

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

**Department 5**

**June 17, 2026 8:30 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

---

**1 CVL67975 William Bell vs. California Highway Patrol et al 01/08/2026**

**William Bell** Pro Per

**California Highway Patrol**

**Susan Anddleman**

**Demurrer**

**Case Management Conference**

to trail demurrer

**01/08/2026 Complaint**

**File Tracking**

01/28/2026 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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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 civil action for damages commenced by plaintiff against the California Highway Patrol after his red 2001 Ford Mustang was impounded. The salient facts are these:

On 08/06/2023, someone driving a vehicle registered to plaintiff was clocked by a CHP deputy speeding. The deputy initiated a traffic stop, which the driver did not heed (plaintiff claims that the driver did not know the overhead lights and siren were for him, while simultaneously claiming he was not the driver). The driver successfully evaded the officer, bringing an end to the brief chase.

On 08/09/2023, the same CHP deputy made a request for a seizure warrant pursuant to CA Veh. Code §§ 2800.2(a) and 14602.7. A judicial officer (JHGC) approved the request and issued the warrant. The vehicle was soon thereafter impounded several weeks later (which plaintiff alleges to have been outside the scope of the warrant). “Section 14602.7 provides for vehicle impoundment when an officer establishes, before a magistrate, reasonable cause to believe the vehicle was used to flee a police officer or was driven in a reckless manner.” *California Highway Patrol v. Superior Court* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1144, 1153-1154. Plaintiff retrieved his vehicle from impound, incurring a total of \$2,048.42 in direct and consequential out of pocket costs.

On 06/02/2025, plaintiff filed a small claims action against the CHP. See SC20629. The trial court dismissed the case with prejudice based on plaintiff’s failure to file a government tort claim (see Order dtd 08/20/2025). Although it is unclear from the record whether this issue was actually litigated (compare *Pitzen v. Superior Court* (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 1374 with *Sanders v. Walsh* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 855), plaintiff timely filed a motion to vacate the dismissal, as well as a motion for reconsideration. Neither motion were set for hearing, causing this Court to abate further proceedings in this action until the small claims case could be completed. No hearing date was set on this either. Thus, as it presently stands, SC20629 appears to remain active awaiting hearing dates.

If plaintiff wishes to drop his suit for economic damages (requiring a timely prefilling claim) and proceed solely under 42 USC §1983, this Court will sustain the demurrer and permit the filing of a First Amended Complaint. However, the suit would have to run against the actual deputy alleged to have caused the violation, not the agency which employed her. See *O’Leary v. California Highway Patrol*, 923 F.2d 862 (9th Cir. 1991); in accord, *Phalen v. Tuolumne County Jail*, WL2695568 at \*2-3 (E.D. Cal. 2025); *Martinez v. California*, WL6083444 at \*3 (C.D. 2020).

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>2</b>	<b>CV66334</b>	<b>Adriana Carrera et al vs. Toste Insurance Services, Inc. et al</b>	<b>08/09/2024</b>
----------	----------------	---	-------------------

<b>Adriana Carrera</b>	Pro Per
<b>Victor Ayala Valdez</b>	Pro Per
<b>Toste Insurance Services, Inc.</b>	Attorney: Amanda Heitlinger
<b>SafeCo</b>	Attorney: Joshua Kastan
<b>Case Management Conference</b>	

FURTHER

**08/09/2024 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 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=NTRMTONwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [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 coverage dispute involving first-party loss to a vehicle. The parties are presumably ready for dates:

### Full CMC

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

3	CVL68226	Trevon Davis vs. Liquor Junction et al		03/19/2026
---	----------	--	--	------------

Trevon Davis Pro Per

Liquor Junction

Ketul Shah

Daniel (Doe) Carrier

**Motion Hearing - Judgment on the Pleadings**

Filed 5-27-26

**Motion Hearing - Strike**

Filed 5-27-26

**03/19/2026 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/24/2026 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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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 defamation action between employee and employer. Before the Court this day is a defense motion to strike and a defense motion for judgment on the pleadings. While the court file does not include any oppositions thereto, neither motion is supported by the required meet and confer declaration. See CCP §§ 435.5, 439. In addition, the motion to strike was to have been filed “within the time allowed to respond to a pleading” (CCP §435(b)) and defendant filed an answer on 04/30/2026 – which was 30 days after service of the summons. In other words, the motion to strike is not timely. The motion for judgment on the pleading shall be continued to permit a proper meet and confer effort.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

