



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>2</b>	<b>CV67757</b>	<b>John Kevin Donahue vs. California Department of Motor Vehicles</b> <b>John Kevin Donahue</b> <b>California Department of Motor Vehicles</b> <b>Writ of Mandate Hearing</b>	Attorney: Mark Smith	10/22/2025
----------	----------------	--	----------------------	------------

10/22/2025 Writ

<b>File Tracking</b> 11/14/2025 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=NTRMTONwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [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 special mandamus proceeding to direct the Department of Motor Vehicles to set aside an order suspending petitioner's driving privileges following an arrest for §23152. The underlying criminal charges (CRM76470) were dismissed following petitioner's successful §1538.5 motion. Although petitioner assumes the outcome is controlled by *Zapata v. Department of Motor Vehicles* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 108, that decision (which was probably correct) was subsequently overruled in a 4-3 split decision in *Gikas v. Zolin* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 841. See also *People v. Superior Court (Moore)* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1202, 1213-1214. While the DMV is not automatically estopped from considering the issues raised in petitioner's §1538.5 motion, the DMV is nevertheless required to hear evidence and make a finding that the facts and circumstances known to the officer support a reasonable suspicion that the driver violated the Vehicle Code or some other law. In other words, the DMV still has to find that the stop was valid (ie, a finding that is contrary to what a trial court already decided). See Veh. Code §13557(b)(2); *Gikas, supra* at 847; *Mercer v. Department of Motor Vehicles* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 753, 768-769.

Court is awaiting an appearance by the DMV to direct preparation of the administrative record and a briefing schedule. Summons appears to have been served on DMV.

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

**Department 5**

**March 4, 2026 8:30 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

**3 CV66568**

**Rodrigo Cruz Garcia vs. XL Concrete Masonry, LLC**

10/21/2024

**Rodrigo Cruz Garcia**

Attorney: Kane Moon

**XL Concrete Masonry, LLC**

Attorney: Alden Parker

**Case Management Conference**

Settlement Filed? Special Set Time

**Motion Hearing - Other**

for preliminary approval of class action and paga settlement

**10/21/2024 Complaint**

**File Tracking**

04/29/2025 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 wage/hour dispute. Before the Court is a motion by plaintiff for provisional certification of the class, provisional approval of the class settlement, and approval of the PAGA settlement.

Class Certification

If the class has not yet been certified, part of the motion will include a request for provisional certification for purposes of settlement only. See CRC 3.769. Although the provisional process is less demanding than a traditional motion for class certification, a trial court reviewing an application for preliminary approval of a settlement must still find that the normal class prerequisites have been met. See *Carter v. City of Los Angeles* (2014) 224 Cal.App.4th 808, 826. The moving party must establish by admissible evidence: (1) the existence of an ascertainable and sufficiently numerous class; (2) a well-defined community of interest; and (3) substantial benefits from certification that render proceeding as a class superior to the alternatives. A class is ascertainable when it is defined in terms of objective characteristics and common transactional facts that make the ultimate identification of class members possible, and that is sufficient to allow a member of the class to identify himself or herself as having a right to recover. A community of interest exists there if predominant common question of law or fact which will impact all class members, if the proposed class representative has similar individual claims to the class, and if the proposed class representative and counsel will adequately represent the class. *Noel v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 955, 980-986; *Duran v. U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass'n* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 28-29; *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021. Here, the proposed class of "all hourly-paid non-exempt employees in California between 02/11/2023 and 12/21/2025" is amenable to class certification. The class is ascertainable, numerous, common and typical. There is certainly value in the class process here.

The Settlement

For the **class action portion**, the proponent of the settlement bears the burden of showing that the settlement is within the reasonable range such that a trial court will likely be able to approve it at a final hearing, taking into consideration these four factors: (1) have putative class members been adequately represented by experienced counsel and a vested representative; (2) was the settlement a result of a serious, informed, non-collusive, arm's length negotiation; (3) whether the relief obtained has any real value to class members when compared to what those claims might yield; and (4) are certain segments of the class entitled to preferential treatment. Because this is not the final approval hearing, the level of scrutiny at this stage is often described as something less than a "finding" of fairness and more of a "feeling" of fairness. See *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1166. Despite what may appear to be a rather amorphous standard at this juncture, it is in the best interests of all involved to have some real scrutiny. Thus, even at the preliminary hearing stage, courts should still keep the fairness elements in mind, to wit (1) the strength of plaintiffs' case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status through trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement when compared to the potential recovery; (5) the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) any evidence of collusion, fraud or overreaching by the negotiating parties; and (8) due regard to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement. See *Jones v. Farmers Insurance Exchange* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 986, 998; *Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 581; *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 409. The **PAGA portion** is final, which means that it must pass at this juncture the fairness inquiry, to wit: (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 following data points are key:

