdrawal with court authorization. The Petition does not include the name and address of the depository, as required by Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12A(7).

The minor's presence at the hearing is required in order for the court to approve the Petition. Local Rules of the El Dorado County Superior Court, Rule 7.10.12.D.

TENTATIVE RULING #3: THE MATTER IS CONTINUED TO 8:30 A.M. ON JUNE 21, 2024, IN ORDER TO GIVE THE PETITIONER AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE THE DOCUMENTS REQUIRED BY LOCAL RULE 7.10.12A TO SUPPORT THE PETITION.

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

4. 24CV0405 CHAPMAN, TRUSTEE, ET AL v. JACKSON, TRUSTEE, ET AL

Preliminary Injunction

The Complaint in this case is filed by the Chapman Family Revocable Living Trust (“Trust”) as the owner of real property, and the Defendants are the owners of the adjacent real property. The allegations of the Complaint are that there are encroaching structures on Plaintiff's property built by Defendants. The Complaint seeks preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants enjoining them from encroaching on Plaintiffs’ property.

The motion for preliminary injunction was filed at the same time as the Complaint in February. No Answer was filed, and default was requested and entered on May 1.

On May 13, following a hearing on an ex parte motion to set aside the default, the motion was voluntarily withdrawn after the parties appeared.

There is no opposition to the motion for preliminary injunction.

The court requests appearances on the issue of whether the motion for preliminary injunction is moot given the entry of default.

TENTATIVE RULING #4: APPEARANCES ARE REQUIRED AT 8:30 A.M. ON FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2024, IN DEPARTMENT NINE.

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

5. 24CV1000 FICHTNER v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

The Complaint in this action alleged personal injuries suffered by a minor as a result of a dog attack and includes causes of action for negligence, strict liability, breach of fiduciary duty, negligent hiring, negligent failure to warn and premises liability.

Plaintiff's father has applied to be appointed guardian ad litem for the Plaintiff. The application states that the applicant is not aware of any actual or potential conflict that would or might arise from the appointment.

There is no opposition to the application on file with the court.

TENTATIVE RULING #5: ABSENT OBJECTION THE APPLICATION FOR APPOINTMENT AS GUARDIAN AD LITEM IS APPROVED.

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

6. PCL20140318 MOUNTAIN LION ACQUISITIONS v. COLLINS

Motion to Set Aside Default Judgment

A Default Judgment was entered in this case on August 4, 2014. The underlying action involves a Promissory Note executed by Defendant in favor of CashCall. The Promissory Note, dated May 12, 2012, is attached to the August 14, 2014, Declaration of Don Summers in Support of Default Judgment, as is a record of partial payments made by Defendant on the Note during 2012. Plaintiff later purchased the Note from CashCall.

Proof of service of the Summons and Complaint was filed on June 18, 2014, showing substituted service made on June 5, 2014 to a person in charge at the usual place of business of the Defendant, followed by mailing to the address where the copies were left on June 10, 2014.

The motion to vacate and set aside the default judgment states that the Defendant failed to timely respond to the Complaint through inadvertence and/or oversight, and that Defendant was unaware of the proceeding.

In a Declaration dated May 10, 2024, Defendant specifically declares that the judgment should be set aside because:

1. The case CFPB v. CashCall, Inc., No. 18-55407 (9th Cir. 2022) found that CashCall engaged in illegal lending practices and the debt may be unenforceable.
2. Attorney D. Scott Carruthers, the attorney who purchased the debt and filed the original judgment, was disbarred in 2022, allegedly for “improper debt collection practices”; although the attached Sate Bar Report does confirm disbarment, it does not include the substance of disciplinary violations.
3. The Plaintiff corporation that is owned by D. Scott Carruthers is not in good standing with the Secretary of State; however, the attachment to the Declaration indicates that the corporation is in active status with the Secretary of State as of the date of the attachment in 2021.
4. The judgment is not valid because the Plaintiff’s name is misspelled in the October 11, 2014 Abstract of Judgment.

California Code, Code of Civil Procedure § 473 specifies the court’s authority to set aside a default judgment:

(b) The court may, upon any terms as may be just, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Application for this relief shall be accompanied by a copy of the answer or other pleading proposed to be filed therein, otherwise the application shall not be granted, and shall be

made within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months, after the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken. . . .

