

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED**

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

Thursday, November 13, 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

Thursday, November 13, 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-03971	S.C. Anderson, Inc. vs Golden State Construction and Framing, Inc., et al.
------------	--

Writ of Attachment

The application of cross-complainant, El Capitan Hotel Merced, LLC, (ECHM) for a writ of attachment against cross-defendant, S.C. Anderson, Inc. (SCA) is GRANTED in the amount of \$8 million. A writ of attachment will issue upon the filing of an undertaking of \$50,000 by ECHM.

Having reviewed the application, supporting memorandum of points and authorities and declarations, as well as the opposition and reply, the Court finds that ECHM's claim is one on which an attachment may be issued; ECHM has established the probable validity of the claim on which the attachment is based; the attachment is sought for no purpose other than the recovery on the claim on which the attachment is based; and the amount to be secured by the attachment is greater than zero.

The amount to be secured by the attachment was determined based upon an evaluation of the probable validity of ECHM's claim, balanced against the probable validity of the affirmative defenses raised by SCA as well as the probable validity of SCA's claims

against ECHM, which were not accounted for in ECHM's calculation of the \$15 million attachment request.

SCA admits in their opposition that approximately \$4.1 million in contractual damages are "capable of substantiation." However, the evidence relied upon by SCA to support further reduction of those damages is largely inadmissible as hearsay and speculation, and is rebutted by ECHM's admissible evidence in support of its application. The total amount of an attachment is calculated based upon the potential damages, combined with attorney's fees, costs, and prejudgment interest, should cross-complainant prevail, amounts also accounted for in this Court's determination.

This Court finds that an attachment of \$8 million is supported by admissible evidence and is reasonable based on its assessment of the various and numerous claims of the parties to this application, as well as the highly particular facts of this case.

Although a standard undertaking of \$10,000 is required for a writ of attachment to issue, this Court finds that damages in the event of a wrongful attachment would exceed that amount. Having considered the upcoming trial date and duration of the attachment, the Court finds an appropriate measure of possible damages and the requisite undertaking to be paid by ECHM to be \$50,000.

The following property is subject to attachment and is not exempt: All corporate property for which a method of levy is provided by Article 2 (commencing with Section 488.300) of Chapter 8 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. The Court will sign the order lodged with the application, modified to reflect the above order.

21CV-03770 Omar De Los Santos, et al. vs 3K Farming Company, Inc., et al.

Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal - Notice of Settlement

Appearance required. Appear to address status of settlement announced at the trial setting conference on September 16, 2025.

23CV-00271 Mehki Bryant vs Thomas Wilson, et al.

Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery

Defendant's motion to compel responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Two, is GRANTED.

Plaintiff has failed to provide timely responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Two.

Objections are waived.

Plaintiff shall serve verified responses, without objections, within thirty (30) days of the date of service of this order.

Defendant's motion to have Requests for Admissions, Set Two, deemed admitted is GRANTED.

Plaintiff failed to provide timely responses to Requests for Admissions, Set Two.

The matters specified in Defendant's Requests for Admissions, Set Two, are deemed admitted, unless Plaintiff serves, before the hearing, a proposed response to the requests for admission, that is in substantial compliance with Code of Civil Procedure § 2033.220.

The court notes that there was no request for sanctions, accordingly no sanctions are granted.

24CV-01009 Jose Pahua, et al. vs California Dairy Farms LLC, et al.

Review of Case Status

CONTINUED to May 13, 2026, at 8:15 a.m. in Courtroom 8 pursuant to the joint case management conference statement filed by the parties October 28, 2025, to allow time for arbitration.

Case Management Conference

DROPPED FROM CALENDAR.

25CV-03872 People vs Forty Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty Dollars (\$40,920.00),
U.S. Currency

Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-03873 People vs Twelve Thousand Nine Hundred Thirty-Five Dollars
(\$12,935.00) U.S. Currency

Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-03874 People vs Twenty-Five Thousand Four Hundred Ninety-Seven Dollars
(\$25,497.00) U.S. Currency

Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-04971

Lourdes Ramirez Rivas vs Marbella Villalobos Ramirez

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. There is no proof of service on Respondent filed with the court.

25CV-04989

Antony Lopez vs Charles Sullivan

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. There is no proof of service on Respondent filed with the court.

25CV-05053

Elizabeth Valencia Revuelta vs Thomas Guevara

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required. There is no proof of service on Respondent filed with the court.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Limited Civil Calendar
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9

627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Thursday, November 13, 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) 725-4240 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-00580	[Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]
------------	--

Default Prove Up Hearing

Appearance required.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Order
Hon. Jennifer O Trimble
Courtroom 12

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 13, 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) 725-4240 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-00655	Lois Carmo vs. Sophia Sardia
------------	------------------------------

Restraining Order Contested Special Set

Appearance required.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Order
Hon. Ashely Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 13, 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) 725-4240 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-03907	Scott Savage vs. Reginald Grimes, Junior
------------	--

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Order
Hon. Ashely Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 13, 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) 725-4240 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-05191	Maria Lemus Gonzalez vs Frank Puerta Parga
------------	--

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

Appearance required.