4	CV66835	Jane Doe 02 vs. Jason Elias		01/10/2025
---	---------	-----------------------------	--	------------

**Jane Doe 02**

Attorney: Paul Lewellyn

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**01/10/2025 Complaint**

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

05/27/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66838  
CV66831  
CV66918  
CV66836  
CV66837  
CV66834  
CV66833  
CV66330

---

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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>6</b>	<b>CV66836</b>	<b>Jane Doe 04 vs. Jason Elias</b>		<b>01/10/2025</b>
----------	----------------	------------------------------------	--	-------------------

**Jane Doe 04**

Attorney: Ryan Erickson

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**01/10/2025 Complaint**

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

05/22/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66838  
CV66831  
CV66918  
CV66837  
CV66834  
CV66833  
CV66330  
CV66835

---

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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlydzzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>7</b>	<b>CV66838</b>	<b>Jane Doe 05 vs. Jason Elias</b>		<b>01/10/2025</b>
----------	----------------	------------------------------------	--	-------------------

**Jane Doe 05**

Attorney: Ryan Erickson

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**01/10/2025 Complaint**

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

05/22/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66831  
CV66918  
CV66836  
CV66837  
CV66834  
CV66833  
CV66330  
CV66835

---

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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>8</b>	<b>CV66834</b>	<b>Jane Doe 06 vs. Jason Elias</b>		01/10/2025
----------	----------------	------------------------------------	--	------------

**Jane Doe 06**

Attorney: Ryan Erickson

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**01/10/2025 Complaint**

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

05/22/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66838  
CV66831  
CV66918  
CV66836  
CV66837  
CV66833  
CV66330  
CV66835

---

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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>9</b>	<b>CV66831</b>	<b>Jane Doe 07 vs. Jason Elias</b>		01/10/2025
----------	----------------	------------------------------------	--	------------

**Jane Doe 07**

Attorney: Paul Lewellyn

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**01/10/2025 Complaint**

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

05/22/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66838  
CV66918  
CV66836  
CV66837  
CV66834  
CV66833  
CV66330  
CV66835

---

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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

10	CV66918	Jane Doe 08 vs. Jason Elias		02/07/2025
----	---------	-----------------------------	--	------------

**Jane Doe 8**

Attorney: Ryan Erickson

**Jason Elias**

Attorney: Ian Scharg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**02/07/2025 Complaint**

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

07/09/2025 High Density
-------------------------

Other Cases

CV66838  
CV66831  
CV66836  
CV66837  
CV66834  
CV66833  
CV66330  
CV66835

---

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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

Court intends to maintain stay pending resolution of principal action against Adventist.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

11	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**

**09/30/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 10/01/2025    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 judicial foreclosure action involving a rental home on Carter Street. There are apparently two subordinate HUD loans on the property. Neither of the record owners reside there, and in fact they just evicted the tenants who were living there (see CVL68239). It appears as though HUD and co-borrower Christopher have been served, and service is awaiting upon Katrina. There is a record of sub-service upon her at the same address as Christopher, although she previously indicated in open court that they were "getting a divorce" and the sub-service has some question marks.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>12</b>	<b>CV68094</b>	<b>Hollie McCain vs. Adventist Health</b>		02/13/2026
-----------	----------------	---	--	------------

<b>Hollie McCain</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
----------------------	---------------------------

<b>Adventist Health</b>	Attorney: Shiva Davoudian
-------------------------	---------------------------

**Case Management Conference**

**Motion Hearing - Compel**

arbitration and stay proceedings

**02/13/2026 Petition**

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/05/2026 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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

This is a wage/hour PAGA suit. Before the Court this day is a defense motion to compel contractual arbitration and stay the action. In response thereto:

“Plaintiff will agree to arbitrate her individual claims including her individual PAGA claims and to stay the remaining non-individual representative PAGA claims pending the completion of arbitration. However, Plaintiff would like the Court to note that the proposed order submitted by Defendant in support of its Motion identifies putative class claims to be dismissed, which was likely inadvertently inserted in error as there are no class claims alleged in Plaintiff s operative complaint. As such, the request for the dismissal of class claims should be stricken.”

