

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED**

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

Wednesday, January 8, 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 Jamieson

Courtroom 9 – Commissioner David Foster

Courtroom 12 – Hon. Jennifer O. Trimble

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 Jamieson
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, January 8, 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
20CV-02493	Animal Legal Defense Fund v. Foster Poultry Farms
	Motion by Foster Poultry Farms to Maintain Sealing of Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Animal Legal Defense Fund
	The Motion by Foster Poultry Farms to Maintain Sealing of Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Animal Legal Defense Fund is GRANTED. To date, Plaintiff has failed to establish that Defendant Foster Poultry Farms has not engaged in a lawful proprietary process which might be coopted by competitors if disclosed to the public.
	Readiness Conference
	DROPPED FROM CALENDAR AS MOOT given order vacating previously set trial date.
	Trial Setting 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. Appear to set trial or further Trial Setting Conference.

21CV-01925

Jose Pena v. N&S Tractor

Motion for Approval of Settlement

At the July 31, 2024, Case Management Conference, the parties asked that a Hearing Date be Set for Approval of a Settlement, but no motion for approval of any settlement has been filed. Accordingly, this matter is DROPPED FROM CALENDAR.

22CV-02708

Gallo Global Nutrition LP v. Jared Wheat, 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 status of the performance of the Settlement.

23CV-03845

City of Merced, et al. v. State of California, et al.

Demurrer by Defendant State of California by and through Department of Fish and Wildlife to Second Amended Complaint of *Tony Borba et al.* (Case 24CV-01073)

Demurrer by Defendant State of California by and through Department of Fish and Wildlife to Second Amended Complaint of *Maria Perez-Ramirez et al.* (Case 24CV-00234)

Demurrer by Defendant State of California by and through Department of Fish and Wildlife to Second Amended Complaint of *Courtney Glenn et al.* (Case 24CV-01073)

The above listed separate Demurrers brought by Department State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) on October 21, 2024 and October 22, 2024 were addressed in a consolidated opposition filed by the Plaintiffs on December 9, 2024, and in a consolidated reply filed by the State of California on December 18, 2024. Accordingly, the Court will combine its discussion of the three separate demurrers.

This Court OVERRULES the objections and GRANTS the Request for Judicial Notice filed in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) indicating that the official records of the Department of Fish and Wildlife indicate that such department does not own the property on which the waterways at issue in this action are located. Matters subject to judicial notice may be considered when evaluating a demurrer (C.C.P. § 430.30(a)). The Court does not find this issue dispositive, because the fundamental issue raised by the parties is whether the exercise of regulatory authority pursuant to Fish and Game Code §§ 1600 et seq. equates to control for purposes of the causes of action alleged herein, despite the fact that Defendant did not own such properties, a matter that the parties concede to be a matter of first impression.

There is no dispute that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife has the exclusive authority to determine whether a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement ("LSAA") is necessary under Fish and Game Code §§ 1602, 1603. Stated another way, once the Department of Fish and Wildlife has determined that and LSAA is necessary, no maintenance or improvement can be performed until the LSAA is issued. The complaints at issue contain detailed allegations concerning the efforts to obtain LSAA approval prior to the flood and that LSAA approval had still not been granted at the time of the flood.

(See *Borba Second Amended Complaint* at ¶¶ 63-79, *Perez-Ramirez First Amended Complaint* at ¶¶ 55-71, *Glenn First Amended Complaint* at ¶¶ 61-77.)

The issue presented here, is whether the State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife can *never* be held liable for damage resulting from the delay in approving a LSAA no matter how long the delay in issuing an LSAA, no matter how obviously dangerous the failure to issue an LSAA might be, no matter how much damage or how frequently damage results, and no matter how trivial the reason for delay. Defendant contends that it can never be held liable and even if it could be held liable, the instant causes of action fail to establish a legal basis for such liability. Plaintiffs argue that they alleged sufficient specific facts to establish control and the resulting liability. None of the cases cited by the parties directly address the issue presented here and all of the cases appear distinguishable on their facts or procedural standing.

