

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

1	CVL66958	Capital One, N.A. vs. Shirley N. Riddle		02/06/2025
---	-----------------	--	--	------------

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Donald Sherrill

Shirley N. Riddle

Motion Hearing - Set Aside/Vacate

Dismissal and Enter Judgment

02/06/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/25/2025 Archive Room

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a motion to set aside the entry of dismissal, entered 07/09/2025, to permit entry of a stipulated judgment (minus credits) via CCP §664.6 based upon plaintiff's alleged default of the settlement agreement. The matter was set for hearing, as was a right guaranteed to the defendant in the settlement agreement. Service appears to have been made on the defendant, and no response from her has been received. If defendant fails to appear and offer legal cause why the dismissal should not be set aside in favor of a judgment consistent with the terms of the written settlement agreement, it will be incumbent upon her to appear. Otherwise, the motion will be granted and the relief prayed for provided provided.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

February 18, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

2 CV65628

Beverly W. Cooley vs. Sonora Community Hospital

10/06/2023

Beverly W. Cooley

Attorney: David Yeremian

**Sonora Community Hospital, a
California Corporation**

Attorney: Daniel Whang

**Adventist Health System/West, a
California Corporation**

Attorney: Daniel Whang

Review Hearing

Settlement?

Motion Hearing - Other

Prove-Up

10/06/2023 Complaint

File Tracking

07/16/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a wage/hour PAGA suit. Before the Court this day is plaintiff’s motion to approve the settlement reached herein. The trial court must review and approve any PAGA settlement, making sure it is fair to both the LWDA, as well as the employees subjected to one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations. Although the litmus for fairness is not precisely defined, courts generally look to whether the settlement is genuine, meaningful and consistent with the underlying purpose of PAGA, to wit: protecting employees, augmenting the state’s enforcement capabilities, encouraging compliance with Labor Code provisions, and deterring noncompliance. Some of the factors to consider, subject to a sliding scale, include (1) the LWDA’s views, or lack thereof, on the settlement; (2) the likelihood of any discretionary reduction of PAGA penalties under §2699(e)(2); (3) the value of any nonmonetary relief (such as changes in company policies); and (4) whether the same employees entitled to PAGA penalties are already recovering monetary relief as part of a class settlement. See, e.g., *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 548-549; *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348, 382; *Moorer v. Noble L.A. Events, Inc.* (2019) 32 Cal.App.5th 736, 742-744; *Julian v. Glenair, Inc.* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 853, 865-866.

The PAGA data points are as follows:

- Number of aggrieved employees: 1,896
- Number of impacted pay periods: 76,209
- Potential Exposure: \$3,810,450.00
- Settlement Amount: \$ 710,000.00
 - LWDA Portion: \$ 322,009.73
 - Attorney Fee (35%): \$ 248,500.00
 - Litigation Costs: \$ 18,153.70
 - Administrator Fee: \$ 14,000.00
 - Employee Portion: \$ 107,336.58
 - Average pay out: \$ **56.61**

The settlement represents an overall quotient of 18.6%, which is considerably low – even by PAGA standards. The fee sought represents an hourly rate across the board of \$1,650.00. Counsel describes this as “reasonable” and only “modestly above” the lodestar plus a 2x multiplier. Counsel is mistaken. Every lodestar analysis is tethered to the local legal community rates, and the rates here for garden-variety PAGA actions do not exceed \$550/hr. This case did not involve any formal discovery, law/motion, or serious effort warranting any multiplier.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

3	CV66440	Fawn B Foster Harbour vs. FCA US, LLC		09/12/2024
----------	----------------	--	--	-------------------

Fawn B Foster Harbour	Attorney: Tionna Dolin
------------------------------	------------------------

FCA US, LLC	Attorney: Elizabeth McNulty
--------------------	-----------------------------

FCA US, LLC	Attorney: Christopher Waldon
--------------------	------------------------------

FCA US, LLC	Attorney: Christopher Brown
--------------------	-----------------------------