Number of Employees (301) spread over a potential of 3,642 pay periods affected

Settlement amount of \$269,000.00 (aka quotient of 6.5%) – administrator fees – legal fees (\$90,000) – costs (\$25,000) – class rep (\$7,500).

No lodestar cross-check feasible because billing records not provided. No discovery, only mediation. Fee 28%; Class Rep \$4,500.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>4</b>	<b>CV67081</b>	<b>Teresa Houston vs. Ann Taylor</b>		<b>03/18/2025</b>
----------	----------------	--------------------------------------	--	-------------------

**Teresa Houston**

Attorney: Hal Channell

**Ann Taylor**

Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

**Review Hearing**

Case Status? Set Settlement Conference?

**03/18/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

04/09/2025 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.

---

Hearing to re-set settlement conference or to set trial.

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

**Department 5**

**March 4, 2026 8:30 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

**5 CV67306 Richard Lee Lasater vs. James Gianelli et al**

05/29/2025

**Richard Lee Lasater**

Pro Per

**James Gianelli**

Attorney: Jason Sommer

**Kate Powell Segerstrom**

**Jefferey Kaufman**

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

**Motion Hearing - Set Aside/Vacate**

**Demurrer**

to plaintiff's second amended complaint

**Motion Hearing - Strike**

Second amended complaint

**Demurrer**

J Kaufman's to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint

**05/29/2025 Complaint**

**File Tracking**

07/22/2025 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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnYdZzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [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. Parties have already stipulated here.

This is a legal malpractice action decades in the making. Before the Court this day are two demurrers and a motion to strike directed at the Second Amended Complaint. For the reasons which follow, the demurrers are SUSTAINED with leave to amend, rendering the motion to strike moot.

Demurrer For Uncertainty – Sustained with Leave to Amend

A demurrer is a legal challenge to the adequacy of a pleading, not a challenge to the validity of the claims themselves. See *Greif v. Sanin* (2022) 74 Cal.App.5th 412, 426. A demurrer for uncertainty will be sustained only where the pleading is so bad that the defendant cannot reasonably determine what issues must be admitted or denied, or what counts or claims are directed against him or her. See *A.J. Fistes Corp. v. GDL Best Contractors, Inc.* (2019) 38 Cal.App.5th 677, 695; *Chen v. Berenjian* (2019) 33 Cal.App.5th 811, 822; *Lickiss v. Financial Industry Regulatory Authority* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1125, 1135; *Khoury v. Maly's of California, Inc.* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 612, 616. Here, the operative pleading contains three of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> causes of action ostensibly against different parties, but then an 8<sup>th</sup> causes of action for conspiracy against all three for the same acts. To add to the confusion, plaintiff starts the paragraph numbering anew with each cause of action, requiring cerebral gymnastics to figure out which charm is applicable to which defendant.

Demurrer for Statute of Limitations – Sustained with Leave to Amend

The statute of limitations for legal malpractice is one year (discovery) or four years (actual). A demurrer on the ground of the bar of statute of limitations will not lie where the action may be, but is not necessarily, barred – so it must appear affirmatively upon the face of the complaint or from matters amenable to judicial notice that the right of action is barred. *Committee for Green Foothills v. Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors* (2010) 48 Cal.4th 32, 42; *May v. City of Milpitas* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1307, 1324. Defendant asks this Court to take judicial notice of filings within CV59955 and CVL59679, both which seem to have informed plaintiff by the winter of 2015 that he signed a version of the leave agreement containing the option to purchase. In fact, by the fall of 2017, plaintiff monetized that decision for \$600,000. Since a cause of action for legal malpractice accrues when a client has *reason to suspect* that the attorney has committed error. *Ovando v. County of Los Angeles* (2008) 159 Cal.App.4th 42, 66. The Sooter's settlement conference statement from August of 2007 states that plaintiff's own attorney (at that time, Segerstrom) confirmed in an email his willingness to accept the purchase option – but either way the October 2005 lease does not become effective unless/until plaintiff signs the document, which he did. As such, he will need to show actual fraud on the part of his lawyers both in discussing the issue in 2005, and in keeping plaintiff in the dark through 2024. See CCP §340.6(a)(3). If he has those facts, he must set them forth with clarity in the next iteration. What does the settlement agreement from 2017 say?

