

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

2260 N Street, Merced
627 W. 21st Street, Merced
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Wednesday, April 01, 2026

Tentative rulings are provided for the following courtrooms and assigned Judicial Officers with scheduled civil matters:

Courtroom 8 – Hon. Stephanie L. Jamieson

Courtroom 9 – Commissioner David Foster

Courtroom 12 – Hon. Jennifer O. Trimble

Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to seek permission and arrange for a remote appearance.

IMPORTANT: Court reporters will NOT be provided; parties must make their own arrangements. Electronic recording is available in certain courtrooms and may only be activated upon request.

The tentative rulings for specific calendars follow:

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Civil Law and Motion Tentative Rulings
Hon. Stephanie L. Jamieson
Courtroom 8

627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, April 01, 2026
8:15 a.m.

The following tentative rulings shall become the ruling of the court unless a party gives notice of intention to appear as follows:

1. You must call (209) 725-4240 to notify the court of your intent to appear.
2. You must give notice to all other parties before 4:00 p.m. of your intent to appear.

Per California Rules of Court, rule 3.1308(a)(1), failure to do both items 1 and 2 will result in no oral argument. *Note:* Notifying CourtCall (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

Case No. Title / Description

20CV-01569 Mikeiah Hargrett, et al. vs. William Gustavo Lopez, et al.

Motion for Order Requiring Plaintiff to Pay Expenses of Proof

Defendant's motion for costs of proof is DENIED.

Defendant moves for an award of his attorney's fees and other costs of proof under Code of Civil Procedure section 2033.420, which provides that, "If a party fails to admit the genuineness of any document or the truth of any matter when requested to do so under this chapter, and if the party requesting that admission thereafter proves the genuineness of that document or the truth of that matter, the party requesting the admission may move the court for an order requiring the party to whom the request was directed to pay the reasonable expenses incurred in making that proof, including reasonable attorney's fees." (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.420, subd. (a).)

"The primary purpose of requests for admissions is to set at rest triable issues so that they will not have to be tried; they are aimed at expediting trial. The basis for imposing sanctions . . . is directly related to that purpose. Unlike other discovery sanctions, an award of expenses . . . is not a penalty. Instead, it is designed to reimburse reasonable expenses incurred by a party in proving the truth of a requested admission . . . such that trial would have been expedited or shortened if the request had been admitted.'" (*Stull v.*

Sparrow (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 860, 865, citations omitted.) “ ‘The determination of whether a party is entitled to expenses under [Code of Civil Procedure] section 2033, subdivision (o) [current § 2033.420] is within the sound discretion of the trial court.’” (Id. at p. 864, citation omitted.)

“[I]t is entirely within the trial court's discretion to determine whether a party proved the truth of matter that had been denied. That an issue be proved is an express statutory prerequisite to recovery under section 2033, subdivision (o) [current § 2033.420]. Proof is something more than just evidence. It is the establishment of a fact in the mind of a judge or jury by way of evidence. Until a trier of fact is exposed to evidence and concludes that the evidence supports a position, it cannot be said that anything has been proved.” (Id. at pp. 865–866, citations omitted.)

This matter was decided by way of nonsuit. No evidence was presented by Defendant proving the truth of the matter that had been denied.

Accordingly, the motion is denied.

25CV-01878 William Mooneyham., et al. vs Steve Mooneyham., et al.

Demurrer to Second Amended Complaint

Continued to May 6, 2026, at 8:15 a.m. in Courtroom 8 to allow Plaintiffs to file an amended complaint.

If an amended complaint is filed at least three (3) court days before that date the hearing will come off calendar.

25CV-06778 Petition of: Larry Chavez

Order to Show Cause Re: Name Change

Appearance required. Appear to show proof of publication of petition.

26CV-00761 Petition of: Jessica Casares Velasquez

Order to Show Cause Re: Name Change

Appearance required. Appear to show proof of publication of petition and proof of service of notice on the non-petitioning parent.

26CV-01158

Matthew McVey vs Rob Abate

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. Proof of unsuccessful service on Respondent was filed March 13, 2026.

26CV-01287

Ian Paulo-Watkins vs Melvin Cheever

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. Proof of unsuccessful service on Respondent was filed March 16, 2026.

26CV-01288

Joshua Evans vs Melvin Cheever

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. There is no proof of service on Respondent on file.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Limited Civil
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9

627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, April 01, 2026
10:00 a.m.

The following tentative rulings shall become the ruling of the court unless a party gives notice of intention to appear as follows:

1. You must call (209) 725-4240 to notify the court of your intent to appear.
2. You must give notice to all other parties before 4:00 p.m. of your intent to appear.

Per California Rules of Court, rule 3.1308(a)(1), failure to do both items 1 and 2 will result in no oral argument. *Note:* Notifying CourtCall (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

Case No.	Title / Description
----------	---------------------

25CV-00069	Onemain Financial Group, LLC vs. Edilberta Cruz
------------	---

Review Hearing – Status of Settlement

Appearance required. The Court has reviewed plaintiff's case management conference statement filed on March 16, 2026. Plaintiff indicates that the Defendant has defaulted on the settlement agreement and requests that the Court set the case for court trial.

25CV-02208	Midland Credit Management, Inc. vs Isabel Nuno
------------	--

Review Hearing – Status of Settlement

Appearance required. At the case management conference on November 14, 2025, counsel for plaintiff indicated the parties had reached a settlement. Appear to address the status of the settlement agreement.

25CV-03941 Cedric Wallace vs. Kenny K. Auto Sales

Order of Examination (Small Claims) – Kenny K Auto Sales

Appearance required.

25CV-05568 Bank of America, N.A. vs. Laura Chavez

Order to Show Cause re: Dismissal – Notice of Settlement

On January 23, 2026, Plaintiff filed a stipulation agreement as well as a notice of conditional settlement indicating that a dismissal would be filed no later than December 10, 2026. The present OSC was scheduled prematurely. If no party appears to request a specific date for the continuing hearing, the Court intends on its own motion to continue the OSC re: dismissal to Wednesday, February 10, 2027, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 9 and direct the clerk's office to provide notice to the parties.

25CV-06781 [Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]

Review Hearing – Status of Stipulation

Appearance required.

26CV-00333 [Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]

Court Trial: Unlawful Detainer

Appearance required. Trial was continued from March 18, 2026.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Limited Civil Short Cause Trials
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9

627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, April 01, 2026
1:30 p.m.

The following tentative rulings shall become the ruling of the court unless a party gives notice of intention to appear as follows:

1. You must call (209) 725-4240 to notify the court of your intent to appear.
2. You must give notice to all other parties before 4:00 p.m. of your intent to appear.

Per California Rules of Court, rule 3.1308(a)(1), failure to do both items 1 and 2 will result in no oral argument. *Note:* Notifying CourtCall (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

Case No.	Title / Description
24CV-02706	LVNV Funding LLC vs. Laura Vargas
	Court Trial
	Appearance required.
24CV-04186	LVNV Funding LLC vs. Laura Vargas
	Court Trial
	Appearance required.
25CV-00888	Discover Bank vs. Maria D Gutierrez
	Court Trial
	Appearance required.

25CV-01248

Citibank, N.A. vs. Hefziba Medina

Court Trial

Appearance required.
