

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

2260 N Street, Merced
627 W. 21st Street, Merced
2840 West Sandy Mush Road, Merced
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, October 2, 2025

NOTE: Merced Superior Court will no longer be consolidating Courtroom 8 and Courtroom 10.

Tentative Rulings are provided for the following Courtrooms and assigned Judicial Officers with scheduled civil matters:

Courtroom 8 – Hon. Donald Proietti

Courtroom 9 – Commissioner David Foster

Courtroom 12 – Hon. Jennifer O. Trimble

Courtroom 13 – Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser

Courtroom 10 will continue to post separate Probate Notes that are not included in these tentative rulings.

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

The specific tentative rulings for specific calendars follow:

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED
Civil Law and Motion
Hon. Donald Proiette
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, October 2, 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No.	Title / Description
22CV-04212	Dorothy Jimenez v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc. Status Conference – Post Arbitration
	Appearance required. 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. Appear to address the status of the arbitration, is if such arbitration has no yet occurred, a date by which it is likely to be completed.
24CV-02512	Vicent Inaudi v. General Motors, LLC Motion to Compel Deposition of Person Most Knowledgeable
	Category Number 1 [All Communications between Plaintiff Vincent Inadui and General Motors LLC]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 1 is GRANTED. Deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Category Number 2 [All Communications between Plaintiff's Legal Counsel and General Motors LLC]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All

other Objections OVERRULED. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 2 is GRANTED. Deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Category 3 [All communications between General Motors LLC and its authorized repair facility regarding subject vehicle]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific communication that the objection pertains to and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 3 is GRANTED. Deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Category 4 [Policies or guidelines regarding the handling of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Claims]: All objections SUSTAINED. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 4 is DENIED.

Category 5 [Policies or guidelines to assure compliance with Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act]: All objections SUSTAINED. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 5 is DENIED.

Category 6 [The basis of the denial by General Motors LLC of Plaintiff's request for restitution]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific grounds for denial that the objection pertains to and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 6 is GRANTED. Deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Category 7 [The basis for failure to provide restitution]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific grounds for denial that the objection pertains to and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel one or more person most knowledgeable depositions with regard to Category Number 7 is GRANTED. Deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Request for Production of Documents 1 [all writings that refer to any communications between you and Plaintiff or Plaintiff's counsel]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific document withheld and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel documents

at deposition not subject to a sustained objection is GRANTED. Documents to be produced at deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Request for Production of Documents 2 [all writings that refer to any communications between you and authorized repair facility regarding Plaintiff's vehicle]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific document withheld and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel documents at deposition not subject to a sustained objection is GRANTED. Documents to be produced at deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Request for Production of Documents 3 [all documents reviewed in connection with decision to deny restitution]: To the extent there have been communications concerning a vehicle other than the vehicle that is the subject of the instant litigation, Objection SUSTAINED. All other Objections OVERRULED, except to the extent that objections based on proprietary information, attorney-client privilege, or attorney-work product doctrine are contained in a privilege log that specifies the specific document withheld and the basis for such objection. The Motion to compel documents at deposition not subject to a sustained objection is GRANTED. Documents to be produced at deposition to occur on or before November 14, 2025, unless a later date is agreed to by the parties in writing.

Request for Production of Documents 4 [documents relate to policies or guidelines to assure compliance with Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act]: All objections SUSTAINED. The Motion to compel production of documents responsive to Request 4 is DENIED.

24CV-05727 Margaret Estrada, et al. v. Fratelli Beretta USA, Inc.

Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement

The unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action settlement is GRANTED. The Court will sign the proposed Order and Judgment lodged with the court on September 4, 2025.

Case Management Conference

In light of the above order providing for final approval of class action settlement and entry of judgment, the Case Management Conference is DROPPED FROM CALENDAR and the court finds that no further Case Management Conferences are warranted.

25CV-00710 Madeline Lerma v. Karen Lerma

Trial Setting Conference-Order to Show Cause re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. 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. Appear to set trial on the pending Order to Show Cause re: Restraining Order.