Motion to Strike – Moot, but ...

Though moot, this Court feels compelled to clarify the circumstances upon which the Second Amended Complaint came to be filed, which promoted the motion to strike. On 11/12/2025, plaintiff had pending a motion to transfer venue to Stanislaus County. It is common practice to halt proceedings until the motion is resolved. See *Thompson v. Thames* (1997) 57 Cal.App.4th 1296, 1303-1304; *Moore v. Powell* (1977) 70 Cal.App.3d 583, 587. For that reason, this Court did not rule on the pending pleading motions. However, because plaintiff indicated at that hearing his desire to retain counsel, this Court offered (albeit in *dicta*) that counsel would likely want to revise the operative pleading because it was a "substantive labyrinth" replete with Rule of Court defects, "argument, case citation, stream of consciousness" and too many pages. This Court did not officially give plaintiff leave to amend, only the encouragement to streamline his claims. It is understandable why plaintiff heard this Court's pontification as permission to actually file a new pleading. Defense counsel is correct that leave was never technically granted, but plaintiff is equally correct that exalting form over substance serves no long-term value.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

7	CV67134	Petition of Kevin Starks		04/11/2025
---	---------	--------------------------	--	------------

<b>Kevin Starks</b>	Pro Per
<b>School District of Curtis Creek Elementary</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
<b>Case Management Conference</b>	
<b>Motion Hearing - Other</b>	
Reclassification from Limited to Unlimited	
<b>Motion Hearing - Continuance</b>	

04/11/2025 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b> 12/26/2025 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=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. Parties have already stipulated here.

---

No appearance is necessary.

The CMC shall be continued to align with the next round of pleading motions, currently set for hearing April 1, 2026. However, this bench officer will be on assignment that week, so the hearings set that date will need to be moved to April 15, 2026 at 8:30 a.m.

As an aside, the motions to continue and reclassify are already moot and will not be carried over to April 15, 2026.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

8	<b>CVL66873</b>	<b>Accelerated Inventory Management, LLC vs. Heather Smith</b>	01/07/2025
---	-----------------	--	------------

**Accelerated Inventory  
Management, LLC  
Heather Smith**

Attorney: Flint Zide

**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**

Re: Dismissal or Default

01/07/2025 **Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

08/11/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 01/07/2025
- Defendant Served: 02/21/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 3
- Amount in Controversy: \$7,555.93
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC re Tier I Sanctions for 05/06/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice.

Q: No POS from clerk's office for today so if TT does not show, consider reset.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

9	CVL66949	Accelerated Inventory Management, LLC vs. Todd Taylor	02/03/2025
---	----------	---	------------

**Accelerated Inventory  
Management, LLC  
Todd Taylor**

Attorney: Hada Fernandez

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

02/03/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

03/17/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 02/03/2025
- Defendant Served: not
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$9,797.75
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC re Tier II Sanctions for 05/06/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice.

Q: No POS from clerk's office for today so if TT does not show, consider reset.

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

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
10 CVL66664	<b>American Express National Bank vs. Carol McKee</b>  <b>American Express National Bank</b> Attorney: Douglas Wallace  <b>Carol McKee</b> Pro Per  <b>Review Hearing</b> Dismissal or Default Judgment		11/13/2024
11/13/2024	<b>Complaint</b>	<b>File Tracking</b> 06/09/2025 High Density	

No appearance is necessary.

This is a collections case in which an answer has been filed, and a dispositive motion set for hearing on 05/06/2026. A review of the court file reveals that the "OSC" first set on 05/23/2025 was done so in error, and must be vacated forthwith. The CMC set for this date shall be continued to align with the pending MSJ on 05/06/2026 at 8:30 a.m.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

11	<b>CV67107</b>	<b>Ernest Anthony Biera vs. Giving-To-Change et al</b>	03/27/2025
----	----------------	--	------------

<b>Ernest Anthony Biera</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-----------------------------	---------------------------

**Giving-To-Change, a California  
Nonprofit Public Benefit  
Corporation; et. al.**

**Kathleen Rebecca Solano**

**Angelina Artemoff**

**Rowen Artemoff-Meyerson**

**Jose Munoz**

**Jack E Downhill**

**Russell D Park**

**Jeneane Prevatt Partnership**

**Zoe Raven**

**Case Management Conference**

Further

03/27/2025 **Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

03/28/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

This is a partition action. Despite the mandates of CRC 3.110, there are no appearances by any defendants and no proof of service for any. At the last hearing counsel advised that the parties were trying settlement first.