Defendant argues that Fish and Game Code § 1610 permits emergency maintenance without an LSAA and therefore could have proceeded with any necessary maintenance if an emergency existed and therefore Defendant's actions may not be the sole cause of the resulting damages. While this provision may be a factor in determining the amount of liability at trial, it does not necessarily preclude liability under all circumstances.

This Court rejects the "no liability under any circumstances" argument of the State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife and finds that the complaints at issue state facts—which this Court must assume to be true—sufficient to establish potential liability. Accordingly, the demurrers to the Second Amended Complaint in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and the First Amended Complaint *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) are OVERRULED.

This Court has previously overruled the demurrer to the inverse condemnation action in Case 23CV-03845 and adopts that reasoning in OVERRULING the instant demurrers to the inverse condemnation cases at issue here.

This Court finds that sufficient facts are alleged that Defendant created or assisted in the creation of a nuisance and finds that *Lussier v. San Lorenzo Valley Water Dist.* (1988) 206 Cal.App.3d 92, 99-102 implicitly establishes that applicability of such cause of action to a failure to remove natural debris where storms caused creeks to swell and carry debris downstream resulting in damage, though the defendant was ultimately not shown to be negligent. Accordingly, the demurrer to the Nuisance causes of action are OVERRULED.

This Court finds that sufficient facts are alleged to establish control under Government Code § 835. (See *Borba Second Amended Complaint* at ¶ 116, *Perez-Ramirez First Amended Complaint* at ¶ 108, and *Glenn First Amended Complaint* at ¶ 114.) This Court finds the facts of *Public Utilities v. Superior Court* (2010) 181 Cal.App.4th 364 and *Aaitui v. Grand Properties* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1369 to be distinguishable, Accordingly the demurrer to the dangerous condition on public property causes of action are OVERRULED.

This Court finds that sufficient facts are alleged to establish a Mandatory Duty under Fish and Game Code §§ 1602, 1603, and 1605. (See *Borba Second Amended Complaint* ¶ 122-126, *Perez-Ramirez First Amended Complaint* at ¶ 114-118, *Glenn First Amended Complaint* at ¶ 120-124.) Accordingly, the demurrer to the Breach of Mandatory Duty Cause of Action is OVERRULED.

This Court finds that while Government Code § 818.4 provides immunity for an exercise of a discretionary duty, it does not protect a failure to perform a mandatory duty or a failure to exercise discretion. While Government Code § 818.4 may provide a affirmative defense on motion for summary judgment or trial, it is not a blanket bar to the instant claims.

Accordingly, the Demurrers brought by the State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Game are OVERRULED.

Demurrer by Defendant State of California by and through Department of Fish and Wildlife to Second Amended Complaint of *Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management, et al. v. Merced Irrigation District*.

Although a separate opposition was filed this Court finds that the issues raised in the Demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint of Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management, et al. v. Merced Irrigation District raises the same issue, and accordingly, that demurrer is OVERRULED ON ALL GROUNDS for the reasons stated above.

Demurrer by Merced Irrigation District (and Joinder of City of Merced) to Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the Second Amended Complaint in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and the First Amended Complaint in *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073)

The Demurrer by Merced Irrigation District (and Joinder of City of Merced) to the Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the Second Amended Complaint in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and the First Amended Complaint in *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) is OVERRULED.

This Court finds that the complaints establish that Water Code § 12650 creates a mandatory duty to maintain minimum channel capacities and that such duty was imposed on the Demurring Defendants. Accordingly, the Demurrers are OVERRULED.

Demurrer by County of Merced (and Joinder by City of Merced) to Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the Second Amended Complaint in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368)

Demurrer by County of Merced (and Joinder by City of Merced) to Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234)

Demurrer by County of Merced (and Joinder by City of Merced) to Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the First Amended Complaint in *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073)

The above listed separate Demurrers brought by County of Merced (Joinder by City of Merced) in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) on October 21, 2024, and October 22, 2024 were addressed in a consolidated opposition filed by the Plaintiffs. Accordingly, the Court will combine its discussion of the three separate demurrers.