In this case, there is no allegation in the motion of “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.” Further, the motion was made nearly ten years after the default judgment was entered. Under these circumstances the court has not authority to set aside the default judgment.

TENTATIVE RULING #6: DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT IS DENIED.

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT’S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999).

NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING. IF A PARTY OR PARTIES WISH TO APPEAR BY ZOOM PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (530) 621-5867 AND MEETING INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED.

7. 24CV0817 PNC BANK, N.A. v. DYKSTRA ENTERPRISES INC., ET AL

Writ of Possession

Plaintiff filed an action against defendant for claim and delivery, breach of contract and conversion related to financing the purchase of a Bobcat excavator (“Equipment”). Plaintiff applies for the issuance of a prejudgment writ of possession.

The Plaintiff must serve upon the defendant with a copy of the Summons and Complaint, a notice of the application and hearing date, and a copy of the application for writ of possession and the affidavits in support of the application. Code of Civil Procedure § 512.030. Proof of service as to both Defendants was filed with the court on May 15, 2024. The proof of service filed with the court declares that defendant Dykstra was personally served with the Summons, Complaint, and documents related to the hearing on the application for writ of possession on May 12, 2024, and that Dykstra Enterprises, Inc. was served on the same date through personal service on Dykstra as its agent for service of process.

A writ of possession shall issue if both of the following are found: (1) the Plaintiff has established the probable validity of the claim to possession of the property; and (2) the Plaintiff has provided an undertaking as required by Section 515.010. Code of Civil Procedure § 512.060(a). “A claim has ‘probable validity’ where it is more likely than not that the plaintiff will obtain a judgment against the defendant on that claim.” Code of Civil Procedure § 511.090.

The definition of “probable validity” calls for the establishment of a prima facie case by the plaintiff, who has the burden of proof on this issue; and the plaintiff will not be entitled to the writ if the defendant shows that there is a reasonable probability of a successful defense to the action. (Legislative Com. Comment to C.C.P. 512.060.) Thus, if the defendant appears, the court must consider the relative merits of the positions of both parties and determine the probable outcome of the litigation. (Law Rev. Com. Comment to C.C.P. 511.090.)

6 Witkin, California Procedure (5th ed. 2008) Provisional Remedies, § 261, page 208.

Plaintiff has filed a Declaration of Michael McGinley, dated April 18, 2024 (“Declaration”), in support of the application for writ of possession, which declares:

1. Plaintiff and Defendant entered into an agreement for financing the purchase of the Equipment; Defendant pledged the Equipment as security for the financing. Declaration ¶¶5-6, Exhibit 1. See Code of Civil Procedure § 512.010(b)(1) (If the basis of the Plaintiff’s claim is a written instrument, a copy of that instrument shall be attached to the application for a writ of possession.)

2. Plaintiff holds a security interest in the Equipment. Declaration ¶6, Exhibit 2.
3. Defendant defaulted in payments on August 15, 2023, and there remains \$46,674.40 due and owing on the contract, not including interest late charges and fees. Declaration ¶¶15-16, Exhibit 3.
4. Plaintiff believes the Equipment is in the possession or under the control of Defendants, and to the best of the declarant's knowledge, the Equipment is located at 3130 Springer Road, Placerville, CA 95667, or at 6201 Enterprise Drive, Suite B, Diamond Springs, CA 95619. Declaration ¶¶20-21.
5. Plaintiff has made a demand for the Equipment but Defendants have failed and refused to deliver the Equipment to Plaintiff. Declaration ¶24.
6. The Equipment has not been taken for tax, assessment, or fine pursuant to a statute and has not been seized under an execution against Plaintiff's property. Declaration ¶25.

There is no opposition to the application in the court's file. In the absence of opposition, the court finds that Plaintiff has established a prima facie case that it is more likely than not that the Plaintiff will obtain a judgment against the Defendant on the claim, and Defendant has not shown that there is a reasonable probability of a successful defense to the action. (See Code of Civil Procedure, § 512.060(a) and 6 Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Provisional Remedies, § 263, page 210).