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

**Department 5**

**March 4, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

---

12 CV67027 **Randell Campbell vs. McDonald's USA, LLC, et al** 03/06/2025

<b>Randall Campbell</b>	Attorney: Mark Smith
<b>McDonald's USA LLC</b>	Attorney: David Roth
<b>McDonald's USA LLC</b>	Attorney: Grace Neisingh
<b>McDonald's Corp.</b>	Attorney: David Roth
<b>McDonald's Corp.</b>	Attorney: Grace Neisingh
<b>Graspointner Mgmt. Co., INC</b>	Attorney: David Roth
<b>Graspointner Mgmt. Co., INC</b>	Attorney: Grace Neisingh
<b>Graspointner Dennis</b>	Attorney: David Roth
<b>Graspointner Dennis</b>	Attorney: Grace Neisingh

**ENTERED IN ERROR-UNABLE TO  
DELETE DUE TO RECEIPT  
Case Management Conference**

Further - Set Trial?

03/06/2025 Petition

**File Tracking**

05/30/2025 Dept. 1 Calendar/Clerk

---

This is a personal injury action. At last hearing parties were advised that trial dates would be set at this hearing:

- 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**

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

13	CVL66959	Capital One, N.A. vs. Erika E. Diaz	02/06/2025
----	----------	-------------------------------------	------------

**Capital One, N.A.**

Attorney: Donald Sherrill

**Erika E. Diaz**

**Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740**

02/06/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

03/17/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 02/06/2025
- Defendant Served: 04/03/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$6,858.35
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC re Tier I Sanctions for 05/06/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice.

Q: No POS from clerk's office for today so if TT does not show, consider reset.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

14	<b>CVL67035</b>	<b>Capital One, N.A. vs. Bill Morales</b>	03/07/2025
----	-----------------	---	------------

**Capital One, N.A.**

Attorney: Anthony DiPiero

**Bill Morales**

Pro Per

**Case Management Conference**

Further

03/07/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

03/17/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case. Answer filed. Need to set for trial. Defendant insists that they have the wrong named individual (possible ID fraud?)

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

**Department 5**

**March 4, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

---

15   **CVL67453**   **Capital One, N.A. vs. Nicole J Hurtado**   **07/16/2025**

**Capital One, N.A.**

Attorney: Daria  
Lourtchenko

**Nicole J Hurtado**

Pro Per

**Case Management Conference**

Further- Bankruptcy Filed?

**07/16/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

07/21/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case. Answer filed. Set for trial?

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

16	<b>CV67370</b>	<b>Cathryn Chavez vs. Kennedy Meadows Resort and Pack Station, Inc</b>	06/25/2025
----	----------------	--	------------

**Cathryn Chavez**

Attorney: Paul Scheele

**Kennedy Meadows Resort and Pack Station, Inc**

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

**Case Management Conference**

Further

06/25/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

07/22/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

No appearance necessary.

Court intends to conduct CMC alongside the MSJ currently scheduled for May 20, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

17	CV67131	<b>Nick Chiaverini et al vs. Tuolumne Utilities District</b>	04/04/2025
----	---------	--	------------

<b>Nick Chiaverini</b>	Attorney: Gary Dambacher
------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Chelsea Chiaverini</b>	Attorney: Gary Dambacher
---------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Tuolumne Utilities District</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
------------------------------------	---------------------------

**Case Management Conference**

Further

04/04/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 04/07/2025 High Density
---

---

Water main rupture with residential flooding. Parties have additional mediation efforts on calendar, but counsel may be delayed due to recent injury. Parties will likely request additional continuance.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

18	CVL66951	Discover Bank vs. James Wagner, Jr		02/03/2025
----	----------	------------------------------------	--	------------

**Discover Bank**

Attorney: Spencer Penuela

**James Wagner**

**Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740**

02/03/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

03/17/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 02/03/2025
- Defendant Served: not
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$12,207.80
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC re Tier II Sanctions for 05/06/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice.