While it is true that the proposed order asks that “the putative class claims [be] dismissed” and the Complaint does indeed appear to be limited to PAGA, the frequency with inadvertent “block/copy” errors in wage/hour cases is pervasive, and presumptively innocent. This Court would not have signed said order without first lining out the sentence at issue, but all good.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

13	CV66799	<b>Moyle Excavation, Inc. vs. Iron Mechanical, Inc.</b>		12/31/2024
----	---------	---	--	------------

<b>Moyle Excavation, Inc.</b>	Attorney: Timothy Trujillo
-------------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Iron Mechanical, Inc.</b>	Attorney: Brittany Rupley
------------------------------	---------------------------

**Motion Hearing - Ex Parte**

Order Shortening Time

12/31/2024 **Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 08/12/2025 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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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 breach of contract action. Before the Court this day is plaintiff’s ex parte application for an Order Shortening Time for hearing on Plaintiff s Motions to Compel Frogs, further FRogs, RFAs, and SRogs. According to plaintiff, the motions were filed on 05/20/2026 but given a hearing date of 09/15/2026 – which is after the discovery motion cut-off date. Pursuant to statute, discovery motions require 16 court days’ notice. This Court has no idea why the motions were scheduled as they were, this Court has an obvious obligation to timely address them (despite their daunting size).

Parties to advise as follows:

- Door #1: Hearing date in mid-July
- Door #2: Trial date vacated
- Door #3: Considering the amount in controversy (\$51,000), revisit this discovery dispute and decide whether the time and sanction risk is really worthwhile.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

14	CV66705	Lee Pagni v City of Sonora et. al.		12/04/2024
----	---------	------------------------------------	--	------------

**Lee Pagni**

Attorney: Terry Stark

**City of Sonora**

Attorney: Angela Shrimp de la Vergne

**William Canning**

**Motion Hearing - Other**

Request for Augmentation of Record

**Motion Hearing - Amend**

3rd petition

**12/04/2024 Petition**

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

03/17/2025 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.

---

No appearance is necessary. Based on a review of the minute order from the previous hearing, it appears that defense counsel wishes to run a motion under CRC 2.816 to have the City's stipulation withdrawn. While such a representation does not effectuate a stay, as a courtesy to defendant and counsel, this Court intends to continue the hearing on plaintiff's motion (1) to augment the administrative record and (2) file a Third Amended Petition for a reasonable period to permit defense counsel run that motion. Hearing continued to 08/19/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in this Department, unless the matter has been reassigned beforehand. The current briefing schedule should likewise be stayed pending resolution of the pleading, record and assigned department concerns.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

15	CV67946	<b>Solarworx, Inc vs. Lindsey Dovik</b>		12/26/2025
----	---------	---	--	------------

**Solarworx, Inc**

Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

**Lindsey Dovik**

Attorney: Andrea Chapman

**Demurrer**

for Amended Complaint - RESERVED

**Case Management Conference**

**12/26/2025 Complaint**

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

01/07/2026 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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

This was to be a hearing on demurrer, but the parties reached an agreement to permit the filing of an amended pleading. This Court is always pleased when the parties can resolve their own differences.

The CMC also set for this day is arguably premature at this juncture, so the Court intends to continue the CMC for a period of 60-90 days. If no appearance is made, the Court will set the next CMC for 09/02/2026 at 10:00 a.m.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>17</b>	<b>CV66763</b>	<b>Christopher Allen Vine vs. Bonnie Corey Rangel</b>		12/17/2024
-----------	----------------	---	--	------------

**Christopher Allen Vine** Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

**Bonnie Corey Rangel** Attorney: Scott Ward

**Review Hearing**

Stipulated Judgment Status/ No appearance necessary if filed. / ADDRESS MOTION

**Motion Hearing - Other**

Interlocutory Judgment / ADDRESS MOTION

**12/17/2024 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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.

---

No appearance is necessary.