Trial Setting

Motion Hearing - Summary Judgment

09/12/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

07/09/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a lemon law case with a pending MSJ and trial setting hearing. Although the parties have previously appeared before the Commissioner, the court records does not clearly reflect a CRC 2.816 stipulation so no tentative can be posted yet. However, this Court notes that while the CCP §437c(h) request is notably anemic, no prejudice would befall the defense if plaintiff were allowed an additional 90 days to (1) complete the requested discovery and (2) file an amended opposition to the MSJ. This is the more prudent approach, and with no trial date pending, it stands to reason that discovery will open and permit plaintiff to complete what is needed. Even without the sub (h) basis for a continuance, trial courts have inherent authority to continuance the hearing either way.

Court's indicated handling of the MSJ is to permit plaintiff the additional time sought and schedule a new date for amended opposition, amended reply, and a new hearing date. Court also intends to reschedule the date for trial setting.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

6	CVL65551	J.P. Morgan Chase Bank vs. Alisha Curnow		08/21/2023
----------	-----------------	---	--	-------------------

J.P. Morgan Chase Bank	Attorney: Matthew Keim
-------------------------------	------------------------

Alisha Curnow

Motion Hearing - Other

Opposition to Claim of Exemption

Hearing requested by attorney for defendant over the phone. FLA

08/21/2023 Complaint

File Tracking 02/27/2024 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a collections case involving a judgment in the approximate amount of \$8,000.00. Before the Court this day is a hearing on the debtor’s claim of exemption. The opposition does not directly dispute any claim exceptions, and only seeks “proof” of the claimed monthly expenses – which is an issue for a debtor’s examination, not a hearing on exemptions. See CCP §703.560. Either way, the hearing must be continued, with a stay on collection in place, because neither the levying officer nor the judgment creditor provided this Court with a copy of the debtor’s claim of exemption. See CCP §703.550(a).

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

February 18, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

8 CV67641 Bryan Sherbino vs. Sierra Pacific Industries

09/15/2025

Bryan Sherbino

Attorney: Adam Stewart

Sierra Pacific Industries

Demurrer

Case Management Conference

Further

09/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

09/19/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a personal injury. As alleged, plaintiff was lent by an employment agency to defendant to perform manual labor on the job, using a rotary saw allegedly equipped with an improper blade. According to plaintiff, he was wearing loose sleeves, which were caught in the teeth of the blade, resulting in injury.

A demurrer to the original complaint was pending, but rendered moot with the filing of a First Amended Complaint. The court file does not yet reveal a responsive pleading to the FAC, though it is assumed that the defendant intends to continue litigating.

A further CMC remains on calendar this day. Although the matter is not yet at issue, there does not appear to be any impediment to setting dates. However, the Court is amenable to a continuance of the CMC if that is the preference of the parties.

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

- Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)
- Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5 **February 18, 2026 10:00 am** **DA Case #** **Date Filed**

12 CVL67546 **Bank of America, N.A. vs. Robert Filko** 08/12/2025

Bank of America, N.A. Attorney: Harvey Moore

Robert Filko

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

08/12/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/14/2025 High Density
--

Collections case.

Answer filed 09/25/2025.

Set for bench trial.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
13 CV65506	California Department of Forestry vs. Dutton Landscape et al		08/16/2023
	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	Attorney: Evan Eickmeyer	
	Dutton Landscape Services		
	Ryan Dutton		
	D.R.	Attorney: Bethany Lukitsch	
	D.R.	Attorney: Kamran Ahmadian	
	Charmaine Turpin-Erwin	Attorney: Jason DiGioia	

This is a fire cost recovery action relating to the Moc Fire from 2020. On 08/28/2025, plaintiff caused to be filed a Notice of Unconditional Settlement of Entire Case. Pursuant to CRC 3.1385(b), "if the plaintiff or other party required to serve and file the request for dismissal does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case 45 days after it receives notice of settlement unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed."