The Demurrer by County of Merced (and Joinder by City of Merced) to the Sixth Cause of Action for Violation of a Mandatory Duty pursuant to Water Code § 12650 in the Second Amended Complaint in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and the First Amended Complaint in *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) is OVERRULED.

This Court finds that the complaints establish that Water Code § 12650 creates a mandatory duty to maintain minimum channel capacities and that such duty was imposed on the Demurring Defendants. Accordingly, the Demurrers are OVERRULED.

Motion by Defendant State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife to Designate Matters as Complex

The Motion by Defendant State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife to Designate Matters as Complex is GRANTED.

California Rules of Court, rule 3.400 defines a complex case as “an action that requires exceptional judicial management to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the court or the litigants and to expedite the case, keep costs reasonable, and promote effective decision making by the courts, the parties, and counsel.” The motions on calendar at this hearing alone establish the elements of Rule 3.400. The volume and unique nature of discovery alone justifies a complex designation. There will be a need to manage a large number of witnesses and substantial documentary evidence. This Court finds that the duty to afford all of the parties herein to a fair and efficient trial outweighs the objections raised by City of Merced and Public Risk Innovations, Solutions, and Management and Fidelis Insurance, the sole objectors to the Motion to Designate the Matter Complex. Accordingly, the Motion by Defendant State of California by and through the Department of Fish and Wildlife to Designate Matters as Complex is GRANTED.

Appointment of Discovery Referee

The objection by Plaintiffs in *Tony Borba, et al.* (Case 23CV-04368), the First Amended Complaint in *Maria Perez-Ramirez, et al.* (Case 24CV-00234), and the First Amended Complaint in *Courtney Glenn, et al.* (Case 24CV-01073) (collectively referred to as the Kabateck Plaintiffs) are OVERRULED. The costs of a discovery referee can be initially determined on equitable grounds by the discovery referee and any objections to an inequitable allocation can be referred to the Court. The premise of the objecting Plaintiffs’ opposition is that those Plaintiffs anticipate minimal discovery and no need for a referee. If that proves to be the case those plaintiffs are unlikely to be required to bear the costs of adjudicating discovery issues brought by other parties and will be outweighed by the benefits of supervised information gathering.

The Court is inclined to appoint Rick Jacobson as referee. Parties who object to the appointment of Rick Jacobson, versus a different referee, are ordered to appear at the hearing to provide an alternative recommendation.

24CV-00163

Catherine Hoag, Ph.D. v. Regents of University of California

Demurrer by Defendant The Regents of the University of California and Defendant Westerling to Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint

The Demurrer to the First Cause of Action for Gender Discrimination in Violation of Government Code § 12940(a) is SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND. While the Plaintiff filed a timely disability claim, the imbedded gender discrimination claim was filed more than three years after the alleged gender discrimination occurred. (Government Code § 12960(e)(5).) Furthermore, since mere work-related criticism does not qualify as an adverse employment action (See *Light v. Department of Parks & Recreation* (2017) 14 Cal.App.5th 75, 92-93), Plaintiff has failed to allege an adverse employment action. Similarly, claims that Plaintiff’s input was ignored when she served on committees is not an actionable adverse employment action. (*Yanowitz v. L’Oreal USA, Inc.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1028, 1054-55.) Plaintiff fails to allege a causal connection between the 2017 gender discrimination events and her 2023 suspension for violating the faculty code of conduct. Plaintiff has failed to articulate how further leave to amend might cure this defect given her prior failure to do so. (*Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court* (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1035; *Banis Restaurant Design Inc. v. Serrano* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1035, 1044.)

The Demurrer to the Fifth Cause of Action for Retaliation and Wrongful Termination in Violation of Labor Code section 6310 is SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND.

(Muller v. Automobile Club of Southern California (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 431, 436-437 [“[t]he voicing of a fear about one’s safety in the workplace does not necessarily constitute a complaint about unsafe working conditions under Labor Code section 6310”].) Plaintiff has failed to articulate how further leave to amend might cure this defect given her prior failure to do so. (Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1035; Banis Restaurant Design Inc. v. Serrano (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1035, 1044.)