Q: No POS from clerk's office for today so if TT does not show, consider reset.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

19 CV67341	Kari Lee Faughnan vs. Denelle Jean Strobe		06/13/2025
------------	---	--	------------

**Kari Lee Faughnan**  
**Denelle Jean Strobe**  
**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**  
Served Complaint?

06/13/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 07/22/2025 High Density
---

---

This is a personal injury action, arising out of a rear-end automobile accident. Plaintiff alleges that the at-fault driver was “Ms. Strobe,” who was in the course and scope of her employment with “Mr. and Ms. Larson” at the time. The action was commenced on 06/13/2025. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff was to have filed proof of service upon all three defendants within 60 days thereof. She did not. She has recently filed proof of service upon Mr. Larson and Ms. Strobe, using the same address. It appears that perhaps Ms. Strobe and Ms. Larson may be the same individual – which would mean that all named defendants have now been served.

Plaintiff’s counsel to confirm. If so, OSC re Sanctions will vacate.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

20	CV67519	<b>Petition of Freddie Mac vs Servhl Underlying Trust 2019</b>	08/06/2025
----	---------	--	------------

<b>Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
<b>Servhl Underlying Trust 2019-1</b>	Pro Per
<b>C/O Wilmington Trust National Association</b>	
<b>Review Hearing</b>	

Default Judgement Filed?

08/06/2025 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b> 01/14/2026 High Density
---

---

This is a quiet title action in which a default has already been entered. Court is simply awaiting a motion to enter judgment, which will need to be noticed and set on the 8:30 calendar.







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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

24	CV67690	Lakeview Loan Servicing LLC vs. Katrina De Anda et al.	09/30/2025
----	---------	--	------------

Lakeview Loan Servicing LLC      Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Katrina De Anda et al.

The Secretary of Housing and  
Urban Development  
Christopher De Anda

Case Management Conference

Further

09/30/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

10/01/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Judicial foreclosure action. No service on property owners yet. Well past the CRC 3.110 60-day period.





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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

27	CV67033	Mill Villa MHP, LP vs. County of Tuolumne	03/07/2025
----	---------	---	------------

**Mill Villa MHP, LP**

Attorney: Daniel Rudderow

**County of Tuolumne**

Attorney: Keith Lemieux

**County of Tuolumne**

Attorney: Alex Lemieux

**Case Management Conference**

03/07/2025 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

08/08/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Dismissal filed 02/20/2026



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>29</b>	<b>CV67773</b>	<b>Dennis Overholtzer vs. Kathleen Overholtzer, et al</b>	<b>10/27/2025</b>
-----------	----------------	---	-------------------

<b>Dennis Overholtzer</b>	Attorney: Michael Germain
---------------------------	---------------------------

<b>Kathleen Overholtzer</b>	Pro Per
-----------------------------	---------

<b>Kathleen Overholtzer</b>	Pro Per
-----------------------------	---------

<b>Nathan Nutting</b>	Attorney: Nathan Nutting
-----------------------	--------------------------

**Jacob Overholtzer**

**Case Management Conference**

**10/27/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 11/14/2025 High Density
---

---

Related to FL18072 – which is in this department’s inventory. This is a family law dispute regarding equity in the marital residence, which is presently on hold pending final division of assets. No judgment has been issued in the family case, and since bifurcation has yet taken place, plaintiff’s current legal action potentially violates the ATROS barring action taken against the spouse.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

30	CVL67066	<b>Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC vs. Daniel Persson</b>	03/14/2025
----	----------	--	------------

<b>Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC</b>	Attorney: Donald Sherrill
---	---------------------------

<b>Daniel Persson</b>	Attorney: Jenna Moreno-Cortez
-----------------------	-------------------------------

**Case Management Conference**

Further

03/14/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/19/2025 High Density
---

---

Collections. Answer filed. RFA granted. Set for trial?



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

32	<b>CVL66708</b>	<b>Synchrony Bank vs. Brian Gabrielson</b>	11/25/2024
----	-----------------	--	------------

**Synchrony Bank**

Attorney: Hootan Atefyekta

**Brian Gabrielson**

Attorney: Lynda Jacobs

**Review Hearing**

Signed Stipulation?

11/25/2024 **Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 06/09/2025 High Density
---

---

Collections case. Filed 11/25/2024 but reported as being settled three months ago. There is no Notice of Settlement in the court file, so an OSC re sanctions for failure to file may be set.

