

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

1	CVL67718	American Express National Bank vs. Richard Hicks	10/06/2025
---	----------	--	------------

American Express National Bank Attorney: Janet Brown

Richard Hicks Attorney: Garrett Charity

Motion Hearing - Attorney Withdrawal

POS filed?

10/06/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

10/07/2025 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, as the Court does not envision a need for oral argument.

This is a collections case set for bench trial on September 9, 2026. Before the Court this day is another motion by defense counsel to withdraw from representation. An attorney may withdraw as counsel of record if conduct by the client renders it unreasonably difficult for the attorney to do his job, including when there is a breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. CRPC 3-700(c); *Estate of Falco v. Decker* (1987) 188 Cal.App.3d 1004, 1014. If the attorney does not have the client's consent, he or she must proceed by way of noticed motion consistent with CCP §§ 284 and 1005, and CRC 3.1362. The motion this day is not timely since it was apparently (no POS) served via certified mail on 07/02/2026, and set for hearing a mere thirteen calendar days thereafter.

Courts have a duty of inquiry regarding the grounds for the motion, and are not required to accept at face value vague, unsupported or uncertain representations as to reasons why an attorney wants out. *Manfredi & Levine v. Superior Court* (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 1128, 1134-1136. Counsel has a corresponding duty to respond and to describe the general nature of the issue, within the confines of any privilege. *Aceves v. Superior Court* (1996) 51 Cal.App.4th 584, 592-593. The degree of detail is on a sliding scale against counsel's candor and trustworthiness. *Mossanen v. Monfared* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 1402, 1409. Just as with the earlier motion, the skeletal declaration provides no factual predicate for the request to withdraw this close to trial – which will obviously put the client in a difficult position to effectively defend the action.

Motion denied without prejudice.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

2 CV67107 Ernest Anthony Biera vs. Giving-To-Change; et. al.

03/27/2025

Ernest Anthony Biera

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

File Tracking

03/28/2025 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.

At the previous hearing, the parties were directed to be in compliance with CRC 3.110. Since the last hearing, the court file is barren in terms of progress made.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

3 CV68350

Edward Bolitho vs. Roger Perkins

04/22/2026

Edward Bolitho

Attorney: Gary Dambacher

Roger Perkins

Petition Hearing

Release Mechanics Lien

04/22/2026 Petition

File Tracking

04/24/2026 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=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 special proceeding to release a mechanics lien. As alleged, on 11/07/2024 the defendant caused to be recorded in the chain of title of APN 062-520-023-000 a mechanics lien in the amount of \$15,121.31. It is further alleged that defendant took no action to enforce his lien within the statutory period of repose set forth in Civil Code §8460. Despite a timely demand for release, neither party took any action thereon in 2024 or 2025. Plaintiff filed suit in April of this year to have the lien removed. The defendant has been served with summons.

Pursuant to Civil Code §8460(a), if the claimant has not commenced an action to enforce the lien within 90 days of its recording or beyond the agreed-upon date of extension, "the claim of lien expires and is unenforceable." The fact that the lien expires does not automatically lead to expungement; instead, "the owner of property may petition the court for an order to release the property from the claim of lien" after giving the lien holder at least 10-days to comply. Civil Code §§ 8480(a), 8482. Once the petition is filed and served, "the clerk shall set a hearing" within 30 days there. Civil Code §8486(a). Although it may not have been crystal clear at the previous hearing, today is the hearing on the motion to compel release.

Pursuant to Civil Code §8488(a), "the petitioner has the burden of proof as to the issue of compliance with the service and date for hearing requirements of this article. The claimant has the burden of proof as to the validity of the lien." Taking judicial notice of the court file, this Court can already conclude that service and notice requirements have been satisfied. All that remains is a good reason for why defendant ignored the demand to release, failed to timely enforce the lien, and failed to file any response to the pending petition. "The prevailing party is entitled to reasonable attorney fee's." *Id.*

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

4 CV68318	Denise Renee Cargill vs. Wal-Mart Associates Inc et al		04/14/2026
------------------	---	--	------------

Denise Renee Cargill	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-----------------------------	---------------------------

Wal-Mart Associates Inc

Megan Bally

Demurrer

-RESERVED

04/14/2026 Complaint

File Tracking 04/17/2026 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 needed.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, the hearing on the demurrer will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 2.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

5 CV66070	Stefan Karl Cathrein vs. Cheryl R Johnson-Gonzales		04/05/2024
------------------	---	--	------------

Stefan Karl Cathrein	Attorney: Stacy Tyler
-----------------------------	-----------------------

Cheryl R Johnson-Gonzales	Attorney: J. Murrin
----------------------------------	---------------------

Cheryl R Johnson-Gonzales	Attorney: J. Murrin
----------------------------------	---------------------

Stefan Karl Cathrein	Attorney: Stacy Tyler
-----------------------------	-----------------------

Review Hearing - Modify

Motion under submission

05/06/2024 Cross Complaint

File Tracking

08/28/2025 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.