Neither party has proffered good cause for additional time, so the matter shall be dismissed with prejudice, effective immediately.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

14	CVL66963	Discover Bank vs. Shirley J. Eckhart	02/10/2025
----	----------	--------------------------------------	------------

Discover Bank

Attorney: Jeremy LaForge

Shirley J. Eckhart

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

02/10/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

03/17/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 02/10/2025
- Defendant Served: 03/31/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$5,186.00
- OSC Issued on: n/a; ordered but never sent out by clerk

CRC 3.740(f) Tier I (though this should be Tier II)

Set OSC re Sanctions for 03/18/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice and to serve the actual OSC.

Note: Counsel indicates that a default prove-up package "has been" submitted, but the court file does not show a completed one.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

16	CV67220	Michelle Johnson vs. Robert White et al	05/02/2025
----	---------	---	------------

Michelle Johnson Attorney: John Montevideo

Robert White

Paradise Shores, LLC Attorney: David Casady

Case Management Conference

FURTHER

05/02/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 05/09/2025 High Density

This is a dog bite case ...

It appears that plaintiff was renting a campsite or visiting the campsite when she was attacked by defendant's dog. She sued the dog owner and the campsite. The premises location answered, filed XC against dog owner. Dog owners apparently leased a campsite trailer, so there is presumably some dog control rules in place.

Plaintiff and defendant campsite both filed CMC statements. Dog owner Robert and/or Joan White is apparently still in the wind. Court intends to set dates today with or without the White family.

- o Is the case fully at issue?
- o Do we have all the necessary and/or interested parties before us?
- o Does anyone plan to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- o Are there any related cases?
- o What is the amount in controversy for purposes of jurisdiction only?
- o Jury demanded?
- o Time estimate?

Trial: _____
Thursday @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation
Mondays @ 8:00 a.m. in Dept 3

Settlement Conference
Dept 2 1st and 3rd Tuesday @ 1:30 pm
Dept 5 2nd and 4th Wednesday @ 1:30 pm, any Friday @ 1:30 pm

CRC 3.110 requires service to be effectuated in 60 days.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

17	CVL67745	JP Morgan Chase Bank vs. Larry Torres, Jr	10/17/2025
----	-----------------	--	------------

JP Morgan Chase Bank	Attorney: Brian Langedyk
-----------------------------	--------------------------

Larry Torres

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

10/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density

“Collections” case:

- Litigation Commenced: 10/17/2025
- Defendant Served: 11/18/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 1
- Amount in Controversy: \$29,428.91
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set for Day 360 review on 11/04/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. with OSC re CRC 3.740(f) Tier I.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

20	CVL66819	LVNV Funding, LLC vs. Cristobal Seva, Jr	01/02/2025
----	----------	--	------------

LVNV Funding, LLC

Attorney: Flint Zide

Cristobal Seva

Review Hearing

Judgment or dismissal filed?

01/02/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/13/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 01/02/2025
- Defendant Served: 02/06/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$1,689.42
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC re Tier I Sanctions for 03/18/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice and to serve the actual OSC.

**Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger**

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

21	CVL67445	Midland Credit Management, Inc vs. Chelsea Moyle	07/17/2025
----	-----------------	---	------------

Midland Credit Management, Inc Attorney: Junqiao Xiao

Chelsea Moyle Attorney: Christina
Melhouse

Case Management Conference

07/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 07/21/2025 High Density
--

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Per CMC, parties have settled but there is no Notice of Settlement on file so the matter will be set for a short-cause bench trial.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

22	CVL67296	Nationwide vs. Aviram Rahamim Makhluf; Et al.		05/27/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

Nationwide

Attorney: Christina Cicione

Aviram Rahamim Makhluf

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier 1

05/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/28/2025 High Density

This is a subrogation case. At the previous hearing, this court set an OSC re Tier I sanctions for plaintiff's failure to comply with CRC 3.110. The OSC was served via mail on 11/19/2025, and to date there has been no response to the OSC, and no compliance with proof of having served the defendant. It has now been over eight months, where the Rule of Court allows two months.

