

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED**

2260 N Street, Merced  
627 W. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced  
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Tuesday, August 5, 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. Stephanie L. Jamieson**

**Courtroom 9 – Commissioner David Foster**

**Courtroom 10 – Mark V. Bacciarini**

**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

Unlimited Civil Law and Motion  
Hon. Stephanie L. Jamieson  
Courtroom 8  
627 W. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced  
Tuesday, August 5, 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
----------	---------------------

23CV-03050	Natalie Hernandez-Arzabal v. Fresno Foods, LLC, et al.
------------	--

Discovery Motions and Case Management

**These matters are being heard in Courtroom 10, the Hon. Mark V. Bacciarini presiding, see separate tentative rulings below.**

19CV-02017	Jesus Munoz, Jr., et al. v. Merced County Office of Education, et al.
------------	---

Order to Show Cause re: Dismissal-Notice of Settlement

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. Appear to address the status of the settlement.**

23CV-01513	Christina Valenti-Felix v. Mark Martinez Enriquez, et al.
------------	---

Order to Show Cause re: Dismissal

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. On July 18, 2025, this Court sustained Merced County's demurrer to the**

third amended complaint, denying leave to amend. Absent an appearance by a party to this action and a showing of good cause as to why this matter should not be dismissed, the matter will be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

---

23CV-04572

Lilia Arroyo v. Estate of Jose M. Arroyo, et al.

Case Management Conference

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. The original complaint was filed in this action on December 6, 2023. An amended complaint was filed on April 17, 2025. There is no proof of service on file for either complaint. Appear to address the status of service of the amended complaint.**

---

24CV-03777

Henry Miller Reclamation District #2131 v. Francis, et al.

Demurrer

**The request for judicial notice of the complaint filed in this action is GRANTED.**

**Misjoinder**

The demurrer on the grounds of misjoinder is **OVERRULED**. The precise person or entity that installed the temporary pipeline that is the subject of this litigation is a fact uniquely known to Defendants—there is no physical or other indication on a pipe structure to identify which entity paid to have it installed or is using it, and it is possible that multiple entities jointly own it and share or jointly use it. Even when there is a requirement that a matter be alleged with specificity, less specificity is required when it appears that the facts lie more within the defendant's knowledge than plaintiff's. (See *Committee on Children's Television, Inc. v. General Foods Corp.* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 197, 216; see *Miles v. Deutsche Bank Nat'l Trust Co.* (2015) 236 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 394, 403-404 [omission of names of mortgage servicer employees and their authority to speak not fatal to fraud claim where defendants had more knowledge of the facts than plaintiffs].) The ultimate fact of ownership has been properly alleged sufficiently to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer on grounds that insufficient facts are plead establishing a basis for joinder is **OVERRULED**.

**First Cause of Action for Trespass**

Defendants concede that "unauthorized" entry is an element of a trespass claim (*McBride v. Smith* (2018) 18 Cal.App.5<sup>th</sup> 1160, 1174), but argue that an allegation that use was unauthorized is not a contention that is binding on the court. Since facts properly alleged in a complaint are assumed to be true and interpreted in favor of the Plaintiff on demurrer, the court finds that an action for trespass is adequately alleged, and provides sufficient notice to enable Defendant to prepare a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the first cause of action for trespass on the grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

**Second Cause of Action for Trespass to Chattel**

While Defendants assert facts that may preclude Plaintiff from prevailing on the second cause of action or may constitute an affirmative defense, since Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged an interference with personal property not amounting to conversion

(*Jamgotchian v. Slender* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1384, 1400-1401), the allegations are sufficient to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the second cause of action for trespass to chattel on the grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

#### **Third Cause of Action for Private Nuisance**

While Defendants assert that the ultimate facts alleged are conclusory, Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged an intentional and unreasonable interference with the free use of property to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the third cause of action for private nuisance on grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

#### **Fourth Cause of action for Public Nuisance**

The complaint adequately states a claim for public nuisance by alleging harm to the general public both in the general allegations of the complaint's paragraphs 17-36 that are incorporated into the fourth cause of action, as well as in paragraph 7. Interference with a canal that serves the public qualifies as a potential public nuisance. While Defendants assert that the ultimate facts alleged are conclusory, Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged facts to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the fourth cause of action for public nuisance on grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