Neither party has indicated any desire to argue this Court’s fifteen-page indicated ruling issued on June 29. Instead, this Court received the stipulation to effectively put a halt on the active litigation, which gives this Court much joy. The hearing on the pending MSJ is off-calendar. The pretrial readiness conference, and trial date, are likewise vacated. Discovery deadlines may track any new future trial date, as requested by the parties. Of note, the proposed “stip and order” was missing page three – the “order” part.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

6 CV61804	Anthony Collins vs. Michael Leonard, et al.		08/23/2018
------------------	--	--	------------

Anthony Collins	Attorney: Denae Budde
Anthony Collins	Attorney: Michael Abbott
Michael Leonard	Attorney: Jill Cohoe
Michael Leonard	Attorney: Jill Cohoe
Anthony Collins	Attorney: Michael Abbott
Anthony Collins	Attorney: Denae Budde
Dept of Veterans Affairs for the State of California	Attorney: Jovanna Schmidt
Motion Hearing - Set Aside/Vacate	

Void Judgment and Enter Amended Judgment

08/08/2019 Complaint

File Tracking 12/28/2023 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 needed.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, the hearing on the demurrer will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 2. The previous case note is repeated below for ease of reference.

This is a boundary line dispute that has been hotly litigated for many years, before several (now retired) bench officers. During the course of that litigation, it was always assumed that the Court would cooperate with effectuating the needed lot line adjustment – but according to Leonard the County has no interest in helping make this Court’s judgment a reality. The problem with the motion, as explained by Collins, is that the motion fails to set forth just what the issue really is. This Court has no trouble issuing a citation to the Tuolumne County Community Resources Agency (CRA) and/or the Tuolumne County Surveyor’s Office to ascertain what the issues are, noting of course that if the issues relate to shortcomings on the part of Leonard (rather than the County), Leonard shall immediately bear the costs associated with the citation hearings, County employee time, and the like. It has been almost 3 years since the Judgment was entered, so there must be a fairly robust paper trail relating to the lot line adjustment.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

7	CV67431	Darren Duez vs. Hugo Alejandro Mata Arreola		07/17/2025
----------	----------------	--	--	-------------------

Darren Duez	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
--------------------	---------------------------

Hugo Alejandro Mata Arreola

North River Insurance Company

Evrard Concrete Inc.

Evrard Landscape and Hardscape

Western Surety Company	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-------------------------------	---------------------------

Case Management Conference

Further - Prove up or Default?

07/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 07/18/2025 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.

No appearance is needed.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, the hearing on the demurrer will be continued to 08/14/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2. For the benefit of the parties, there is no motion to strike the answer, and no amended answer by a licensed attorney, so from this Court's perspective the matter is still not at issue.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

8	CV68450	J.G. Wentworth Originations, LLC vs. Cherie Mentzer-Dinneen	05/27/2026
---	---------	---	------------

J.G. Wentworth Originations, LLC Attorney: James Felton

Cherie Mentzer-Dinneen

Motion Hearing - Ex Parte

FURTHER for Approval for Transfer of Payment Rights

05/27/2026 Petition

File Tracking

05/29/2026 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.

As indicated at the previous hearing, the payee/transferor appears to be married. Pursuant to Ins. Code §10139.5(c), "every petition for approval of a transfer of structured settlement payment rights shall include, to the extent known after the transferee has made reasonable inquiry with the payee, the payee's marital status, and, if married or separated, the name of the payee's spouse." The petition must also include "the amounts and sources of the monthly income and financial resources of the payee's spouse." Finally, a transfer "is void unless a court reviews and approves the transfer and finds the transfer of the structured settlement payment rights is fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the payee, taking into account the welfare and support of his or her dependents" – which includes a spouse. Ins. Code §§ 10134(b), 10137(a). Most practitioners resolve these concerns by simply having the spouse sign-off on the transfer.

Nothing was filed since the last hearing, except an updated contract with no highlighted reference to the spousal issue.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

9 CV67334 Thomas Knowlton vs. Henry Speeth

06/11/2025

Thomas Knowlton

Attorney: Colin Jones

Henry Speeth

Attorney: Marissa
Vandersluys

Henry Speeth

Attorney: Marissa
Vandersluys

Motion Hearing - Compel

Case Management Conference

06/11/2025 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=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 needed.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, the hearing on the demurrer will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 2. The previous case note is repeated below for ease of reference.