25CV-04723 Irma Gomez v. Jesus Palacios

Order to Show Cause re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. 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. There is no proof of service showing service of the papers filed in this action on respondent.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Mandatory Settlement Conferences
Hon. Donald Proietti
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, October 2, 2025
9:00 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

There are no Mandatory Settlement Conferences Scheduled

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Specially Set Discovery Motions
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13
1159 G Street, Los Banos
Thursday, October 2, 2025
9:00 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No.	Title / Description
25CV-00397	Randall Orozco v. Teixeira and Sons LLC, et al.

Specially Set Discovery Motions

Motion by Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco for Relief from Waiver of Objections pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2030.290, 2031.300, and 2033.280.

The Motion by Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco for Relief from Waiver of Objections pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2030.290, 2031.300, and 2033.280 is DENIED.

Although the responses were substantially compliant, the reason for the late responses is attributable to counsel being busy and not due to mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

The Declaration of Mathew Russell, Esq. in support of Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco's Motion for Relief from Waiver of Objections admits, "Due to my prolonged absence during the month of May for the above trial in Sonoma County Superior Court as well as the out of town depositions from May 27 through 29, 2025, I experienced severe disruption in my ability to receive and calendar the discovery requests served on

PLAINTIFF. As a result, DEFENDANT'S propounded discovery was not calendared or attended to in a timely manner." (Russell Dec, ¶ 12.)

The Declaration of Mathew Russell, Esq. further admits, "PLAINTIFF'S failure to provide timely responses was due to mistake, inadvertence, and excusable neglect, *primarily arising from my prolonged absence and trial engagement for almost an entire month.*" (Russell Dec, ¶ 16.) (emphasis added)

Counsel's declaration is clear that the issue occurred as a result of being busy, not due to mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect. This is not grounds for relief.

As sections 2030.290, 2031.300, and 2033.280 provide for the relief from waiver, and because the language in those sections mirrors the relief language in section 473, subdivision (b), the legislature intended that "general principles developed in application of section 473 would be utilized in connection with the discretion to be exercised pursuant to the [Discovery] Act." (*Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 263, 275.)

Under Code of Civil Procedure section 473 the press of an attorney's practice does not warrant relief. (see *Lyons v. Swope* (1957) 154 Cal.App.2d 598, 600 ["Pressure of legal business is not sufficient to invoke Code of Civil Procedure, section 473."]; *City of Fresno v. Superior Court* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 1459, 1467.)

Motion by Defendant/Cross-Defendant John Santos to Compel Plaintiff to Serve Amended Discovery Responses, for Production of Documents and for Monetary Sanctions.

The request for monetary sanctions is GRANTED.

Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,260.00 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

When a party serves response after a motion to compel is filed, the court maintains jurisdiction within its discretion to determine the sufficiency of the response. (*Sinaiko Healthcare Consulting, Inc. v. Pacific Healthcare Consultants* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 390, 410-411.)

The separate statement filed by Defendant Santos showed that further responses were warranted. In general, the objections by plaintiff were improper, non-responsive, and where objected to due to privilege or work product there was no privilege log.

Based on the moving papers further responses were warranted, however Plaintiff provided further responses rendering the underlying motion moot.

Although further responses have been provided the court can still grant sanctions.

California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1348. Sanctions for failure to provide discovery states:

(a) Sanctions despite no opposition

The court may award sanctions under the Discovery Act in favor of a party who files a motion to compel discovery, even though no opposition to the motion was filed, or

opposition to the motion was withdrawn, or the requested discovery was provided to the moving party after the motion was filed.

Defendant is seeking \$1,660 in sanctions for four hours of time spent on the motion and the \$60 filing fee. (Colaw Dec. ¶ 6). Defendant's request for sanctions is granted, however the court finds it reasonable to reduce the hourly rate from \$400 to \$300 as Counsel's declaration does not include information to support the requested hourly rate above those charged by local counsel.

Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,260.00 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

Motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One, and request for sanctions.

The motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One, and request for sanctions is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

Form Interrogatories Nos. 2.8, 6.7, 10.1, and 10.2:

The responses to these requests were incomplete and evasive.

The responses also appear to have been given without having reviewed reasonably available information to Plaintiff and without having made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain the information.

For example, No. 2.8 asks if plaintiff has been convicted of a felony. Plaintiff responds that they do not have sufficient information to provide a response to the request. This is an evasive response. If plaintiff truly does not know if they have been convicted of a felony, they have the ability to obtain that information.

Form Interrogatories Nos. 2.11, and 14.1.

Plaintiff served only objections to these requests. The objections were waived by the failure to provide a timely response, and Plaintiff was not relieved from the waiver (see concurrent ruling).

Special Interrogatories Nos. 7, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 40, 47, 50, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 79, 80, and 81:

Plaintiff served only objections to these requests. The objections were waived by the failure to provide a timely response, and Plaintiff was not relieved from the waiver (see concurrent ruling).

Special Interrogatories Nos. 9, 10, 48, 49, 73, 74, 75, and 76:

Objections are waived. The responses to these requests were incomplete and evasive.

The responses appear to have been given without having reviewed reasonably available information to Plaintiff and without having made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain the information.

For example, Special Interrogatory No. 9, is a contention interrogatory and asks Plaintiff to state all facts that support the contention that “DEFENDANTS were charged with the non-delegable duty to perform safety inspections and/or maintenance on the electrical wiring at the Subject Property,” as alleged in the complaint. Plaintiff makes no attempt to respond to this interrogatory other than to state that the interrogatory is premature and that Plaintiff lacks sufficient information to fully answer. This is an evasive response. Plaintiff has a responsibility to provide a straightforward response.

Special Interrogatories: Not to be compelled: No. 54:

The response to No. 54 is substantially compliant as Plaintiff responded that all documents currently in his possession were produced that support his contention that he suffered past wage loss.

Plaintiff is to provide further verified responses, without objections, to the following:

Form Interrogatories Nos. 2.8, 2.11, 6.7, 10.1, 10.2, and 14.1. Plaintiff is also ordered to provide further responses to the 17.1 responses that correspond to the Requests for Admissions that need further responses or clarification.

Special Interrogatories Nos.: 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 40, 47, 48, 49, 50, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, and 80.

Defendant is seeking \$2,200 in sanctions for eight hours of time spent on the motion at \$270 /hour and the \$60 filing fee. (Marcia Dec. ¶ 15). Defendant’s request for sanctions is granted, however the court finds it reasonable to reduce the hours from eight to four as many arguments of the motion are cut and paste.

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2030.300, et seq., and 2023.010 et. seq. Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

Motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Admission, Set One, and request for sanctions.

The motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Admission, Set One, and request for sanctions is GRANTED.

Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

Requests for Admission Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, and 33.

The objections are waived and only objections were provided.

Requests for Admission Nos. 9, 10, and 31.

Objections are waived. The response is substantially compliant, but the corresponding 17.1 of the form interrogatories needs a further response.

Requests for Admission Nos. 14 and 16.

Objections are waived. Plaintiff is to provide clarification as there are conflicting responses. The response to the RFA and corresponding 17.1 do not match.

Plaintiff is to provide further verified responses, without objections, to the following:

Request for Admissions Nos.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, and 33.

Requests for Admission Nos. 9, 10, and 31 - The response is substantially compliant, but the corresponding 17.1 of the form interrogatories needs a further response.

Requests for Admission Nos. 14 and 16.

Need clarification as there are conflicting responses. The response to the Requests for Admission and corresponding 17.1 do not match.

Defendant is seeking \$2,200 in sanctions for eight hours of time spent on the motion at \$270 /hour and the \$60 filing fee. (Marcia Dec. ¶ 15). Defendant's request for sanctions is granted, however the court finds it reasonable to reduce the hours from eight to four as many arguments of the motion are cut and paste.