Sanctions imposed in the amount of \$500, payable forthwith.
Second OSC set for 04/15/2026 @ 10:00 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

25 CVL66967	OPORTUN, INC. vs. Elizabeth Fran Kelly McDaniel		02/10/2025
-------------	--	--	------------

OPORTUN, INC.

Attorney: Stephanie Boone

Elizabeth Fran Kelly McDaniel

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Sanctions re: failure to comply with CRC 3.740

02/10/2025 **Complaint**

File Tracking 03/17/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- **Litigation Commenced:** 02/10/2025
- **Defendant Served:** 04/14/2025 (filed 11/05/2025)
- **# of Hearings (incl this):** 3
- **Amount in Controversy:** \$4,547.44
- **OSC Issued on:** 10/29/2025

Though issued as possible Tier II, plaintiff did in fact effectuate service of the summons on time. Even though CRC 3.740 requires proof of service of the summons to be "filed" by Day 180, this defect can be forgiven in the interests of justice. However, since we are already past Day 360, a Tier 1 sanction is still required.

Impose sanction of \$500.00, payable forthwith.
Set OSC re Tier II Sanctions for 03/18/2026 @ 10:00 a.m.
Clerk to give notice.

**Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger**

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

27	CV67777	PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICE, LLC vs. Amoz Marshall et al	10/28/2025
----	---------	--	------------

PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICE, LLC Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Amoz Marshall

The Secretary of Veteran Affairs

Case Management Conference

10/28/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density

This is a judicial foreclosure action. The action was commenced almost four months ago and, as yet, there is no proof of service upon either the homeowner or the federal government. CRC 3.110 applies with equal force regardless of the nature of the action.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

28	CV67749	Pleasant Mattress Inc. vs. Ryder Truck Rental Inc. et al.		10/20/2025
----	---------	---	--	------------

Pleasant Mattress Inc.	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
------------------------	---------------------------

Ryder Truck Rental Inc. et al.

Case Management Conference

10/20/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density

This is a workers compensation subrogation action in which the employer has sought contribution from a third-party for its part in bringing about injuries to plaintiff's employee. Despite being commenced nearly four months prior, there is no proof of service upon the defendant in the court file. CRC 3.110 applies with equal force regardless of the nature of the action.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

29	CV63591	Stanley Redick, III vs. Sonora Police Department	01/19/2021
		Stanley Redick	Pro Per
		Sonora Police Department	Attorney: Van Longyear
		Stanley Redick	
		Sonora Police Department	Attorney: Van Longyear
		County of Tuolumne District Attorney Office	Attorney: Jeffrey Arnold
		City of Sonora	Attorney: Van Longyear
		Case Management Conference	
		FURTHER	

10/21/2024 Civil Appeal

File Tracking 07/09/2025 High Density

Other Cases
CV63593
CV63592
CV63539

On 12/08/2025, and again on 02/13/2026, plaintiff filed statements in the action indicating that no bench officer is presently assigned to hear this case. This bench officer has twice convened a hearing, once with plaintiff actually present (though declining to substantively participate) Since this bench officer requires an affirmative or reliably-tacit stipulation to serve in any binding capacity herein, these statements permit the inference that since the last hearing plaintiff has decided NOT to provide the required CRC 2.816 stipulation. Rather than continue to hold "house-keeping" hearings only, it would improve the efficiency of justice to have this case actually assigned to a bench officer for whom a stipulation is not required. Unless the parties indicate otherwise, the intention is to have the matter transferred.

**Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger**

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

30	CV67250	Kelli Slater vs. Doug Benton et. al.	05/12/2025
----	---------	--------------------------------------	------------

Kelli Slater Pro Per

Doug Benton

Frederick Wentworth

Judy Wentworth

Case Management Conference

05/12/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 05/12/2025 High Density

Related to #23 ...