This is a personal injury action, arising out of an automobile accident. Before the Court this day is defendant's motion to compel plaintiff's attendance at an independent medical examination with a neuropsychologist. The parties do not disagree regarding the propriety of an DME in the abstract; rather, they disagree over plaintiff's right to audiotape the examination and/or receive copies of testing material.

The right to audiotape the examination is a given. The Legislature has already made plain that plaintiff "shall have the right to record a mental examination by audio technology." CCP §2032.530(a); in accord, Carpenter v. Superior Court (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 249, 271. Since plaintiff can bring in a device to record the examination, and leave with the device, plaintiff can obviously retain a recording thereof. The protective order keeps plaintiff and his attorney from sharing the recording with others. It hardly seems that different from a deposition.

*The harder question is whether this Court should exercise its discretion to order the release of the raw testing materials and data. The decision in Randy's Trucking, Inc. v. Superior Court (2023) 91 Cal.App.5th 818, which both parties cite, holds only that neither CCP §2032.610 nor federal regulations impose any prohibitions against a trial court's presumed authority to order disclosure of these items. Id. at 848 ["Defendants and amici curiae urge us to create a bright-line rule limiting transmission of neuropsychological and psychological testing materials and raw test data, as well as audio recordings of examinations, to licensed neuropsychologists or psychologists ... The Legislature, however, has not codified the expert-to-expert limitation advocated by defendants and amici curiae. On this writ, our role is simply to determine whether, based on the rules of evidence, the trial court abused its discretion in ordering transmission of these materials to plaintiffs' attorney subject to a protective order."]. As noted last year by the Iowa Supreme Court in Burton v. West Bend Mutual Ins. Co., 17 N.W.3d 340, 345 (2025): "these cases allow disclosure based on a balancing of one party's need for the information against the ethical restraints imposed on licensed psychologists, the commercial interests of the testing companies, and the need to protect the scientific validity of the testing instruments – which could be impaired from wide disclosure of the testing material." However, the Nevada Supreme Court this year, citing Randy's, thought the concerns were overblown: "Just as the courts in Randy's Trucking, Wright, Cook, and Glennon found, (1) disclosure of data to those other than a neuropsychologist is proper, as plaintiffs should not be required to hire a neuropsychologist to attack the credibility of defense experts and effectively cross-examine the experts; (2) a protective order can effectively alleviate confidentiality concerns; and (3) speculative concerns about disclosure do not outweigh the right of the plaintiff to access the data." Powers v. District Court County of Clark, 142 Nev. Adv. Op. 35 at *7 (2026).*

Which brings this Court to the crux of the issue: what is the "good cause" offered by plaintiff for needing the raw data and testing materials? Surely plaintiff will have his answers, the expert's opinion as to what those answers mean, and a counter expert to offer a different opinion. Since counsel is not an expert, what does possession of the raw data do for counsel in preparing for the case? Plaintiff has not adequately explained the good cause for needing this, nor has defendant explained the lack of good cause for releasing it. Perhaps an in camera review is the only way to proceed.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

10 CV67771

Peitra Rice vs. Adventist Health Sonora, James Boyd

10/27/2025

Peitra Rice

Attorney: Howard Knapp

Adventist Health Sonora

Attorney: Ian Scharg

James Boyd

Attorney: Ian Scharg

Case Management Conference

Further - Set Trial

10/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlyZzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [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 medical malpractice action stemming from a knee surgery.

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: _____ (Weds @ 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

July 15, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

11 CV67224 Jessica Smittle et al vs. Kaden Fields et al

05/06/2025

Jessica Smittle

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Noah Smittle

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Kaden Fields

Attorney: Melissa Raffalow

Douglas Fields

Attorney: Melissa Raffalow

Mac Smittle

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Review Hearing

Dismissal filed?

Moved to be heard with the Petition

Petition Hearing - Other

Minors Compromise

05/06/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/11/2025 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 needed.

This is a petition to approve a proposed compromise and release of a personal injury claim belonging to a minor, stemming from a rear-end automobile accident. There are only three persons authorized by law to compromise a minor’s injury claim: (1) the minor’s legal guardian (Prob. Code §§ 2401, 2451, 2462); (2) the minor’s appointed guardian ad litem (CCP §372(a)(2)); or (3) the parent having care, custody, or control of the minor (Prob. Code §3500). The petition here is pursued by the GAL.