The parties previously advised that no court action would be needed unless/until the subject property was sold:

“The Parties agree that the evidentiary hearing shall be set as soon as practical following the sale of the Subject Property. The purpose of the evidentiary hearing shall be for the Parties to present evidence regarding how the Court should order distribution of the net proceeds of the sale of the Subject Property between the Parties or, in the event that a party has exercised the right of first refusal set forth in paragraph 6 above, the amount owed by one Party to the other Party pursuant to CCP §874.311, et seq.. If possible, the hearing shall not be held fewer than sixty (60) days after close of escrow on the sale of the Subject Property. Each Party shall submit to the other Party all evidence that party will offer at the hearing not less than thirty (30) days before the evidentiary hearing.”

As this Court has not heard that the property has even sold, a continued review hearing will be set for 09/02/2026 at 10:00 a.m.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

18	<b>CV68073</b>	<b>Anderson et al vs. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection</b>	02/05/2026
----	----------------	---	------------

<b>Richard Todd Anderson</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
------------------------------	---------------------------

<b>Glenn Riggs</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
--------------------	---------------------------

**California Department of Forestry  
and Fire Protection  
Case Management Conference**

02/05/2026 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/09/2026 High Density
---

---

This is a FEHA case involving alleged sexual harassment. This is the initial CMC. Given the infancy of the action, this Court presupposes that the parties will be seeking a continuance of the CMC – which is agreeable.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>19</b>	<b>CVL67512</b>	<b>Aspire General Insurance Company vs. Isabella Luczy</b>	<b>08/04/2025</b>
-----------	-----------------	--	-------------------

<b>Aspire General Insurance Company</b>	Attorney: Todd Haines
---	-----------------------

<b>Isabella Luczy</b>	Pro Per
-----------------------	---------

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**08/04/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 08/07/2025 High Density
---

---

Collection case.

Answer filed.

Time to set bench trial.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

20	CVL67319	<b>Autovest LLC vs. Sabrina Alfreds</b>		06/04/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

**Autovest LLC**

Attorney: Bryant Burnstad

**Sabrina Alfreds**

**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**

OSC Tier 1

06/04/2025 Complaint

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

06/04/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 06/04/2025
- Defendant Served: ---
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$5,557.70
- OSC Issued on: 03/06/2026
  - Response: "120 more days to try new address"

Impose Tier II sanction (\$750) and set next OSC for 08/19/2026 @ 10 a.m.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

21	CV68124	John Baldwin vs. Waterfall Lodge Improvement CO.,	02/19/2026
----	---------	---	------------

John Baldwin	Attorney: Thomas Swett
--------------	------------------------

**Waterfall Lodge Improvement CO.,**

**Case Management Conference**

02/19/2026 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/10/2026 High Density
---

---

Quiet title action awaiting completion of substituted service through the Secretary of State, followed likely by default prove-up hearing. Consider setting hearing for future L&M calendar at this time.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

22	CVL67466	<b>Barclays Bank Delaware vs. Albert Sandner</b>	07/18/2025
----	----------	--	------------

<b>Barclays Bank Delaware</b>	Attorney: Matthew Keim
-------------------------------	------------------------

<b>Albert Sandner</b>	Pro Per
-----------------------	---------

**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**

Dismissal Filed?  
non-appearance is approved if dismissal is filed. - sp

**07/18/2025 Complaint**

<b>File Tracking</b> 07/29/2025 High Density
---

---

On 03/17/2026, plaintiff filed a Notice of Conditional Settlement of the Entire Case. Therein, it indicated that a dismissal would be filed “no later than 09/03/2027.” Rather than keep the case open, this Court prefers to enter a dismissal with a §664.6 reservation.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

24	CVL68133	Columbia Bank (formerly UMPQUA BANK) vs. Avery H Anderson et al	02/20/2026
----	----------	---	------------

**Columbia Bank (formerly UMPQUA BANK)** Attorney: Lisa Spiwak

**Avery H Anderson**

**Chester H Anderson**

**Case Management Conference**

02/20/2026 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/10/2026 High Density
---

“Collection” via consumer loan.