Undertaking

Code of Civil Procedure, § 515.010(b) provides that:

If the court finds that the defendant has no interest in the property, the court shall waive the requirement of the plaintiff's undertaking and shall include in the order for issuance of the writ the amount of the defendant's undertaking sufficient to satisfy the requirements of subdivision (b) of Section 515.020.

Defendant has submitted evidence that the fair market value of the Equipment is \$65,000. Declaration ¶27, that the unpaid principal balance is \$47,674, Declaration ¶29, and that the Agreement grants no right of ownership of the Equipment to Defendants until all payments under the Agreement are made. Declaration, ¶ 30. Inasmuch as it has been established by the evidence submitted that Defendant has no interest in the property, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure, § 515.010(b) the court waives the requirement of the Plaintiff's undertaking.

Code of Civil Procedure § 515.020 allows the Defendant to prevent the Plaintiff from taking possession of the Equipment by filing an undertaking with the court in the amount equal to the amount of the Plaintiff's undertaking, and the court is required by Code of Civil Procedure § 515.010(b) to set the amount of that undertaking in its Order issuing the writ. Plaintiff requests

the Defendants' undertaking amount be set at \$75,000, representing the market value of the Equipment and estimates of Plaintiff's costs at \$10,000 if the matter goes to trial.

TENTATIVE RULING #7: THE WRIT OF POSSESSION IS GRANTED; PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, § 515.010(B) THE REQUIREMENT OF PLAINTIFF'S UNDERTAKING IS WAIVED; IF DEFENDANT SHOULD FILE AN UNDERTAKING PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE § 515.020, THE AMOUNT OF THAT UNDERTAKING IS SET AT \$75,000.

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

8. 22CV1378 T.C. v. DOE 1

**Demurrer
Motion to Strike**

Plaintiff filed the Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) on January 9, 2023. It alleges negligence by five separate county governments, including Sacramento County. Nevada County’s demurrer to the SAC was granted following a hearing on September 1, 2023. Sacramento County has filed a demurrer to the SAC, and a motion to strike.

Plaintiff was removed from her family in Sacramento County and temporarily resided in a foster home in Sacramento County, regarding which there is no allegation of sexual assault. She was placed in “Foster Home 1” in Yolo County when she was approximately six years old. SAC ¶30. The SAC alleges that in this Yolo County foster home Plaintiff was sexually assaulted by another foster child in the home. SAC ¶¶32-33. Plaintiff was then placed in “Foster Home 2” in El Dorado County, where she was sexually assaulted by her foster mother and her foster mother’s son. SAC ¶¶37, 39-40. These alleged acts constituted “childhood sexual assault” as defined in Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(d). SAC ¶¶34, 41. The only connection of this childhood sexual assault to Sacramento County is asserted at SAC ¶16, which alleges an agency relationship among the county governments named in the SAC.

Request for Judicial Notice

County requests the court to take judicial notice of certain state statutes and regulations. Judicial notice is a mechanism which allows the court to take into consideration matters which are presumed to be indisputably true. California Evidence Code Sections 451, 452, and 453 collectively govern the circumstances in which judicial notice of a matter may be taken. Evidence Code Section 452 lists matters of which the court may take judicial notice, including ““regulations and legislative enactments issued by or under the authority of the of the United States or any public entity in the United States.” Evidence Code § 452(b). A trial court is required to take judicial notice of any matter listed in section 452 if a party requests it and gives the other party sufficient notice to prepare to meet the request. Evidence Code § 453. Accordingly, County’s request for judicial notice is granted.

Demurrer

The SAC’s Second Cause of Action for negligence is the only one applicable to Sacramento County (“County”), and the County’s demurrer is directed at that Second Cause of Action.