As for the merit, a petition to compromise must include a full disclosure of all information that has any bearing on the reasonableness of the settlement reached. See CRC 7.950; in accord, *Chui* at 903-904; *Pearson v. Superior Court* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1337; *Espericueta v. Shewry* (2008) 164 Cal.App.4th 615, 627. This is similar to the “ballpark” test for good faith settlements. Given that the minor did not sustain any lasting injuries and has fully recovered from this accident, this Court is convinced that the settlement amount is well within the range of reasonable. Finally, trial courts are obliged to scrutinize requests for fees and costs. The request for a 25% fee is reasonable, particularly in light of counsel’s honorable practice of first subtracting file costs. The petition will be granted.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

12	CVL66357	Synchrony Bank vs. Bennie Aguilera		08/12/2024
----	----------	------------------------------------	--	------------

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Stella Park

Bennie Aguilera

Motion Hearing - Set Aside/Vacate

08/12/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

09/11/2024 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=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 court, having received and reviewed plaintiff’s request to set aside its own default judgment and to have the case dismissed, those requests will be GRANTED.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

13 CV68458 In the Matter of Robert Kayvon & Scott & Associates

03/18/2026

Scott & Associates

Hearing: Other

Sanctions Paid? CVL68183 \$750.00

03/18/2026 Sanctions

File Tracking

The order from 05/20/2026 has apparently not been served on plaintiff's counsel, which may explain why the recent augment of sanctions has not been satisfied. However, the original sanction order has likewise not been honored.

Hearing will be continued to 08/14/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

14 CV68459

In the Matter of Flint Zide and Scott & Associates

05/20/2026

Scott and Associates

Hearing: Other

Sanctions paid? CVL67239

05/20/2026 Sanctions

File Tracking

Other Cases

CVL67239

Full dismissal in underlying action entered on 06/29/2026. As a courtesy to counsel, the sanction order will be vacated.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

15 CV68490	In the Matter of Robert Kayvon and Scott & Associates		05/20/2026
------------	---	--	------------

Scott & Associates

Hearing: Other

Sanctions Payment / Hear with CVL67018

05/20/2026 Sanctions

File Tracking

06/05/2026 LP Labels Needed

Other Cases

CVL67018

The order from 05/20/2026 has been served, but the sanction has not been paid.

Hearing will be continued to 08/14/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

16 CV66458

Veronica Aguayo vs. BestNest Management LLC

09/20/2024

Veronica Aguayo

Attorney: Larry Lee

BestNest Management LLC

Review Hearing

Dismissal

09/20/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

08/08/2025 High Density

On 05/05/2026, this Court issued an order with the penultimate order as follows:

“the motion to lift the stay and withdraw the dispute from arbitration is DENIED without prejudice; but if defendant fails to tender the \$16,000 + \$2,500 within 30 days, this Court expects plaintiff to bring the issue back to this Court for a presumed victory lap.”

Although this Court did not specify how that victory lap might take shape, it is evident given that defendant is now without representation and unable to proceed without counsel, that a formal noticed motion is needed so that the Court may rule on the renewed request to find a *Hohenshelt* waiver. As a reminder this case still sits in the vestigial limbo of arbitration reference.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:00 am		DA Case #	Date Filed		
17	CV68218	American Credit Acceptance LLC vs Jordan M. Newington			03/18/2026		
		American Credit Acceptance LLC	Attorney: Danny Oh				
		Jordan Matthew Newngton					
		Case Management Conference					
03/18/2026 Petition		<table><tr><td>File Tracking</td></tr><tr><td>03/18/2026 LP Labels Needed</td></tr></table>				File Tracking	03/18/2026 LP Labels Needed
File Tracking							
03/18/2026 LP Labels Needed							

This case involves repossession of a Ford Bronco Sport. This is the initial case management conference. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff was to have filed a proof of service upon defendant within 60 days – or at the very least a declaration of due diligence showing some reasonable effort to effectuate service of process. There is nothing in the court file reflecting efforts to serve, let alone service.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

18	CVL68273	American Express National Bank vs. Jonathan Jorgensen	04/02/2026
----	----------	---	------------

American Express National Bank Attorney: Zhen Ren

Jonathan Jorgensen

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

04/02/2026 Complaint

File Tracking 04/07/2026 High Density
--

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Set for bench trial.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

19 CV68255	Joshua Axene vs. Eric Icenogle et al		03/26/2026
------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------

Joshua Axene

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Eric Icenogle

Classic Ford Broncos of California

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

03/26/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

03/26/2026 LP Labels Needed

This case involves breach of a classic car agreement. This is the initial case management conference. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff was to have filed a proof of service upon defendant within 60 days – or at the very least a declaration of due diligence showing some reasonable effort to effectuate service of process. Plaintiff has filed a declaration, and a request for publication, but during this Court’s review it was noted that counsel made a typo in the address that likely may be the reason the process server is having trouble serving. At a minimum, due diligence has not been exhausted.