Answer filed.

Continue CMC or set bench trial. No CMC statements from either party.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

25	CVL67328	Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Tiffany Moore	06/06/2025
----	----------	---	------------

**Crown Asset Management, LLC** Attorney: David McGaffey

**Tiffany Moore**

**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**

OSC - Tier 1

06/06/2025 Complaint

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

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 06/06/2025
- Defendant Served: ---
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$2,579.80
- OSC Issued on: 03/06/2026
  - Response: none

Impose Tier II sanction (\$750) and set next OSC for 08/19/2026 @ 10 a.m.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

27	CVL66828	Crown Asset Managment vs. Stephanie Harami	01/03/2025
----	----------	--	------------

**Crown Asset Management, LLC** Attorney: Venessa Thomas  
**assignee of FinWise Bank (Upstart**  
**Network Inc.)**  
**Stephanie Harami**

**Review Hearing**  
Dismissal or Judgment

01/03/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 08/12/2025 High Density
---

Notice of Conditional Settlement filed 12/01/2025 indicating compliance on or before 01/18/2026. Pursuant to CRC 3.1385(c)(2), "if the plaintiff required to serve and file a request for dismissal within 45 days after the dismissal date specified in the notice does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed." At the last hearing in April, counsel advised that defendant has already defaulted on the settlement and that a motion to enforce/convert would be filed. It has not. Instead, for reasons that are not entirely clear, plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint – which under the circumstances is a nullity.

No good cause is present/shown, so the action will be dismissed without prejudice, with jurisdiction reserved pursuant to CCP §664.6 to enforce any settlement.

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

**Department 5**

**June 17, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

28 CVL67304 DNF Associates, LLC. vs. John Mercucio, Jr

05/27/2025

**DNF Associates, LLC.**

Attorney: Leon Roundtree

**John Mercucio**

**OSC Hearing - Sanctions**

Tier 1 - per CRC3.740

05/27/2025 Complaint

**File Tracking**

05/29/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 05/27/2025
- Defendant Served: 06/14/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$19,598.59
- OSC Issued on: n/a
  - Response: n/a

Set OSC re Tier II sanction (\$750) for 08/19/2026 @ 10 a.m.

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

**Department 5**

**June 17, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

29 CV67557

**Farmer vs. Tuolumne County et al**

08/15/2025

**Erin Farmer as Guardian Ad Litem** Attorney: Yet Not Entered  
**for Meadow Farmer, a minor**

**Tuolumne County**

**Monica Hirschfield**

**Jamestown School District**

**Case Management Conference**

FURTHER

08/15/2025 Complaint

**File Tracking**

08/20/2025 High Density

Plaintiff alleges that she suffered personal injuries and general and special damages after being injured while at the County Youth Center. Plaintiff pled causes of action for Negligent Supervision of a Minor, and Negligent Training, Hiring and Supervision of Employees against Defendants.

**Full CMC**

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

30 CV67341	<b>Kari Lee Faughnan vs. Denelle Jean Strobe</b>		06/13/2025
------------	--	--	------------

**Kari Lee Faughnan**

**Denelle Jean Strobe**

Attorney: Michael Kronlund

**Jeffery Larson**

Attorney: Michael Kronlund

**Case Management Conference**

Set Trial?

06/13/2025 Complaint

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

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

---

This is a personal injury action stemming from an automobile accident. Parties should be ready for dates at this time.

**Full CMC**

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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**

**June 17, 2026 10:00 am**

**DA Case #**

**Date Filed**

34 CV68101

**Stephanie Kay Garcia vs. Rebecca Lorraine Kohl**

02/17/2026

**Stephanie Kay Garcia**

Attorney: Sally Chenault

**Rebecca Lorraine Kohl**

**Case Management Conference**

02/17/2026 Complaint

**File Tracking**

03/05/2026 High Density

This is a personal injury action arising from an automobile accident. Do parties want to continue CMC or set dates?

**Full CMC**

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

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

**Michelle Johnson** Attorney: John Montevideo

**Robert White** Attorney: Yet Not Entered

**Paradise Shores, LLC** Attorney: David Casady

**Joan Mae White** Attorney: Yet Not Entered

**Case Management Conference**

Further - Final.