#### **Fifth Cause of Action for Negligence**

The complaint alleges facts which, if true, establish a legal duty within the meaning of Civil Code section 1714, subdivision (a). Defendants have a duty not to intentionally or negligently interfere with Plaintiff's property. Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged facts to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the fifth cause of action for negligence on grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

#### **Sixth Cause of Action for Declaratory Relief**

This Court finds that Plaintiff has adequately alleged an actual controversy, and the numerous contrary extrinsic facts argued in support of the instant demurrer demonstrate that a number of actual controversies exist. Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged facts to enable preparation of a defense. (*Doe v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 42 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 531, 549-550.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the sixth cause of action for declaratory relief on grounds of failure to state a claim and uncertainty is **OVERRULED**.

---

24CV-05535

Stanislaus Farm Supply Company v. Edgar Perez, et al.

Motion to Substitute Party

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. The unopposed motion to substitute the name of the plaintiff with that of the successor by merger is GRANTED. Appear to address status of defaults in light of the amendment.**

---

Demurrer

**This matter commenced when counsel for Plaintiffs filed a verified complaint stating causes of action for (1) Shareholder Derivative Action, (2) Breach of Written Contract, (3) Breach of Fiduciary Duty, (4) Accounting, (5) Removal of Directors and Officers of Corporation, (6) Complaint for Specific Performance of Contract/Injunctive Relief, (7) Unjust Enrichment, and (8) Declaratory Relief.**

**Before this Demurrer was filed, on May 8, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Appointment of Receiver set for hearing on July 15, 2025. The instant demurrer was then filed June 24, 2025, with proof of service attached to the Notice of Demurrer showing service of the Notice of Hearing, Demurrer, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Attorney Gregory Cavallo by electronic mail on June 24, 2025.**

**On July 14, 2025, the Court posted the following tentative ruling:**

**“The application for appointment of a receiver is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The opposition indicates that new directors are being elected, and corporate documents are being distributed, the same acts that any receiver that might be appointed would need to take. This is not disputed in the reply to the opposition. California law provides that cumulative voting is the appropriate method for protecting the rights of shareholders having conflicting views concerning how corporate business should be conducted. The appointment of a receiver that has not been voted upon by any of the parties is a drastic remedy that does not appear to be necessary at this time. Accordingly, the application for appointment of a receiver is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.”**

**On July 15, 2025, the Court (1) set a Readiness Conference for an Evidentiary Hearing on the Motion for Appointment of Receiver for September 16, 2025 at 8:15 A.M. in Courtroom 8; (2) ordered Defendants to submit an updated declaration concerning the status of the accounting or completed accounting; and (3) provisionally set an evidentiary hearing October 9, 2025, at 8:15 in Courtroom 8. The Court stated that, depending on the outcome of the declarations, the Court may adopt the tentative ruling in full, may appoint a receiver without an evidentiary hearing, or proceed with the evidentiary hearing.**

**Defendants’ demurrer contains a demurrer to the entire complaint on the grounds that the allegations are uncertain, ambiguous, and unintelligible pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 430.10, subdivision (f), apparently brought by all defendants, Soares Dairy Farms, Inc., David Soares, and Rosa Soares, and a separate demurrer by defendant, Gilardi Farms, LLC, to the entire complaint pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 430.10, subdivisions (d) and (e) on the grounds that defendant, Gilardi Farms, LLC, is not a proper defendant and Plaintiffs have failed to state facts sufficient to state a cause of action. Defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC also demurs to the fourth cause of action for accounting on the grounds that Plaintiffs have failed to state facts sufficient to establish an accounting claim against it, and demurs to the sixth cause of action for breach of contract on the grounds that Plaintiffs fail to allege a written, oral, or implied contract breached by Gilardi Farms. LLC.**

**Defendants’ demurrer to the entire complaint on the grounds that the entire complaint is uncertain, ambiguous, or unintelligible is OVERRULED. Since the demurrer does not address any specific cause of action, the existence of one valid cause of action defeats**

the demurrer. This Court has already ordered an accounting and set September 16 as a hearing date for declarations concerning the status of the accounting or the completed accounting.