Hearing will be continued to 08/14/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:00 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
20	CVL67388	Bank of America, N.A. vs. Francine Terri Phillips			06/30/2025
		Bank of America, N.A.	Attorney: Gregory Parks		
		Francine Terri Phillips			
		OSC Hearing - Sanctions			
06/30/2025	Complaint	File Tracking 07/01/2025 High Density			

Default judgment has already been entered. As a courtesy to counsel, the OSC re sanctions will be vacated.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

21 CV67370

Cathryn Chavez vs. Kennedy Meadows Resort and Pack Station, Inc

06/25/2025

Cathryn Chavez

Attorney: Paul Scheele

Kennedy Meadows Resort and
Pack Station, Inc

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

OSC Hearing - Dismiss

re: Dismissal

06/25/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/22/2025 High Density

This is a personal injury action. Plaintiff alleges that she utilized defendant's recreational services and rented a horse, at their recommendation, for a casual trial ride. Plaintiff was reportedly thrown from the horse, sustaining injury. Plaintiff filed suit, alleging that defendant was aware of the animal's dangerous propensities and failure to properly warn plaintiff or match plaintiff to this particular horse. The case was settled and Notice provided two months ago. No dismissal is yet on file. Pursuant to CRC 3.1385, this Court "must dismiss the entire case 45 days after it receives notice of settlement unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed."

Case dismissed ... but with a reservation under CCP §664.6.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:00 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
22	CVL67100	Citibank, N.A. vs. Gary R. Rainbolt			03/24/2025
		Citibank, N.A.	Attorney: Daria Lourtchenko		
		Gary R. Rainbolt			
		Case Management Conference			
		Default / Judgment status			
03/24/2025	Complaint	File Tracking 03/27/2025 High Density			

Judgment entered. Hearing can go off-calendar.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

23 CVL67378 Citibank, N.A. vs. Nicole L Hiemstra

06/26/2025

Citibank, N.A.

Attorney: David Barnett

Nicole L Hiemstra

Attorney: Jerry Wang

Review Hearing

Dismissal filed?

06/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/27/2025 High Density

Contrary to the representation made by plaintiff's counsel, there is in fact no motion to enforce a settlement on calendar. All that remains here is a Notice of Conditional Settlement filed 12/22/2025, and this Court's stated position that the case must be dismissed with a §664.6 reservation rather than remaining open for the entirety of the repayment period. CCP §128 empowers this court to provide for the orderly conduct of the proceedings, and control all persons herein in the interests of justice. With the recent amendment to CIV-110 permitting dismissal with the express reservation under §664.6, there is no reason to keep cases requiring lengthy settlement compliance periods to remain in the court's "active" inventory.

Case will be dismissed with a reservation under CCP §664.6.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

24 CVL67018 Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Steven Milner

03/03/2025

Crown Asset Management, LLC Attorney: Robert Kayvon

Steven Milner

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier III - Previous \$500.00 and \$750.00 Paid?

03/03/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/23/2025 High Density

Other Cases

CV68490

Not sure which sanction this attaches to.

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 03/03/2025
- Defendant Served: 06/18/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 3
- Amount in Controversy: \$6,245.15
- OSC Issued on: 11/19/2025
 - Response: None
 - Sanction: 03/18/2026 (\$500.00)
 - Notice: 04/21/2026 via mail
 - Response: None

Impose \$750 sanction.

Set Tier III for 07/15/2026.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

25 CVL67358 Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Joseph M Harrelson

06/20/2025

Crown Asset Management, LLC Attorney: Ann Doan

Joseph M Harrelson

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

3.740 Tier 1

06/20/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/23/2025 Cubicle 12

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 06/20/2025
- Defendant Served: 07/10/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$3,533.50
- OSC Issued on: 01/27/2026
 - Response: "Need more time"

Impose \$500 sanction.

Set Tier II for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

26 CVL67407 Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Thomas Brickley

07/08/2025

Crown Asset Management, LLC
assignee of Cross River Bank
(Upgrade Inc.)

Attorney: Lucas Conley

Thomas Brickley

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

FURTHER

07/08/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/09/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 07/08/2025
- Defendant Served: 07/22/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$3,042.83
- OSC Issued on: n/a

Set OSC Tier II for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

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

Trevon Davis	Pro Per
--------------	---------

Liquor Junction

Ketul Shah

Daniel (Doe) Carrier

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

03/19/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

03/24/2026 High Density

No appearance is necessary.