Standard of Review

A demurrer tests the sufficiency of a complaint by raising questions of law. (*Rader Co. v. Stone* (1986) 178 Cal.App.3d 10, 20, 223 Cal.Rptr. 806.) In determining the merits of a

demurrer, all material facts pleaded in the complaint and those that arise by reasonable implication, but not conclusions of fact or law, are deemed admitted by the demurring party. (*Moore v. Conliffe, supra*, 7 Cal.4th at p. 638, 29 Cal.Rptr.2d 152, 871 P.2d 204; *Interinsurance Exchange v. Narula, supra*, 33 Cal.App.4th at p. 1143, 39 Cal.Rptr.2d 752.) The complaint must be construed liberally by drawing reasonable inferences from the facts pleaded. (*Flynn v. Higham* (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 677, 679, 197 Cal.Rptr. 145.)

Rodas v. Spiegel, 87 Cal. App. 4th 513, 517 (2001).

In addition to the facts actually pleaded, the court considers facts of which it may or must take judicial notice. Cantu v. Resolution Trust Corp., 4 Cal.App.4th 857, 877 (1992).

Certificate of Merit

The County demurs to the SAC because it does not comply with the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(f) and (g), which require filing certificates of merit for plaintiffs over 40 years of age at the time of filing. Plaintiff in fact fell into this category and filed certificates of merit on December 12, 2022. However, those certificates of merit were apparently never served on Sacramento County.

Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(i) provides that the certificates of merit need not be served on the Defendant until the court has reviewed those certificates and has found “there is reasonable and meritorious cause for the filing of the action against that defendant.” Once that finding is made the Plaintiff has a duty to serve the certificate relating to a particular Defendant on that Defendant. Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(i). The court entered an Order on December 27, 2022, and authorized Plaintiff to file a First Amended Complaint. The Plaintiff did file a First Amended Complaint on December 27, 2022, but immediately thereafter filed the SAC on January 9, 2023, before serving notice of the First Amended Complaint. The Summons and Complaint for the SAC that was served on Sacramento County, filed with the court on February 2, 2023, did not include the certificate of merit pertaining to Sacramento County. Nor does the SAC recite any compliance with this requirement.

The failure to comply with a statutory requirement of service is not a pleading requirement that relates to the County’s demurrer, and given the court’s ruling on this motion the issue has been rendered moot as to Sacramento County. However, the court notes that if the Plaintiff intends to pursue a claim against any of the named Defendants she will have to comply with this requirement.

Uncertainty

The parties have briefed multiple theories in their pleadings related to the County’s demurrer. Among the arguments in support of its demurrer, County argues that the SAC is defective as uncertain and is subject to demurrer under Code of Civil Procedure § 430.10(f). Specifically, County argues that the SAC fails to sufficiently identify specific conduct of

Defendant in order to allow it to properly answer the allegations. The court finds that this argument is sufficient grounds to sustain the demurrer. Other arguments, such as whether statutory duties had been enacted at the time of the alleged conduct, or whether those statutes establish discretionary or mandatory duties, are difficult to analyze when the SAC does not specify the conduct on the part of the County that is at issue.

The SAC describes the duties of all Defendants without identifying specific acts or omissions attributable to any Defendant in Paragraphs 14-27. The SAC attributes to all Defendants notice of the risk of harm and resulting harm to Plaintiff in Paragraphs 42-57, including broad statements of systemic deficiencies in foster care systems that bear no relation to the facts specific to Plaintiff's case. The SAC describes breaches of duty equally attributable to all Defendants without distinction in Paragraphs 58-62, again referencing "systemic and chronic issues and failures in the foster care system" but without describing any specific actions or omissions by any particular Defendant. Each of the identical five Causes of Action in the SAC is directed to one of the five named Defendants, without any differentiation as to what conduct by each Defendant is asserted as the basis for liability.

The court agrees that the SAC does not describe facts with sufficient particularity to allow the County to defend the case. Plaintiff entered into foster care in Sacramento County, her original county of residence. SAC ¶29. Foster Home 1, where the first incidents of alleged abuse occurred, was located in Yolo County. SAC ¶30. Plaintiff reported the abuse to her foster mother and in Yolo County. SAC ¶42. There is no allegation that the foster mother reported the abuse to Yolo County, or that Yolo County reported the abuse to Sacramento County. There is no allegation that Foster Home 1 had been identified by either Yolo County or Sacramento County as unsafe. The abuse was not committed by any adult or permanent resident of the foster home; rather, Perpetrator 1 in Yolo County's Foster Home 1 was a minor who was also a foster child. Thus the allegation that Sacramento County "knew, or had reason to know, or [was] otherwise on notice of misconduct", or that Sacramento County was aware of "a propensity to engage in the sexual abuse of children" in Yolo County's Foster Home 1 before Plaintiff's abuse was reported appears to be an unsupported factual conclusion. SAC ¶¶46-47.