The demurrer by defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC to the complaint on the grounds that defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC is not a proper defendant is **OVERRULED**. The complaint alleges in paragraph 7 that defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC “is, and at all times herein mentioned, was a California limited liability company with its principal offices in Los Banos, California. Gilardi purportedly purchased the Dos Palos Ranch from Corporation without notice to, or authority from, Plaintiffs and/or a duly appointed board of directors and knowing that Corporation did not have authority to enter into the sale and over Plaintiff’s objection.” While the demurrer is based in part on the extrinsic contention by defendant Gilardi Farms LLC that it qualifies as a good faith purchaser for value, the fact remains that the allegations of paragraph 7, if proven to be true, would establish that defendant Gilardi Farms LLC is not a good faith purchaser for value because they took title with notice of the alleged unauthorized action.

The demurrer by defendant Gilardi Farms LLC to the complaint’s fourth cause of action for accounting is **SUSTAINED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**. The opposition to demurrer concedes on page 2 footnote 1 that the defendants to the fourth cause of action for accounting are defendants David Soares, Rosa Soares, and Does 1-50, and that defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC is not a defendant to the fourth cause of action. However, paragraph 69 of the fourth cause of action states: “Plaintiff prays for judgment against **DEFENDANTS** as stated in this cause of action...” However, paragraph 9 defines “**DEFENDANTS**” as the defendants referenced in the foregoing paragraphs above which includes paragraph 7, relating to defendant Gilardi Farms, LLC. The demurrer by defendant Gilardi Farms LLC to the fourth cause of action for accounting is **SUSTAINED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**, only to the extent the named defendants are clarified to exclude Gilardi Farms LLC.

The demurrer by defendant Gilardi Farms LLC to the complaint’s sixth cause of action for specific performance of contract/injunctive relief is **SUSTAINED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**. A corporation’s articles of incorporation and bylaws are not a contract between the corporation or its officers and directors and third parties such as Gilardi Farms LLC. While there are mechanisms for enforcing articles of corporation and bylaws against directors, officers, and shareholders, the remedy for an unauthorized act between the corporation and a third party is invalidation of the act, not a claim for breach of contract. Accordingly, the demurrer by defendant Gilardi Farms LLC to the complaint’s sixth cause of action for specific performance of contract/injunctive relief is **SUSTAINED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND** to state a claim against defendant Gilardi Farms LLC. Any amended complaint addressing the sixth cause of action against Gilardi Farms LLC shall be filed by August 29, 2025.

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

---

25CV-03334                      Petition of: Beulah Cole

Order to Show Cause re: Name Change

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. Appear to address status of publication of the petition.**

---

25CV-03394                      Petition of: Shirley Brown

Order to Show Cause re: Name Change

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. Proof of Publication having been filed, this petition by an adult to change her own name is GRANTED.**

---

25CV-03764                      Ari Gonzalez Cardenas v. Erick Santoyo

Order to Show Cause re: Restraining Order

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance. Proof of timely service on the respondent was filed on July 18, 2025 showing service on July 16, 2025.**

---

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED

Unlimited Civil Law and Motion  
Hon. Mark V. Bacciarini  
Courtroom 10  
627 W. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced  
Tuesday, August 5, 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
----------	---------------------

23CV-03050	Natalie Hernandez-Arzabal v. Fresno Foods, LLC, et al.
------------	--

Motion by Defendant Fresno Foods LLC DBA Jack In the Box to Consolidate Case 23CV-03050 and Case 24CV-03590

**The Motion by Defendant Fresno Foods LLC DBA Jack In the Box to Consolidate Case 23CV-03050 and Case 24CV-03590 is GRANTED. PAGA Claims and Class Action Claims are routinely joined in a single lawsuit or consolidated to promote judicially economy as the same Labor Code violations are alleged in both actions and involves the same parties. (See *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 969, 986 [“it is the individual employee—here, the same plaintiff—who brings and litigates the action”].)**