This is a defamation action between employee and employer. Before the Court this day is a CMC, but it appears that the previously-filed demurrer was cured and is ready to be put back on calendar.

Demurrer and CMC set to be heard together on 09/11/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

28 CV67636

Mark Anthony Dunaway vs. Megan Nicole Mantzouranis

09/12/2025

Mark Anthony Dunaway

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Megan Nicole Mantzouranis

Case Management Conference

Further - POS?

09/12/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

09/16/2025 High Density

No appearance is needed.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, the CMC will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

29 CV67953

Estate of Mello vs. Sonora Oxygen and Medical Supply

12/30/2025

Estate of Richard Louis Mello

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Sonora Oxygen and Medical
Supply

Amber Mello

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Paul David Mercy

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Amber Rose Mello

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Sonora Suzanne Mello

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Mark Wassermann

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Chopper Cosmos Mello

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

California Fair Plan Association

Case Management Conference

12/30/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

01/12/2026 High Density

This is a wrongful death action stemming from a residential fire. There may be related matters: PR12698, CV60643.

This is the re-scheduled CMC since nobody appeared at the earlier CMC.

Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiffs have 60 days from filing the complaint to file proof of having served all of the named defendants. Plaintiff's CMC statement states that all defendants have been served and either appeared or were dismissed. That is untrue. No defendant has appeared, or been dismissed. A review of the court file shows that the two defendants were only recently served with the summons, so this Court would expect to see a responsive pleading any day now.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, and still no appearances from any defendants, the CMC will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

30 CV67898

Megahan M Frederick vs. Ford Motor Company et al.

11/20/2025

Megahan M Frederick

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Ford Motor Company et al.

Attorney: Spencer Hugret

Sonora Ford

Attorney: Spencer Hugret

Case Management Conference

Further - Set Trial

11/20/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

11/25/2025 High Density

This is a lemon law action.

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: _____ (Weds @ 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

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

31 CV67737 Seana Hood vs. Twin Pines MHP

10/14/2025

Seana Hood

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Twin Pines MHP

Case Management Conference

10/14/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

10/16/2025 High Density

This is a dog bite case. One defendant has just appeared with a motion to compel arbitration.

The operative pleading and the CMC statement filed by plaintiff leave the reader with some important questions regarding venue. The incident is alleged to have occurred in Riverside County on 10/15/2023, but it is alleged that both dogs (the one plaintiff was walking, and the one owned by defendant which jumped the fence) were “residents” of Tuolumne County when the incident occurred. To complicate matters, plaintiff has since passed away, making venue tied to her domicile (Probate Code §7051), which is not clearly disclosed in the pleading. Finally, the court file does not contain a CCP §377.32 statement from the actual plaintiff. There is much housekeeping to complete, whether or not the defendant joins the action anytime soon.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, both the CMC and the motion to compel arbitration will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 8:30a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

32 CVL67379 JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. vs. Brian Mcdonald

06/26/2025

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

Attorney: David Barnett

Brian Mcdonald

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier II

06/26/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/27/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 06/26/2025
- Defendant Served: 03/11/2026
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$20,400.17
- OSC Issued on: 03/11/2026
 - Response: “we settled and need more time”

This case reportedly settled on 06/16/2025 – 10 days prior to the lawsuit being filed. Pursuant to CRC 3.1385(a), “if an entire case is settled, each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must immediately file written notice of the settlement with the court.” Plaintiff waited an entire year before giving notice, and in that time caused this Court to open a file, conduct a hearing, and incur staffing effort. Counsel’s request for additional time to file a CM-200 is unprofessional, and denied.

Sanction in the amount of \$750 imposed. Set additional OSC for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

33	CVL68229	Avril Ethelind Lewis vs John Morton et all	03/20/2026
----	----------	--	------------

Avril Ethelind Lewis	Pro Per
----------------------	---------

John Morton

William Allen Lewis	Pro Per
---------------------	---------

Carol Jean Morton

Shirley Annette Coombs

Case Management Conference

03/20/2026 Petition

File Tracking

03/24/2026 High Density

No appearance is needed.