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

33 CVL67608

Synchrony Bank vs. Barbara Falk

08/27/2025

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Raymond  
Patenaude

Barbara Falk

Case Management Conference

08/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

09/08/2025 High Density

Collections case. Answer filed. Continue or set for trial.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

34	CV67308	<b>Vallelunga 2018 Trust vs. David Vallelunga et al</b>	05/30/2025
----	---------	---	------------

**Luanne, Trustee of the Luanne Vallelunga 2018 Separate Property Trust Vallelunga** Attorney: Gary Dambacher

**David Vallelunga** Attorney: Eric Nielsen

**Wendy Vallelunga** Attorney: Eric Nielsen

**David Vallelunga and Wendy Vallelunga, Trustees of The Vallelunga 2015 Revocable Trust** Attorney: Eric Nielsen

**Case Management Conference**

Further

05/30/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 07/22/2025 High Density
---

---

Parties have indicated that further settlement efforts are underway, including perhaps the sale of the business at the heart of the dispute.

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

35 CVL67545

Velocity Investments LLC vs. Jaide Carney

08/14/2025

Velocity Investments LLC

Attorney: Bryant Burnstad

Jaide Carney

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

08/14/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/14/2025 High Density

Collections. Answer filed. Continue or set trial.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>37</b>	<b>CV67352</b>	<b>Richard Walker et al vs. Theodore Clement</b>	<b>06/18/2025</b>
-----------	----------------	--	-------------------

<b>Richard Walker</b>	Attorney: Joseph Motta
<b>Bertha Walker</b>	Attorney: Joseph Motta
<b>Alfred Martinez</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
<b>Gabriel Martinez</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
<b>Theodore S Clement</b>	Attorney: Scott Linn
<b>Case Management Conference</b>	

06/18/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 07/22/2025 High Density
---

---

This is a personal injury action arising out of an automobile accident. There appears to be a misjoinder of plaintiffs here as the operative pleading includes only two named plaintiffs but the summons identifies four plaintiffs.

There are no CMC statements so it is unclear to this Court if the parties are ready for trial dates.

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

**Department 5**

**March 4, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

**38 CVL67396**

**Wells Fargo Bank, NA vs. Shantel M Thompson**

07/01/2025

**Wells Fargo Bank, NA**

Attorney: David Bartley

**Shantel M Thompson**

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**Motion Hearing - Judgment on the Pleadings**

**07/01/2025 Complaint**

**File Tracking**

07/02/2025 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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cniYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [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. Though set at the wrong time, plaintiff has before the Court this day a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Pursuant to CCP §439(a), “before filing a motion for judgment on the pleadings pursuant to this chapter, the moving party shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, or by video conference with the party who filed the pleading that is subject to the motion for judgment on the pleadings for the purpose of determining if an agreement can be reached that resolves the claims to be raised in the motion for judgment on the pleadings.” Although the date for the meet and confer is not set in stone, it shall occur “at least 5 days before” the motion is filed – meaning somewhere close to when the motion is going to be filed.

On 01/07/2026, plaintiff and defendant appeared for a CMC and agreed to work together to try and resolve this dispute.

On 01/28/2026, plaintiff filed the pending motion for judgment on the pleadings. The declaration accompanying the motion, and setting forth the required meet and confer, describes a letter sent to defendant on August 14, 2025. This is not a meet and confer for a motion filed five months later, after intervening conferences. The motion is hereby deemed off-calendar and subject to refile after a proper meet and confer.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

39	<b>CV66461</b>	<b>WESCO Distribution, Inc. vs. Alternate Power Solutions Inc. et al</b>	09/23/2024
----	----------------	--	------------

<b>WESCO Distribution, Inc.</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
---------------------------------	---------------------------

**Alternate Power Solutions Inc. a  
California Corporation  
an individual**

<b>Western Surety Company, a South Dakota surety</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
--	---------------------------

**Case Management Conference**

Western Surety (Moved from 2/12/26)

09/23/2024 **Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 07/09/2025 High Density
---

---

Dispute is awaiting settlement agreement, then default prove-up for two parties in default.

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

---

40 CVL67381 Bank of America, N.A. vs. Susi Glover 06/26/2025

Bank of America, N.A.