05/02/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 05/09/2025 High Density
---

This is a personal injury action arising out of a dog bite. Do parties want to continue CMC or set dates?

Full CMC

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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

June 17, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

---

38 CVL67998 LVNV Funding LLC vs. Sandy Cooper 01/14/2026

LVNV Funding LLC

Attorney: Robert Kayvon

Sandy Cooper

Pro Per

Case Management Conference

01/14/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

01/28/2026 High Density

---

Collections.

Answer filed.

Set bench trial.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

40	CVL67332	PCA Acquisitions V, LLC vs. Marie L Scott		06/09/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

PCA Acquisitions V, LLC Attorney: Hada Fernandez

Marie L Scott

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

OSC - Tier 1

06/09/2025 Complaint

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

06/11/2025 High Density
-------------------------

---

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 05/09/2025
- Defendant Served: ---
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$3,765.22
- OSC Issued on: 03/06/2026
  - Response: None

Impose Tier II sanction (\$750) and set next OSC for 08/19/2026 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

41 CV67777

PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICE, LLC vs. Amoz Marshall et al

10/28/2025

PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICE, LLC Attorney: Lucas Conley

Amoz Marshall

The Secretary of Veteran Affairs

Case Management Conference

Further

10/28/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

11/14/2025 High Density

Action dismissed 06/05/2026.





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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

44	CVL67912	<b>Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC vs. Evylene G Meyers</b>		12/15/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

<b>Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC</b>	Attorney: Smita Suman
<b>Evylene G Meyers</b>	
<b>Case Management Conference</b>	

12/15/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 12/24/2025 High Density
---

---

Collections.

Answer filed.

Set bench trial? No CMC statements by either side.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

45 CV68108	Chandra Ann Pounds vs. Joel Bickerstaff		02/18/2026
------------	---	--	------------

Chandra Ann Pounds	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
--------------------	---------------------------

**Joel Bickerstaff**

Case Management Conference

02/18/2026 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 03/10/2026 High Density
---

---

This is a personal injury action arising from an automobile accident. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff had 60 days post-commencement to file proof of service. “If a party fails to serve and file pleadings as required under this rule, and has not obtained an order extending time to serve its pleadings, the court may issue an order to show cause why sanctions shall not be imposed.” CRC 3.110(f). In addition, “no later than 15 calendar days before the date set for the case management conference or review, each party must file a case management statement and serve it on all other parties in the case.” CRC 3.725. Plaintiff has not filed a CMC statement. Pursuant to CRC 2.30(b), “the court may order a person, after written notice and an opportunity to be heard, to pay reasonable monetary sanctions to the court for failure without good cause to comply with the applicable rules.” Court intends to set a dual-OSC and continue this CMC. Unless good cause is shown for the aforementioned shortcomings.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

46	<b>CV67914</b>	<b>Estuardo Giovanni Reyes et al vs. Larry Dean Smith et al</b>	12/15/2025
----	----------------	---	------------

<b>Estuardo Giovanni Reyes</b>	Attorney: W. Fields
--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Silvia Orozco</b>	Attorney: W. Fields
----------------------	---------------------

**Larry Dean Smith**

**Theresa Smith**

**Case Management Conference**

12/15/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 12/24/2025 High Density
---

---

This is a personal injury action arising from an automobile accident. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff had 60 days post-commencement to file proof of service. “If a party fails to serve and file pleadings as required under this rule, and has not obtained an order extending time to serve its pleadings, the court may issue an order to show cause why sanctions shall not be imposed.” CRC 3.110(f). It took plaintiff quite a while to effectuate service, but it appears to have been accomplished now.

Court presupposes that counsel will need a continuance of the CMC.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

47	CVL67553	<b>State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins Co vs. Matthew Aaron Spiller</b>		08/15/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

<b>State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company</b> <b>Matthew Aaron Spiller</b>	Attorney: Richard Mahfouz
---	---------------------------

Review Hearing

Dismissal filed?

