

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED**

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

Thursday, November 20, 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 20, 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
----------	---------------------

20CV-02472	Ramiro Ramos vs Javier Zambrano, et al.
------------	---

Motion for Terminating Sanctions

Plaintiff's motion for terminating sanctions is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

The imposition of terminating sanctions is a drastic consequence, one that should not lightly be imposed or requested. (*Ruvalcaba v. Government Employees Ins. Co.* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1579, 1581.)

Other than the delay of the case due to Defendant's failure to comply with this Court's order entered on April 29, 2025, the Court finds that there is no prejudice to Plaintiff in the absence of the discovery responses that are the subject of the Court's prior order. As a result, the request for terminating sanctions is premature, and termination would be punitive rather than remedial. (*Morgan v. Ransom* (1979) 95 Cal.App.3d 664, 669-670.)

Defendant is ordered to comply with this Court's discovery order entered on April 29, 2025, within ten (10) days of being served with this order.

Motion to Enforce Court's Discovery Order & Request for Sanctions

Plaintiffs' motion to enforce this court's discovery order is GRANTED.

The heart of this matter appears to be disagreement over the language of Paragraph 4 of the May 8, 2025, stipulation and order approved by this court.

Paragraph 4 states in full:

4. Within 21 calendar days after receipt of the list from PSA, Defendants shall produce to Plaintiffs' counsel records of Class Members who did not timely opt out of disclosure and requested by Plaintiffs in discovery. (Stipulation and Order ¶ 4, filed May 8, 2025,)

To resolve this dispute, the court does not need to look any further than Exhibit A to that stipulation.

Exhibit A, attached to the stipulation (Stipulation and Order ¶ 2, filed May 8, 2025), is the Belaire-West notice that was mailed to the Class Members.

The Belaire-West notice clearly states: *"[i]f you do not timely return the enclosed postcard, your name, contact information, pay and time records, and personnel files and documents you signed will be provided to Plaintiffs' attorneys, and those attorneys may then contact you."* (Exhibit A ¶ 5).

The Belaire-West notice was agreed to by all parties and approved by this court.

Based on the Belaire-West notice, it was clearly contemplated and agreed that Defendants would provide the name, contact information, pay and time records, and personnel files and documents that were signed, within 21 calendar days after receipt of the list of the individuals that did not opt out.

The court finds "contact information" includes the address, phone number, and email address of the individual as all are considered ways a person can be contacted.

To the extent Defendants have not done so, and to the extent they are in the possession of these documents, Defendants are to provide the above information to Plaintiffs within ten (10) days of this court's order.

The request for sanctions is DENIED, as the court finds Defendants were substantially justified in opposing the motion.

Petition for Approval of Minor's Compromise

The petition for approval of minor's compromise is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

The amount listed in 12a(2) and 12b(4) of \$879.91 do not match the amount listed in 12b(5)(b)(ii)(C) of \$897.88. In addition, the Court notes that all these amounts appear to be incorrect as the amount charged by DHCS was \$879.88.

Further, there does not appear to be an Attachment 18b(2) to the petition listing the name, branch, and address of the depository where the funds will be deposited.

Petitioner must file an amended petition addressing the above issues.

24CV-04075 John Abbott v. Martin Nordenstrom, et al.

Trial Setting Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-00440 Kobe Ceja vs Planda Elementary School District

Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal - Notice of Settlement

CONTINUED on the Court's own motion to December 3, 2025, at 8:15 a.m.

Petition for Approval of Minor's Compromise

CONTINUED on the Court's own motion to December 3, 2025, at 8:15 a.m.

25CV-04663 Petition of: Telena Hooper

Order to Show Cause Re: Name Change

Appearance required. Proof of publication as received October 21, 2025. Proof of service on the non-petitioning parent was filed November 18, 2025.

25CV-04723 Irma Gomez vs Jesus Palacios

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order

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

25CV-05411 Petition of: Angie Quintero-Hernandez

Order to Show Cause Re: Name Change

Appearance required. Appear to address status of publication of petition.