**This Court takes judicial notice that Plaintiff's Claims in 24CV-03590, a case that commenced on July 12, 2024, have been compelled to arbitration by order dated November 13, 2024 that expressly found that there was no waiver of the right to compel arbitration. Case 23CV-03050 was filed August 23, 2023 and presumably involves the same arbitration agreement with the same Plaintiff, but no motion to compel arbitration has ever been filed in Case 23CV-03050. It would appear that Plaintiff is collaterally estopped from asserting that the same Labor Code violations at issue in 24CV-03590 and 23CV-03050 are not subject to an enforceable agreement to arbitrate those claims.**

**Accordingly, the Motion to Consolidate is GRANTED.**



Motion by Plaintiff to Compel Defendant Fresno Foods, LLC DBA Jack in the Box to Provide Further Responses to Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One)

**While the title to the motion in the caption of the Notice of Motion and Motion relates only to a Motion to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One) and the Separate Statement accompanying the Motion only relates for Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One), the text of the Notice of Motion purports to seek an order compelling further response to Special Interrogatories (Set One) 1-76, Requests for Production of Document (Set One) 1-78, Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One) 209.2, 214.1, 216.1, 217.1, and Form Interrogatories-General (Set One) 4.1, 12.1 and 17.1. Plaintiff has filed Four Separate Discovery Motions, each titled as to one form of discovery and accompanied by a separate statement relating to one form of discovery, but all accompanied by the same notice of motion purporting to bring all four motions as a single motion, but only supporting the grounds for one of the motions listed therein. The Court will assume this was a drafting error and that there are four separate motions, each pertaining to the discovery in the attached Separate Statement.**

**The Oppositions to the Separate Motions to Compel seeks, as an alternative, Request for Stay and Consolidation. Given the above order granting consolidation, and given the prior order compelling arbitration of the claims at issue in 24CV-03590, and given the fact that the same claims are at issue in 23CV-03050, the Motion for Stay is GRANTED. A arbitration status conference is set for Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 in Courtroom 8. The instant discovery motions are also continued to Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 to determine whether there will be a need for discovery post-arbitration.**

Motion by Plaintiff to Compel Defendant Fresno Foods, LLC DBA Jack in the Box to Provide Further Responses to Form Interrogatories-General (Set One)

**While the title to the motion in the caption of the Notice of Motion and Motion relates only to a Motion to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories-General (Set One) and the Separate Statement accompanying the Motion only relates to Form Interrogatories-General (Set One), the text of the Notice of Motion purports to seek an order compelling further response to Special Interrogatories (Set One) 1-76, Requests for Production of Document (Set One) 1-78, Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One) 209.2, 214.1, 216.1, 217.1, and Form Interrogatories-General (Set One) 4.1, 12.1 and 17.1. Plaintiff has filed Four Separate Discovery Motions, each titled as to one form of discovery and accompanied by a separate statement relating to one form of discovery, but all accompanied by the same notice of motion purporting to bring all four motions as a single motion, but only supporting the grounds for one of the motions listed therein. The Court will assume this was a drafting error and that there are four separate motions, each pertaining to the discovery in the attached Separate Statement.**

**The Oppositions to the Separate Motions to Compel seeks, as an alternative, Request for Stay and Consolidation. Given the above order granting consolidation, and given the prior order compelling arbitration of the claims at issue in 24CV-03590, and given the fact that the same claims are at issue in 23CV-03050, the Motion for Stay is GRANTED. A arbitration status conference is set for Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 in Courtroom 8. The instant discovery motions are also continued to Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 to determine whether there will be a need for discovery post-arbitration.**

Motion by Plaintiff to Compel Defendant Fresno Foods, LLC DBA Jack in the Box to Provide Further Responses to Special Interrogatories (Set One)