08/15/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 08/20/2025 High Density
---

---

On 02/20/2026, plaintiff caused to be filed a Notice of Conditional Settlement of Entire Case with a completion date of 06/01/2026. Pursuant to CRC 3.1385(c)(2), "if the plaintiff or other party required to serve and file a request for dismissal within 45 days after the dismissal date specified in the notice does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed." This hearing date is premature as the 45-day grace period has not yet expired.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>48</b>	<b>CV67312</b>	<b>Russell Steeley et al vs. FCA US, LLC</b>	<b>06/02/2025</b>
-----------	----------------	--	-------------------

**Russell Steeley** Attorney: Erik Whitman

**Dora T Steeley** Attorney: Erik Whitman

**FCA US, LLC** Attorney: Michael Gregg

**Case Management Conference**

Further

**06/02/2025 Complaint**

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

This is a lemon law case. It seems to this Court that the time has come to get a firm trial date on the books:

**Full CMC**

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

50 CV67811	Vinod Trivedi vs. Travis Fowler et al		11/06/2025
------------	---------------------------------------	--	------------

Vinod Trivedi	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
---------------	---------------------------

**Travis Fowler**

**Chantal Fowler**

**Fowler Home Services**

**Case Management Conference**

Further

11/06/2025 Complaint

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

---

This is a breach of contract action involving home remediation services by a reportedly unlicensed contractor. Both defendants have been defaulted. Court presupposes that plaintiff will require additional time to prepare default prove-up packages.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>51</b>	<b>CVL67918</b>	<b>Velocity Investment LLC vs. Kenneth A Anderson</b>	12/16/2025
-----------	-----------------	---	------------

<b>Velocity Investment LLC</b>	Attorney: Bryant Burnstad
--------------------------------	---------------------------

<b>Kenneth A Anderson</b>	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
---------------------------	---------------------------

**Case Management Conference - Collections Case CRC 3.740**

12/16/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 12/24/2025 High Density
---

---

Collection case.

Answer filed.

Set bench trial.

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

52 CV67352	Richard Walker et al vs. Theodore Clement		06/18/2025
------------	---	--	------------

Richard Walker	Attorney: Joseph Motta
----------------	------------------------

Bertha Walker	Attorney: Joseph Motta
---------------	------------------------

Theodore S Clement	Attorney: Scott Linn
--------------------	----------------------

Case Management Conference

Further

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. Parties should be prepared to select firm dates.

Full CMC

- 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?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- Time estimate?
  - Plaintiff
  - Defendant
- 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>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>53</b>	<b>CVL67947</b>	<b>Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Nicole Hill</b>	12/26/2025
-----------	-----------------	---	------------

<b>Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</b>	Attorney: Jon Blanda
-------------------------------	----------------------

<b>Nicole Hill</b>	Pro Per
--------------------	---------

**Case Management Conference**

12/26/2025 Complaint

<b>File Tracking</b> 01/07/2026 High Density
---

---

Collections case.

Answer filed.

§998 offer rejected.

Set bench trial (MSJ set for early August).

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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026 10:00 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

---

<b>54</b>	<b>CVL67960</b>	<b>Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Dennis L. Parker</b>	12/30/2025
-----------	-----------------	--	------------

**Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.** Attorney: Anthony Lio

**Dennis L. Parker**

**Case Management Conference**

**Motion Hearing - Other**

to deem requests for admissions admitted and of non appearance

**12/30/2025 Complaint**

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

01/12/2026 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.\[Passcode: 123456\]](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 collections case. Before the Court this day is a CMC and a hearing on plaintiff's unopposed motion to deem RFAs admitted.

The primary purpose behind requests for admissions is to eliminate the need for proof and to set at rest triable issues so that they will not have to be tried. *Stull v. Sparrow* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 860, 865. Requests for admissions may be directed to any matter that is in controversy between the parties: facts, opinions or legal conclusions. See CCP §2033.010; *Miller v. American Greetings Corp.* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1055, 1066. As noted by one Court of Appeal, "the law governing the consequences for failing to respond to requests for admission may be the most unforgiving in civil procedure." *Demyer v. Costa Mesa Mobile Home Estates* (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 393, 394-39. That is mostly true, save perhaps for one, often-overlooked, safe harbor therein, to wit: CCP §2033.280(c). Pursuant thereto, a substantially-compliant response to the RFAs made at any time "before the hearing on the motion" will moot the motion almost entirely (sanctions would still recoverable, but plaintiff did not seek those here). See *St. Mary v. Superior Court* (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 762, 778; in accord, *Katayama v. Continental Investment Group* (2024) 105 Cal.App.5th 898, 908. Thus, before the motion can be granted, plaintiff must confirm that substantially-complaint responses have not been received prior to this day.