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2033.290 et seq., and 2023.010 et. seq. Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

Motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Set One, and request for sanctions.

The motion by Defendant Texiera and Sons, LLC, to Plaintiff Randall Mark Orozco to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Set One, and request for sanctions is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

The court notes that although the declaration in support of the motion does not establish good cause, sufficient information is set forth in defendant's separate statement to proceed to the merits of the motion to compel.

Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 17, 18, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 36, 46, 49, 50, and 51.

The objections are waived, however the responses to these requests are sufficient. No further responses are required.

The court cannot order Plaintiff to produce any documents when he claims that he has no responsive documents. If Plaintiff has concealed records, the court has the power to exclude documents or other physical evidence at trial that has been concealed and that would cause unfair surprise at trial. (*Pate v. Channel Lumber Co.* (1997) 51 Cal.App.4th 1447, 1455.)

Requests for Production Nos. 16, 47, 48, 53, 54, and 55.

The objections are waived. These responses are not code-compliant. Although directing Defendant to prior produced documents or newly produced documents, the statement of compliance is incomplete, and if there is an inability to comply if a reasonable search and diligent inquiry has taken place. In addition, if the inability to fully comply is because another party may have the documents, they need to be identified (CCP § 2031.230).

Requests for Production Nos. 26, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 52.

The objections are waived and only objections were provided.

Plaintiff is to provide further verified responses, without objections, to the following:

Requests for Production Nos.: 16, 26, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, and 55.

Defendant is seeking \$2,200 in sanctions for eight hours of time spent on the motion at \$270 /hour and the \$60 filing fee. (Marcia Dec. ¶ 15). Defendant's request for sanctions is granted, however the court finds it reasonable to reduce the hours from eight to four as many arguments of the motion are cut and paste.

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2031.310, et seq., and 2023.010 et. seq. Plaintiff is ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$1,140 within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Limited Civil Calendar
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, October 2, 2025
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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No.	Title / Description
24CV-01561	Midland Credit Management, Inc. v. See Xiong Status Review of Settlement Appearance required unless notice of settlement is filed prior to the hearing. 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. Appear to address the status of settlement.
24CV-02881	LVNV Funding LP v. Margarita Sandoval Status Review of Settlement Appearance required unless notice of settlement is filed prior to the hearing. 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. Appear to address the status of settlement.

25CV-04079 [Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]

Unlawful Detainer Court Trial

Appearance required. 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.

25CV-04117 [Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]

Unlawful Detainer Court Trial

Appearance required. 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.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Orders
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13
1159 G Street, Los Banos
Thursday, October 2, 2025
11:00 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

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

25CV-01164 Claudia Medina-Cortes v. Veronica Alvarez

Review of Case Status

Appearance required. 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. Appear to address the status of the case since the last hearing.

25CV-04211 Maria Ranjel v. Sherlyn Garay

Order to Show Cause re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. 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.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Ex Parte Matters
Hon. Donald Proietti
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, October 2, 2025
1:15 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

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

There are no ex parte matters scheduled.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Ex Parte Matters
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, October 2, 2025
1:15 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No. _____ **Title / Description** _____

There are no ex parte matters scheduled.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Ex Parte Matters
Hon. Jennifer O. Trimble
Courtroom 12
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, October 2, 2025

1:15 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No. **Title / Description**

There are no ex parte matters scheduled.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Ex Parte Matters
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, October 2, 2025

1:15 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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No. **Title / Description**

There are no ex parte matters scheduled

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Orders
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13
1159 G Street, Los Banos
Thursday, October 2, 2025
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) 725-4111 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 Court Call (the court's telephonic appearance provider) of your intent to appear does not satisfy the requirement of notifying the court.

IMPORTANT: Court Reporters will NOT be provided; parties wanting a hearing transcript must make their own arrangements.

Case No. **Title / Description**

There are no Restraining Orders Scheduled