**While the title to the motion in the caption of the Notice of Motion and Motion relates only to a Motion to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories (Set One) and the Separate Statement accompanying the Motion only relates to Special Interrogatories (Set One), the text of the Notice of Motion purports to seek an order compelling further response to Special Interrogatories (Set One) 1-76, Requests for Production of Document (Set One) 1-78, Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One) 209.2, 214.1, 216.1, 217.1, and Form Interrogatories-General (Set One) 4.1, 12.1 and 17.1. Plaintiff has filed Four Separate Discovery Motions, each titled as to one form of discovery and accompanied by a separate statement relating to one form of discovery, but all accompanied by the same notice of motion purporting to bring all four motions as a single motion, but only supporting the grounds for one of the motions listed therein. The Court will assume this was a drafting error and that there are four separate motions, each pertaining to the discovery in the attached Separate Statement.**

**The Oppositions to the Separate Motions to Compel seeks, as an alternative, Request for Stay and Consolidation. Given the above order granting consolidation, and given the prior order compelling arbitration of the claims at issue in 24CV-03590, and given the fact that the same claims are at issue in 23CV-03050, the Motion for Stay is GRANTED. A arbitration status conference is set for Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 in Courtroom 8. The instant discovery motions are also continued to Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 to determine whether there will be a need for discovery post-arbitration.**

Motion by Plaintiff to Compel Defendant Fresno Foods, LLC DBA Jack in the Box to Provide Further Responses to Requests for Production of Documents (Set One)

**While the title to the motion in the caption of the Notice of Motion and Motion relates only to a Motion to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Production of Documents (Set One) and the Separate Statement accompanying the Motion only relates to Requests for Production of Documents (Set One), the text of the Notice of Motion purports to seek an order compelling further response to Special Interrogatories (Set One) 1-76, Requests for Production of Document (Set One) 1-78, Form Interrogatories-Employment (Set One) 209.2, 214.1, 216.1, 217.1, and Form Interrogatories-General (Set One) 4.1, 12.1 and 17.1. Plaintiff has filed Four Separate Discovery Motions, each titled as to one form of discovery and accompanied by a separate statement relating to one form of discovery, but all accompanied by the same notice of motion purporting to bring all four motions as a single motion, but only supporting the grounds for one of the motions listed therein. The Court will assume this was a drafting error and that there are four separate motions, each pertaining to the discovery in the attached Separate Statement.**

**The Oppositions to the Separate Motions to Compel seeks, as an alternative, Request for Stay and Consolidation. Given the above order granting consolidation, and given the prior order compelling arbitration of the claims at issue in 24CV-03590, and given the fact that the same claims are at issue in 23CV-03050, the Motion for Stay is GRANTED. A arbitration status conference is set for Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 in Courtroom 8. The instant discovery motions are also continued to Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 to determine whether there will be a need for discovery post-arbitration.**

Case Management Conference

**Continued on the Court's Own Motion to Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 8:15 for status on arbitration and to determine whether there will be a need for any post-arbitration discovery.**

---

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED

Jury and Long Cause Court Trials  
Hon. Stephanie Jamieson  
Courtroom 8  
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Tuesday, August 5, 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
----------	---------------------

21CV-03464	Cornelio Medellin, et al. v. General Motors LLC
------------	---

Jury Trial

**Appearance required. Remote appearances are permitted. Parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the clerk of the court at (209) 725-4111 to arrange for a remote appearance.**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED

Restraining Orders  
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser  
Courtroom 13  
627 W. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced

Tuesday, August 5, 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 Restraining Orders scheduled.	
--	--

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED

Ex Parte Matters  
Hon. Stephanie L. Jamieson  
Courtroom 8  
627 W. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced

Tuesday, August 5, 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. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Merced

Tuesday, August 5, 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

Tuesday, August 5, 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

Tuesday, August 5, 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

Civil Law and Motion  
Hon. Ashley Albertoni Sausser  
Courtroom 13  
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Tuesday, August 5, 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
25CV-03290	Petition of: Javana Sammons

Order to Show Cause re: Name Change

**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 publication of this Petition by an adult to change her own first name.**

25CV-03333	Petition of: Raul Garcia
------------	--------------------------

Order to Show Cause re: Name Change

**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 publication of this Petition by an adult to change his own middle name.**

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MERCED

Civil Unlawful Detainers  
Hon. Jennifer O. Trimble  
Courtroom 12  
1159 G Street, Los Banos

Tuesday, August 5, 2025  
2:00 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
25CV-03606	[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.**