This is a quiet title action with what appears to be a potentially complex history between heirs and some probate. The defendants were just recently served and have filed a request to continue the CMC in order to retain counsel. The request is reasonable, and as such will be granted.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, this CMC will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

34 CVL67368 LVNV Funding LLC vs. Nathen Miles

06/24/2025

LVNV Funding LLC

Attorney: Bryant Burnstad

Nathen Miles

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier II

06/24/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

06/26/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 06/24/2025
- Defendant Served: 03/11/2026
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$8,780.62
- OSC Issued on: 03/11/2026
 - Response: none

Issue \$500, Set additional OSC for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

35 CVL67239 LVNV Funding, LLC vs. Kimber Betzenderfer

05/02/2025

LVNV Funding, LLC

Attorney: Flint Zide

Kimber Betzenderfer

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

\$750.00 Paid? Tier III Sanctions case CV68459

05/02/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/12/2025 High Density

Other Cases

CV68459

Case dismissed. Hearing o/c

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

36 CVL65865 Michael T. Macdonald vs. Henry Henley Chapman

02/08/2024

Michael T. Macdonald

Pro Per

Henry Henley Chapman

Pro Per

OSC Hearing - Dismiss

02/08/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

05/09/2024 High Density

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, this CMC will be continued to 08/10/2026 at 1:30 p.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

37 CV67840

Petition of Derek Nunes

11/24/2025

Derek Nunes

Attorney: Michael Hatfield

Derek Nunes

Attorney: Michael Hatfield

City of Sonora

Case Management Conference

FURTHER

11/24/2025 Petition

File Tracking

11/24/2025 High Density

This is a petition for a writ of mandamus seeking disclosure of public records under the control of the City of Sonora pertaining to the waste management franchise previously awarded to California Waste Recovery Systems, LLC. There has been no information submitted to this Court regarding the City's Prop 218 public hearing and whether the matter passed.

The right to receive copies of public records is never absolute, but rather subject to an implied rule of reasonableness. See Govt. Code §7922.000; *Long Beach Police Officers Ass'n v. City of Long Beach* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 74. This is why the burden ultimately falls of the requestor to be reasonably precise. See §§ 7922.530(a), 7922.600(a). Anything discoverable yet withheld is potentially subject to Vaughn indexing, a reasonable explanation for the decision to withhold, and in camera review. See §7923.105; *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. Superior Court* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 733, 790- 792. However, while agencies can elect to produce an index (see §7922.605), there is no obligation to provide a log/index of everything unless a court orders it. See *Haynie v. Superior Court* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1061, 1072-1075. Finally, once a petition has been filed, an order may be secured requiring respondent to provide a factual basis to establish that it conducted a diligent search and reasonable inquiry of those under its control. See, e.g., CCP §2031.230; Govt. Code §7922.000; *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 627-629; *Community Youth Athletic Ctr. v. City of National City* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1428-1429.

This Court is pleased to note that its previous direction vis-à-vis disclosure of records may yield a global resolution. The request to waive a writ hearing and convert to a CMC is encouraging. However, it is unclear at this juncture where the dispute now stands.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

38 CV68175

Pine Mountain Lake Association vs. Mario Levi et al

03/05/2026

Pine Mountain Lake Association

Attorney: D. Robert Ward

Mario Levi

Attorney: Torri Patel

Flora Pavlichenko

Attorney: Torri Patel

Case Management Conference

03/05/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

03/05/2026 LP Labels Needed

This case involves an HOA dispute over improvements.

Likely to continue the CMC.

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: _____ (Weds @ 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

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

39 CVL67406 Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC vs. Vanessa Branscum

07/07/2025

Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC Attorney: Donald Sherrill

Vanessa Branscum

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

07/07/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/09/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 07/07/2025
- Defendant Served: 05/17/2026
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$2,076.96
- OSC Issued on: 04/06/2026
 - Response: none

Issue \$500, Set additional OSC for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

40 CV68228 Christina Santana vs Tuolumne County

03/20/2026

Christina Santana

Pro Per

Tuolumne County

Case Management Conference

03/20/2026 Petition

File Tracking

03/24/2026 High Density

This is a claim involving allegations of civil wrongs committed by local law enforcement. There is no proof of service in the file. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff had 60 days to effectuate service and show proof thereof. The case is now four months old and no progress has been shown.

Set OSC re sanctions for 09/11/2026 in Department 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:00 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
41	CVL67145	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Brittney A. Burd			04/08/2025
		Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Harlan Reese		
		Brittney A. Burd	Attorney: Timothy Reed		
		Case Management Conference			
		FURTHER			
04/08/2025	Complaint	File Tracking 04/17/2025 High Density			

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Set for bench trial?

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

42	CVL68036	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Robert Thurston	01/27/2026
----	----------	--	------------

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Ingrid Caero
------------------------	------------------------

Robert Thurston	Pro Per
-----------------	---------

Case Management Conference - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking 02/06/2026 High Density

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Set for bench trial?

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

43	CVL68305	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Emily Buchanan	04/10/2026
-----------	-----------------	--	-------------------

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

Emily Buchanan	Attorney: Jerry Wang
-----------------------	----------------------

Case Management Conference

04/10/2026 Complaint

File Tracking
04/13/2026 High Density

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Set for bench trial?