Foster Home 2 was located in El Dorado County, and Plaintiff reported the abuse to her El Dorado County social worker. SAC ¶43. There is no allegation that El Dorado County reported the abuse at Foster Home 2 to Sacramento County. The only connection of this childhood sexual assault to Sacramento County is asserted at SAC ¶16, which alleges an agency relationship among the county governments. The SAC does not specify any statutory or contractual basis for this agency relationship. The SAC does not specify any Sacramento County employee whose actions could form the basis for Sacramento County's vicarious liability. The SAC does not specify any conduct on the part of Sacramento County that could establish a breach of duty on

the part of Sacramento County that could support direct liability for negligence. Accordingly, the court will sustain the County's demurrer with leave to amend.

Given that the County's demurrer to the Second Cause of Action is sustained, the County's motion to strike the Second Cause of Action is moot.

TENTATIVE RULING #8:

- (1) DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IS GRANTED.**
- (2) DEFENDANT'S DEMURRER IS SUSTAINED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND WITHIN 10 DAYS.**
- (3) DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE IS MOOT.**

NO HEARING ON THIS MATTER WILL BE HELD UNLESS A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT IS TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE COURT'S WEBSITE OR BY TELEPHONE TO THE COURT AT (530) 621-6551 BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; LOCAL RULE 8.05.07; SEE ALSO LEWIS V. SUPERIOR COURT, 19 CAL.4TH 1232, 1247 (1999).

NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES OF A REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT AND THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH ARGUMENT IS BEING REQUESTED MUST BE MADE BY TELEPHONE OR IN PERSON BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. CAL. RULE CT. 3.1308; EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL RULE 8.05.07. PROOF OF SERVICE OF SAID NOTICE MUST BE FILED PRIOR TO OR AT THE HEARING.

LONG CAUSE HEARINGS MUST BE REQUESTED BY 4:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED AND THE PARTIES ARE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. LONG CAUSE ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTS WILL BE SET FOR HEARING ON ONE OF THE THREE MUTUALLY AGREEABLE DATES ON FRIDAY AFTERNOONS AT 2:30 P.M. THE COURT WILL ADVISE THE PARTIES OF THE LONG CAUSE HEARING DATE AND TIME BY 5:00 P.M. ON THE DAY THE TENTATIVE RULING IS ISSUED. PARTIES MAY PERSONALLY APPEAR AT THE HEARING. IF A PARTY OR PARTIES WISH TO APPEAR BY ZOOM PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (530) 621-5867 AND MEETING INFORMATION WILL BE PROVIDED.

9. 24CV0712 NAME CHANGE OF HARDEN

Petition for Name Change

Petitioner filed a Petition for Change of Name on April 9, 2024.

Proof of publication was filed on May 3, 2024, as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1277(a).

A background check has been filed with the court as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1279.5(f).

TENTATIVE RULING #9: ABSENT OBJECTION, THE PETITION IS GRANTED AS REQUESTED.

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

10. 24CV0565 NAME CHANGE OF ZACHARY

Petition for Name Change

Petitioner filed a Petition for Change of Name on March 22, 2024.

Proof of publication was filed on April 19, 2024, as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1277(a).

A background check has been filed with the court as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1279.5(f).

TENTATIVE RULING #10: ABSENT OBJECTION, THE PETITION IS GRANTED AS REQUESTED.

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

11. 24CV0752 NAME CHANGE OF ARUMUGAM

Petition for Name Change

Petitioner filed a Petition for Change of Name on April 12, 2024.

Proof of publication was filed on May 30, 2024, as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1277(a).

A background check has been filed with the court as required by Code of Civil Procedure § 1279.5(f).

TENTATIVE RULING #10: ABSENT OBJECTION, THE PETITION IS GRANTED AS REQUESTED.

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