Attorney: Brian Langedyk

Susi Glover

Review Hearing

06/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/27/2025 High Density

---

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier I sanction





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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

43 CVL67367 Capital One, N.A. vs. Amber Kreiter

06/23/2025

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Daria  
Lourtchenko

Amber Kreiter

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

06/23/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/26/2025 High Density

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

44 CVL67569 Capital One, N.A. vs. Michael Rathburn

08/21/2025

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Jeremy LaForge

Michael Rathburn

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

08/21/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/28/2025 High Density

Set to 08/19/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

45 CVL67382 Capital One, N.A. vs. Olive L Sheldon

06/26/2025

Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discover Bank  
Olive L Sheldon  
Review Hearing  
Attorney: Peter Tran

06/26/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 06/27/2025 High Density
---

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

46 CVL67573

Capital One, N.A. vs. Sean Amend

08/22/2025

Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discover Bank  
Sean Amend Attorney: Peter Tran

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

08/22/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/28/2025 High Density

Set to 09/16/2026 at 10:00 with Tier I sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

47 CVL67607

Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC vs. Jacquelyn Potts

08/26/2025

Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC Attorney: Robert Kayvon

Jacquelyn Potts

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

08/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

09/08/2025 High Density

Set to 09/16/2026 at 10:00 with Tier I sanction



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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

---

49 CVL67379 JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. vs. Brian Mcdonald 06/26/2025

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. Attorney: David Barnett

Brian Mcdonald

Review Hearing

06/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/27/2025 High Density

---

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

50 CVL67368 LVNV Funding LLC vs. Nathen Miles

06/24/2025

LVNV Funding LLC

Attorney: Bryant Burnstad

Nathen Miles

Review Hearing

06/24/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/26/2025 High Density

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

---

51 CVL67369 Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC vs. Stacy Maier 06/24/2025

Portfolio Recovery Associates, Attorney: Robert Kayvon  
LLC  
Stacy Maier  
Review Hearing

06/24/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 06/26/2025 High Density
---

---

Set to 07/15/2026 at 10:00 with Tier I sanction

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

52 CVL67359

Synchrony Bank vs. Teresa L Holt

06/20/2025

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Spencer Penuela

Teresa L Holt

Review Hearing

06/20/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/24/2025 Cubicle 12

Off-calendar. Clerk's default judgment entered 09/15/2025

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

Department 5

March 4, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

53 CVL67609 Synchrony Bank vs. Bess E Houck

08/27/2025

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Raymond  
Patenaude

Bess E Houck

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

08/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

09/08/2025 High Density

Set to 09/16/2026 at 10:00 with Tier II sanction

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

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026</b>	<b>1:30 pm</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

<b>54</b>	<b>CV67159</b>	<b>Fidelity National Title Insurance Co vs. Kevin Manuel Fields et al</b>		<b>04/14/2025</b>
-----------	----------------	---	--	-------------------

<b>Fidelity National Title Insurance Company</b>	Attorney: Christopher Thomas
--	------------------------------

**Kevin Manuel Fields**

**Christy Adiel Fields**

<b>Christy Adiel Fields</b>	Attorney: Michael Mahon
-----------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Fidelity National Title Insurance Company</b>	Attorney: Christopher Thomas
--	------------------------------

**Kevin Manuel Fields**

**Liliana Vass**

<b>Segerstrom Real Estate, INC., A California Corporation</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
---	---------------------------

**Case Management Conference**

Further - Notice of Discharge Filed?

**06/09/2025 Cross Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 08/11/2025 High Density
---

This is a statutory subrogation action (Civil Code §1113) arising out of a first-party title insurance pay out following an effort to clear an allegedly undisclosed cloud on title. Christy gave Kevin the house via deed, but Kevin did not timely remove Christy from the loan, and in fact had Christy sign for a new loan with HUD just prior to the sale. Kevin filed for bankruptcy protection in the Eastern District, and secured a complete discharge of this debt. The pleadings will need to be refined to account for Kevin's departure.

Will need to set for trial soon.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>March 4, 2026</b>	<b>1:30 pm</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

55	PR12370	In Re: The Ylimaki Family Trust		12/01/2023
----	---------	---------------------------------	--	------------

**Susan Lunsford**

Attorney: Carrie McKernan

**Robert Norman**

**John Hylinger**

Attorney: Carrie McKernan

**Settlement Conference**

TRC - CT set for 3/26 & 3/27

12/01/2023 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b>
----------------------

09/26/2024 High Density
-------------------------

---