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

44	CV68191	Bruce Williams vs. Pine Mountain Lake Association et al	03/17/2026
----	---------	---	------------

Bruce Williams Pro Per

Pine Mountain Lake Association

Allied Trustee Services

Mike Gustafson

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

03/17/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

03/24/2026 High Density

No appearance is needed.

This is a quiet title action, of sorts. There is no proof of service in the file. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff had 60 days to effectuate service and show proof thereof. The case is now four months old and no progress has been shown.

Due to a pending reassignment of the case to Department 2, this CMC will be continued to 08/28/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

45 CV68024

American Express National Bank vs. Suzanne Boynton

01/27/2026

American Express National Bank Attorney: Robert Cox

Suzanne Boynton

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

03/05/2026 High Density

Judgment already entered. Case can go o/c

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

46	CVL68041	Bank of America, N.A. vs. Robert L Thurston	01/27/2026
----	-----------------	--	------------

Bank of America, N.A.	Attorney: Jason Burrows
------------------------------	-------------------------

Robert L Thurston

Review Hearing

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking
02/06/2026 High Density

Collections case.

Answer filed.

Set for CMC 08/28/2026 at 10:00 a.m. in Department 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
47	CVL68021	Capital One, N.A. vs. John Serpa			01/27/2026
		Capital One, N.A.	Attorney: Donald Sherrill		
		John Serpa			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/27/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 02/06/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------------	-----------	------------

48	CVL68022	Capital One, N.A. vs. Colbi Eads	01/27/2026
----	----------	----------------------------------	------------

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Donald Sherrill

Colbi Eads

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

02/06/2026 High Density

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 15, 2026 10:03 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

49 CVL68023 Capital One, N.A. vs. Melissa Jarvis

01/27/2026

Capital One, N.A.

Attorney: Donald Sherrill

Melissa Jarvis

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

02/06/2026 High Density

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
50	CVL67963	Capitol One, N.A. vs. Erin E Polsky			01/02/2026
		Capitol One, N.A.	Attorney: Stella Park		
		Erin E Polsky			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/02/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 01/12/2026 High Density			

Judgment already entered. Haring can go o/c

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
51	CVL67964	Capitol One, N.A. vs. John Houston			01/02/2026
		Capitol One, N.A.	Attorney: Anthony DiPiero		
		John Houston			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/02/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 01/12/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
52	CVL68029	Crown Asset Management, LLC vs. Mark Brooks			01/28/2026
		Crown Asset Management, LLC	Attorney: Lucas Conley		
		Mark Brooks			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/28/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 02/06/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed				
53	CVL68025	JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A. vs. James McIntyre			01/28/2026				
		JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A.	Attorney: Donald Sherrill						
		James McIntyre							
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740							
01/28/2026	Complaint	<table><tr><td colspan="2">File Tracking</td></tr><tr><td>02/06/2026</td><td>High Density</td></tr></table>				File Tracking		02/06/2026	High Density
File Tracking									
02/06/2026	High Density								

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
54	CVL68031	Midland Credit Management, Inc vs. Lei Guo			01/28/2026
		Midland Credit Management, Inc Attorney: Junqiao Xiao			
		Lei Guo			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/28/2026 Complaint		File Tracking 02/06/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
55	CVL68004	Synchrony Bank vs. Angela Craig			01/16/2026
		Synchrony Bank	Attorney: Robert Cox		
		Angela Craig			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/16/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 01/28/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5		July 15, 2026 10:03 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
56	CVL68028	TD Bank USA, N.A. vs. Jaime Morales			01/28/2026
		TD Bank USA, N.A.	Attorney: Lucas Conley		
		Jaime Morales			
		Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740			
01/28/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 02/06/2026 High Density			

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

57	CVL68035	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Michael Barreno	01/27/2026
-----------	-----------------	---	-------------------

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Ingrid Caero
-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Michael Barreno

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

01/27/2026 Complaint

File Tracking
02/06/2026 High Density

Set review hearing 11/13/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. in Dept 2.

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

Department 5	July 15, 2026	2:30 pm	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	---------------	---------	-----------	------------

58	FL19369	Jennifer Underwood and Evan Underwood		01/29/2026
----	---------	---------------------------------------	--	------------

Jennifer Underwood

Pro Per

Evan Underwood

Department of Child Support
Services

Attorney: of Child Support
Services Department

Pre-Trial Conference

Court Trial: Short Cause

House

01/29/2026 Petition

File Tracking

07/08/2026 Judgment Review

No WL/EL from Wife. Court anticipates < 2 hrs.