The Demurrer to the Sixth Cause of Action for Retaliation and Wrongful Termination in Violation of Labor Code § 98.6 is SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND. Labor Code § 98.6 protects types of conduct protected by the Labor Code, e.g. Labor Code § 1101 [Political Activities], Labor Code § 1102.5 [whistleblowing], Labor Code § 96(k) Lawful Conduct during nonworking hours]. Plaintiff has failed to articulate how further leave to amend might cure this defect given her prior failure to do so. (Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1035; Banis Restaurant Design Inc. v. Serrano (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1035, 1044.)

The Demurrer to the Seventh Cause of Action for Violation of Labor Code § 970 is SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND. Plaintiff has failed to alleged facts pleading around the immunity afforded Defendant Westerling by Government Code § 822.2 and has failed to articulate how further leave to amend might cure this defect given her prior failure to do so. (Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1035; Banis Restaurant Design Inc. v. Serrano (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1035, 1044.)

Motion to Strike Second Amended Complaint Allegations regarding referring to Gender Discrimination, Punitive Damages, or Double Damages by Defendant The Regents of the University of California and Defendant Westerling

The Motion to Strike Second Amended Complaint Allegations regarding referring to Gender Discrimination, Punitive Damages, or Double Damages by Defendant The Regents of the University of California and Defendant Westerling is GRANTED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND.”.] Plaintiff has failed to articulate how further leave to amend might cure this defect given her prior failure to do so. (Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1035; Banis Restaurant Design Inc. v. Serrano (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1035, 1044.)

24CV-05893 Petition of: Mary Carmen Ayala

Order to Show Case 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.

24CV-05893 Petition of: Gonzalo Ayala Jr.

Order to Show Case 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.

24CV-05906

Antonekha Medina Lee v. Zackiyah Griffin

Order to Show Case 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. The Court notes that no proof of service is on file showing service of the papers filed in this action on respondent.

24CV-05990

Zackiyah Griffin v. Antonekha Lee

Order to Show Case 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. The Court notes that proof of service was filed January 6, 2025 showing service of the papers filed in this action on respondent.

24CV-06107

In the matter of Diana Gonzalez

In Camera Hearing

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.

24CV-06111

In the matter of Carlos Luis Garcia

In Camera Hearing

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.

24CV-06182

Feuy Saechao v. Meuysio Saetern

Order to Show Case 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. The Court notes that no proof of service is on file showing service of the papers filed in this action on respondent.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

Mandatory Settlement Conference
Hon. Stephanie Jamieson
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, January 8, 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
-----------------	----------------------------

There are no Mandatory Settlement Conferences Scheduled	
---	--

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MERCED

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

Wednesday, January 8, 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
----------	---------------------

21CV-03041	Midland Credit Mgt Inc. vs. Sonia Romero
------------	--

OSC re: Dismissal – Notice of Settlement

Appearance required. On May 1, 2023, plaintiff filed a notice of settlement indicating completion of the conditional settlement and request for dismissal no later than October 14, 2024. No request for dismissal has been filed. If there is no appearance to request additional time to complete the settlement, the Court will dismiss the case (see Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 3.1385(c)). 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.

21CV-03373	Synchrony Bank vs. Miguel Rodriguez
------------	-------------------------------------

OSC re: Dismissal – Notice of Settlement

No appearance is necessary. The order to show cause re: dismissal is discharged and hearing vacated. On December 30, 2024, plaintiff Synchrony Bank filed a noticed motion to set aside and vacate the notice of settlement and to set a trial date. The Court confirms the motion hearing date scheduled for January 30, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 9.

24CV-00652 Leavonia Logan vs. Western Dental Service, Inc.

Small Claims 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.

24CV-04347 [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.

24CV-04603 [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.

24CV-05523 [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

Ex Parte Matters
Hon. Stephanie Jamieson
Courtroom 8
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, January 8, 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

Wednesday, January 8, 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

Wednesday, January 8, 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

Limited Civil Long Cause Court Trials
Commissioner David Foster
Courtroom 9
627 W. 21st Street, Merced

Wednesday, January 8, 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 Limited Civil Long Cause Court Trials Scheduled	
--	--