SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

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

Friday, October 24, 2025

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

Courtroom 13 – Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser

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

Date: Friday, October 24, 2025
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

19CV-05130 Jessica Adams, et al. vs Kings View, et al.

Motion for Final Approval: Class Action & PAGA Settlement

Appearance required. Appearance required to discuss updated information regarding Class Members' responses to the settlement and the final compliance hearing date.

Upon satisfaction, the court will sign the order lodged with the court on October 2, 2025.

Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

24CV-03660 Foster Poultry Farms, LLC vs Pet Treat Holdings

Motion Dismiss or Stay for Forum Non Conveniens

Defendant's motion to dismiss or stay for forum non conveniens is GRANTED.

The current case 24CV-03660 is stayed.

As a threshold determination, the court has found that there is a suitable alternative forum and that the statute of limitations does not bar the action.

The balancing of private and public factors weighs in favor of Defendant. A large portion of the allegations at issue occurred in Wisconsin. The contract was negotiated in Wisconsin, the product was developed and produced in Wisconsin, the sole manufacturing facility for this product is located in Wisconsin, the materials for the product were shipped to and used Wisconsin, the product was shipped from Wisconsin. Overall, Defendant's cumulative connection to California regarding this incident is minimal.

Accordingly, Wisconsin and its citizens have a greater interest in the subject of the dispute.

Plaintiff may request that the stay of the California action be lifted if jurisdiction over the Defendant in the other forum cannot be obtained, or if Defendant raise a statute of limitations defense in the other forum.

Demurrer to First Amended Cross-Complaint

The demurrer to the first amended cross-complaint is deemed moot in light of the court's ruling on Defendant's motion to dismiss or stay for forum non conveniens.

Motion to Strike Portions of First Amended Cross-Complaint

The motion to strike portions of the first amended cross-complaint is deemed moot in light of the court's ruling on Defendant's motion to dismiss or stay for forum non conveniens.

Motion to Seal Portions of Exhibit to Balkissoon

The motion to seal portions of exhibit is deemed moot in light of the court's ruling on Defendant's motion to dismiss or stay for forum non conveniens.

25CV-00857 David Neal vs Lucy Lopez, et al.

Motion for an Order Quashing Defendants County of Merced & Lucy Lopez's Subpoenas for Plaintiff's Medical Billing Records to Various Providers

Plaintiff's motion for an order quashing Defendants' subpoenas for Plaintiff's medical billing records is GRANTED in part, and DENIED in part.

Although a litigant waives their right to privacy in the subject of the litigation by bringing suit, the scope of that waiver must be narrowly construed. (*Vinson v. Superior Court* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 833, 842; see also, *Britt v. Superior Court* (1978) 20 Cal.3d 844, 859.) An implicit waiver of a party's constitutional rights encompasses only that discovery that is directly relevant to the plaintiff's claim and essential to the fair resolution of the lawsuit.

(*Vinson*, *supra*, 43 Cal.3d at p. 842; as cited by *Davis v. Superior Court* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1008, 1014.)

Plaintiff has waived his right to privacy in the requested records to some degree by initiating this lawsuit. However, construing this waiver narrowly, the subpoenas issued by Defendants are overbroad.

The request to quash the subpoenas is DENIED, subject to the following modification as to each subpoena: the description of billing records subject to subpoena is modified to include *only those billing records from June 25, 2024, to present*, and is limited to Plaintiff's *neck and back injuries, vertigo, tinnitus, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)*, *and neuropathy/neurological treatment of the right upper extremities*.

The request for monetary sanctions is GRANTED. Defendants should have known their request was overbroad and subject to a motion to quash. However, the court finds it reasonable to reduce the requested amount to $1,000, to be paid by Defendants within thirty (30) days of this Court's order.

25CV-02170 City of Fresno Employees Retirement System, et al. vs. City of Fresno

Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-04747 Petition of: Maria Mendoza

Order to Show Cause Re: Name Change

Appearance required. Proof of publication was filed October 17, 2025. Absent objection at the time of the hearing, the petition will be GRANTED.

25CV-05160 Monica Eber vs Aixandra Ramos

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. Proof of service on Respondent of the notice of hearing is on file. Response has been filed and served on Petitioner.

25CV-05219 David Daniel vs Sarah Bocanegra

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. No proof of service on Respondent has been filed with the court.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Civil Law and Motion
Hon. Carol Ash
Courtroom 1

2260 N Street, Merced

Date: Friday, October 24, 2025
9:30 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

CSPA Groundwater Cases # 21CV-01691 & 21CV-02127

Review of Case Status

Appearance required. Appear to address case status.