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

31	CVL67553	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co vs. Matthew Aaron Spiller	08/15/2025
-----------	-----------------	--	-------------------

State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company	Attorney: Richard Mahfouz
Matthew Aaron Spiller	
Case Management Conference	

08/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/20/2025 High Density

This is a subrogation action. Defendant was apparently served within one week of the commencement of this action, and yet there is – so far – no answer, no default, and no settlement/dismissal. Pursuant to CRC 3.110(g), “if a responsive pleading is not served within the time limits specified in this rule and no extension of time has been granted, the plaintiff must file a request for entry of default within 10 days after the time for service has elapsed. The court may issue an order to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed if the plaintiff fails to timely file the request for the entry of default.”

Court intends to set an OSC re Tier I sanctions unless counsel can provide a cogent explanation for the six-month silence.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

32 CVL67225	Stearns Bank, National Association vs. Ronnie Lee Johnson		05/06/2025
-------------	--	--	------------

Stearns Bank, National Association

Attorney: Christina Rymcza

Ronnie Lee Johnson

Attorney: Kenneth Foley

Case Management Conference

05/06/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/07/2025 High Density

This is a collections case.

At the hearing on 10/08/2025, counsel for both sides were discussing the need for discovery before a trial should be set. Neither in his CMC statement, nor at the hearing itself, did defendant mention any potential bankruptcy filing.

Apparently, three weeks earlier (on 09/16/2025), defendant did indeed file for Chapter 13 protection. Despite the obligation to do so, defense counsel never filed a Notice of Stay (CM-180) to alert this Court (or, for that matter, plaintiff) of the bankruptcy filing. Defense counsel first informed this Court of the bankruptcy via its recent CMC statement filed 02/09/2026. Problem is, according to plaintiff, the bankruptcy case was dismissed on 01/27/2026 – well before the defense CMC statement signed, let alone filed with this Court as an affirmative basis for a possible continuance.

Court intends to set trial in this case, forthwith. If a real bankruptcy stay is in place, defendant is free to provide proof thereof.

**Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger**

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

33	CV67723	Timberline Environmental Services, Inc vs. Argo Group US INC, et al	10/08/2025
----	---------	---	------------

Timberline Environmental Services, Inc	Attorney: Nicole Adams-Hess
Timberline Environmental Services, Inc	Attorney: Gary Dambacher
Argo Group US, INC	
Terry Northcutt Texas Holdings LLC	Attorney: Nicole Adams-Hess
Terry Northcutt Texas Holdings LLC	Attorney: Gary Dambacher
Timberline Tx, LLC	Attorney: Nicole Adams-Hess
Timberline Tx, LLC	Attorney: Gary Dambacher
Argo Group International Holdings LTD	
Colony Specialty Insurance Company INC	
Marsh and MCLellen Agency LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
Does 1-50	
Case Management Conference	

10/08/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 12/05/2025 High Density

No appearance is needed.

This action has been removed to the federal district court. A review hearing will be set for 08/19/2026 at 10:00 a.m., along with an OSC re dismissal without prejudice. If the action has not been returned here to state court in that time, and there is no indication that the federal court has declined to exercise jurisdiction over state claims, this Court sees no reason to keep the state action active.

**Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger**

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

36	CV66936	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Suzanne Louise Dudeck, MD	01/28/2025
-----------	----------------	---	-------------------

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Tiffany Pack
-------------------------------	------------------------

Suzanne Louise Dudeck

Trial Setting

01/28/2025 Complaint

File Tracking
08/08/2025 High Density

Breach of contract (collection) case.

Answer filed.

Trial must be re-set as it is long overdue.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

45	CVL67555	Capital One, N.A. vs. Robert Bennett	08/14/2025
----	----------	--------------------------------------	------------

Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discover Bank
Robert Bennett

Attorney: Stella Park

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

08/14/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/20/2025 High Density

Collections case.