25CV-05951

Yesenia Rodriguez vs Tamaneika Broomfield

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

Thursday, November 20, 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
24CV-02188	Capital One, N.A. vs. Daniel Bonnersanz

Motion for Summary Judgment

The unopposed motion for summary judgment by plaintiff Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discover Bank, is GRANTED. Upon consideration of all the evidence set forth in the moving papers, particularly the declaration of Litigation Support Coordinator Ruby Cordon and the attached business records, the Court finds that there is no triable issue of material fact and plaintiff is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Plaintiff filed a separate statement of undisputed material facts, supported by admissible evidence, containing Undisputed Material Facts 1-8 and 10-17 that establish each required element of the common count causes of action for open book account and account stated. This shifts the burden to defendant Daniel Bonnersanz to show the existence of one or more triable issues of material fact. (Code Civ. Proc., § 437c, subd. (p)(1).) By not filing any written opposition, defendant has failed to meet his burden on this motion.

In light of the Court's ruling on the motion for summary judgment, it is unnecessary for the Court to rule on plaintiff's alternative motion for summary adjudication as to the first and second causes of action.

The Court will sign the proposed order and proposed judgment lodged with the moving papers on May 12, 2025.

The Court vacates the case management conference scheduled for February 6, 2026, at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 9.

24CV-02803 Starstone National Insurance Company vs. Vail Teal

Review of Case Status – Status of Default

No appearance is required. The Court has reviewed the declaration of plaintiff's counsel indicating that more time is required to submit a default judgment package. On the Court's own motion, the case status review hearing is continued to January 15, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 9. The clerk's office is directed to send notice to plaintiff.

24CV-06079 Stanley Silva vs. Manpreet Rai, et al.

Motion to Strike Answer by Defendant Rai Farm Management, L.L.C.

Plaintiff Stanley Silva's unopposed motion to strike the answer filed by defendant Rai Farm Management, L.L.C. on May 22, 2025, is GRANTED. Corporations, unincorporated associations, and partnerships must be represented in court by licensed attorneys and may not appear through nonattorney agents or as self-represented litigants. (See *Merco Constr. Eng'rs, Inc. v. Municipal Court* (1978) 21 Cal.3d 724, 730–731; *Say & Say, Inc. v. Ebershoff* (1993) 20 Cal. App.4th 1759, 1767; *Albion River Watershed Protection Ass'n v. Department of Forestry & Fire Protection* (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 34, 37.) Defendant has been given reasonable time to obtain counsel.

The Court will sign the proposed order submitted with the moving papers. Plaintiff may request entry of default by filing mandatory form CIV-100.

25CV-02695 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Maria Reyes

Case Status Hearing – Status of Settlement

Appearance required unless notice of settlement is filed prior to the hearing. Appear to address the status of settlement.

25CV-05937 [Parties' names withheld pursuant to CCP § 1161.2(a)(1)]

Demurrer to Complaint for Unlawful Detainer

Appearance required. Any opposition and reply may be made orally at the time of the hearing. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1170(b).)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Civil Unlimited
Law & Motion
Hon. Mark Bacciarini
Courtroom 10

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 20, 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
----------	---------------------

25CV-04605	Kyle Chun vs Merced County Human Services Agency
	Case Management Conference

Appearance required.

25CV-04966	Kyle Chun vs Merced County Human Services of Social Services Agency
	Review of Case Status Petition for Writ of Mandate

Appearance required.

Motion to Consolidate Cases 25CV-04966 & 25CV-05875 & to Transfer Demurrer to Consolidated Case

Appearance required.

25CV-05875

Kyle Chun vs California Department of Social Services, et al.

Motion for Stay of Collection Pending Writ of Mandate

Appearance required.

Motion to Consolidate Cases 25CV-04966 & 25CV-05875 & to Transfer Demurrer to Consolidated Case

Appearance required.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Orders
Hon. Ashely Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 20, 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-05322	Lorena Mendoza Gonzalez vs. Cindy Castro
------------	--

Order to Show Cause Re: Restraining Order Review Hearing

Appearance required.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Law and Motion
Hon. Ashely Albertoni Sausser
Courtroom 13

1159 G Street, Los Banos

Thursday, November 20, 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) 725-4240 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-01104	LENDR.online, LLC vs Birdie and Sons Inc., et al.
------------	---

Order of Examination (Non Appeal)

Appearance required.