As a side note, defendant's recent filing indicates that he is largely willing to settle this case and has been frustrated with a lack of communication from counsel.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

55 CVL67922

Barclays Bank Delaware vs. Rachael Hampton

12/16/2025

Barclays Bank Delaware

Attorney: Alison Schlick

Rachael Hampton

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/16/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Default packet on hand.

Set review hearing for 12/16/2026 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

56 CVL67920

Calvalry SPV I, LLC vs. Deborah D Smith-Caudill

12/16/2025

**Calvalry SPV I, LLC as an assignee** Attorney: Michael Mallonga  
of Citibank, N.A.

**Deborah D Smith-Caudill**

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/16/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Default judgment entered. Off-calendar.



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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

---

58 CVL67930 Capital One, N.A. vs. Peter Lopez, Jr 12/17/2025

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Peter Lopez

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

---

Set review only for 12/16/2026 at 10 a.m.



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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

60 CVL67941

Capital One, N.A., vs. Betty Tinker

12/22/2025

Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discovery Bank  
Betty Tinker Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/22/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/26/2025 High Density

Set review and OSC for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

61 CVL67861

Carmax Business Services vs. Jake E. Llewellyn

12/03/2025

Carmax Business Services, LLC Attorney: Julli Bhuskute  
D/B/A Carmax Auto Finance  
Jake E. Llewellyn

Review Hearing

12/03/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/23/2025 High Density

Set review only for 12/16/2026 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

62 CVL67928

Citibank, N.A. vs. Natalie B Saenz

12/17/2025

Citibank, N.A.

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Natalie B Saenz

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Set review and OSC for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

63 CVL67942 Crown Asset management, LLC vs. Crystal Murillo Medina

12/22/2025

Crown Asset management, LLC Attorney: Spencer Penuela

Crystal Murillo Medina

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/22/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/26/2025 High Density

Set review and OSC for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

64 CVL67913

Independance Capital Recovery, LLC vs. Lori Lizardo

12/15/2025

Independance Capital Recovery, LLC Attorney: Leon Roundtree

Lori Lizardo

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Set review only for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

65 CVL67921 LVNV Funding LLC vs. Kristin Vogel

12/16/2025

LVNV Funding LLC

Attorney: Ann Doan

Kristin Vogel

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/16/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Set review only for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.

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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

66 CVL67937 LVNV Funding LLC vs. Elvis Berisha

12/19/2025

LVNV Funding LLC

Attorney: Kristina Barker

Elvis Berisha

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/19/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

Set review only for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.



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

Department 5

June 17, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

68 CVL67949

Midland Credit Management, Inc. vs. Christopher Bangham

12/26/2025

Midland Credit Management, Inc. Attorney: Michael Kahn

Christopher Bangham

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

12/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

01/07/2026 High Density

Set review and OSC for 01/20/2027 at 10 a.m.



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

---

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>June 17, 2026</b>	<b>1:30 pm</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

---

70	FL11808	Jessica Miller vs. Daniel Jesus		12/06/2012
----	---------	---------------------------------	--	------------

Jessica Miller	Pro Per
----------------	---------

Daniel Jesus	Pro Per
--------------	---------

Abel Jesus	Attorney: Jennifer Lothert
------------	----------------------------

**Court Trial: Short Cause - Child Custody/Visitation**

Fathers Step Up Plan

12/06/2012 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b> 09/26/2024 High Density
---

Other Cases  
FL11817

---

Trial Day.

- Exhibit Lists
- Witness Lists
- Trial Brief
- Vetted List of Questions

Issue: Increase from "1/3, 2/3" to "50/50"