Set review hearing and OSC re Sanctions for compliance with CRC 3.740 for 09/16/2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5 **February 18, 2026 10:03 am** **DA Case #** **Date Filed**

49 **CVL67522** **Credit Corp Solutions, INC vs. Shane Sansen** 08/04/2025

Credit Corp Solutions, INC Attorney: Alison Schlick

Shane Sansen

Review Hearing

08/04/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/13/2025 High Density
--

Collections case.

Set review hearing and OSC re Sanctions for compliance with CRC 3.740 for 08/19/2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

52	CVL67317	Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Vaneza Maxwell	06/04/2025
----	----------	---	------------

Crown Asset Management, LLC assignee of First Bank & Trust (Mercury) Vaneza Maxwell	Attorney: Venessa Thomas
Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740	

06/04/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 06/04/2025 High Density

Collections case.

Set review hearing and OSC re Sanctions for compliance with CRC 3.740 for 06/17/2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5 **February 18, 2026 10:03 am** **DA Case #** **Date Filed**

60 **CVL67543** **Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. David Pineda** 08/11/2025

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Attorney: Edgar Lopez

David Pineda

Review Hearing

08/11/2025 **Complaint**

File Tracking 08/14/2025 High Density
--

Collections case.

Set review hearing and OSC re Sanctions for compliance with CRC 3.740 for 09/16/2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5 February 18, 2026 1:30 pm DA Case # Date Filed

62 CVL66890 Cavalry SPV I, LLC vs. Patricia A. Britt 01/15/2025

Cavalry SPV I, LLC

Attorney: Tiffany Pack

Patricia A. Britt

OSC Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

02/21/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 01/15/2025
- Defendant Served: 03/12/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 4
- Amount in Controversy: \$13,523.97
- OSC Issued on: 01/27/2026

Impose sanction of \$500.

Set OSC re Tier II Sanction for 03/18/2026 @ 10:00 a.m.

Clerk to give notice.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026	1:30 pm	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

64	CVL66608	Discover Bank vs. Elizabeth Hulsey		10/30/2024
----	-----------------	---	--	------------

Discover Bank

Attorney: Hootan Atefyekta

Elizabeth Hulsey

OSC Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

Tier 2

10/30/2024 **Complaint**

File Tracking

07/11/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- **Litigation Commenced:** 10/30/2024
- **Defendant Served:** 12/06/2024
- **# of Hearings (incl this):** 3
- **Amount in Controversy:** \$13,163.69
- **OSC Issued on:** 01/27/2026

Impose Tier I sanction of \$500.

Set OSC re Tier II Sanction for 03/18/2026 @ 10:00 a.m.

Clerk to give notice.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne
Consolidated Calendar
Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	February 18, 2026	1:30 pm	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

65	CVL66324	Velocity Investments LLC vs. Connie Plass		07/31/2024
-----------	-----------------	--	--	-------------------

Velocity Investments LLC

Attorney: Bryant Burnstad

Connie Plass

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier 2

Review Hearing - Sanctions

\$500 Paid?

07/31/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

08/08/2025 High Density

This is a collections case. In the interim since the OSC was recently issued, a Notice of Conditional Settlement was filed. The filing, by Rule of Court, removes all hearings from calendar. Although it is true that CRC 3.1385(c) generally prohibits a trial court from setting hearings “earlier than 45 days after the dismissal date specified in the notice, unless requested by a party,” and that a case sitting in such limbo is to be excluded from the computation of fast track compliance (see CRC 3.1385(c)(4) and Standards 2.2(m)(1)(A)), this Court does have an effective omnibus calendar system in which to segregate cases removed from this court’s control for statistical (and funding) purposes. Since the parties will presumably agree to a stipulated judgment with retained jurisdiction under CCP §664.6, there is no good cause for keeping this case active though April of 2029. The matter will be dismissed and if judicial intervention is needed down the road, the dismissal can be easily set aside. Court will set the OSC re dismissal for 04/15/2026 at 10:00 a.m.