

# Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

## Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	January 23, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------	---------	-----------	------------

1	PR12679	Estate of Arnie Michael Jardine		07/23/2025
---	---------	---------------------------------	--	------------

	Maranda Gertz	Pro Per
--	---------------	---------

Arnie Michael Jardine

	Lothert Law	Pro Per
--	-------------	---------

Review Hearing - Inventory and Appraisal

Inventory and Appraisal

07/23/2025 Petition

File Tracking

07/24/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca.gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 the four-month review hearing to confirm compliance with the obligation set forth in Probate Code §8800 to complete a final Inventory & Appraisal. Due to delays with petitioner's submission of a proposed order and signed Letters, this hearing is actually premature by more than a month. Court intends to continue this hearing to March 6, 2026 at 8:30 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

2 PR12715

Estate of Gertrude Rose Fuego

10/09/2025

Mark Olson

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Gertrude Rose Fuego

Letters of Administration

10/09/2025 Petition

File Tracking

12/05/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."

Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:

<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 petition to admit a holographic will to probate, and to issue Letters of Administration to a local professional who has graciously offered to assist this family (which resides mostly overseas). The previous notice issue has been resolved. The request for forego hunting for nieces in France and England based on the fact that their specific gift has already lapsed is reasonable and granted.

A holographic will is considered presumptively valid if: the testator is at least 18 years of age (§6100(a)); the testator was of sound mind when the will was written (§6100(a)); the signature and material provisions of the will are in the testator's handwriting (§6111(a)); the will is dated (§6111(b)); there was present testamentary intent; there is identifiable property to be devised (§6101); there are identifiable devisees (§6102); and the testator was not acting under duress, menace, fraud, or undue influence (§6104). See also *Lintz v. Lintz* (2014) 222 Cal.App.4th 1346, 1355; *Estate of Ben-Ali* (2013) 216 Cal.App.4th 1026, 1036-1038; *Estate of Williams* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 197, 212-213; *Estate of Burdette* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 938, 946. While some of the eight elements are self-proving from the will itself, without a supporting declaration from anyone, this Court is entirely in the dark as to whether this is decedent's holographic will. The supplement does not provide this Court with any additional information from which to permit at least a basic finding. Surely someone can attest to the decedent's writing/intent?

There is also the issue of a bond. The petition indicates that "all heirs at law" have waived bond, but this is not an intestate estate where the heirs are the only interested parties. When dealing with a testate estate, either the will must affirmatively waive bond (which this one does not expressly do for anyone other than nominated executors) or every devisee must waive bond – and that list (see above) is lengthy. However, before petitioner starts working on more waivers, §8481(b) provides that "notwithstanding the waiver of a bond by a will or by all the beneficiaries, the court may for good cause require that a bond be given," and when a professional fiduciary steps in to serve as personal representative – especially with a testamentary instrument vesting the fiduciary with significant discretion regarding the distribution plan – a bond will be required either way. The petitioner requested at the last hearing a chance to discuss the bond issue, but nothing was filed since the last hearing.

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

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>January 23, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

3	PR12627	Estate of Michelle Cordero		04/07/2025
---	---------	----------------------------	--	------------

**Joseph Batto**

Attorney: Rodney  
Augustine

**Review Hearing**

FURTHER trial setting

**04/07/2025 Petition**

**File Tracking**

04/14/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."

Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:

<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMTONwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456].

All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

Brother action.

See #4

This action is slated for dismissal

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

<b>Department 5</b>	<b>January 23, 2026</b>	<b>8:30 am</b>	<b>DA Case #</b>	<b>Date Filed</b>
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

4 <b>PR12629</b>	<b>Estate of Michelle Elam</b>		04/08/2025
------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------

**Danielle Tilbury**

Attorney: Gary Dambacher

**Review Hearing**

FURTHER trial setting

**04/08/2025    Petition**

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

04/14/2025    High Density
----------------------------

---

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."  
Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:  
<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

---

Step-daughter action.  
Mediation resolved the differences.  
Parties stipulate to this petition being granted.  
Home reportedly sold.

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

Department 5	January 23, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------	---------	-----------	------------

5	PR12734	Estate of Richard Dean Jackson		11/26/2025
		Richard Dean Jackson		
		Mardi Jackson	Pro Per	
		Letters of Administration		

11/26/2025 Petition

<b>File Tracking</b> 12/05/2025 High Density
---

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 the initial hearing on a petition to admit a will to probate and for the appointment of the alternate nominated executor to serve as the personal representative of the estate. The petition cannot be granted just yet for the following reasons:

- There is no proof of publication yet;
- The petition is not filled out accurately (see Para 3.d. and 3.f.)
- There is no proof of service/notice to the sole devisee

Court expects to continue the matter for at least one month.

# Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

## Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

6 PR12328

Estate of Stephen T. Higgins

10/23/2023

Stephen T. Higgins

Kolby Paige Higgins

Attorney: David Song

State of California Franchise Tax

Board REMOVED 7/8/25

Review Hearing - Report - Probate Code 12200

FURTHER / Orders

10/01/2025 Final Distribution

File Tracking

11/20/2024 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."

Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:

<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMTONwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 petition for final distribution. After the last hearing this Court was expecting a supplement from counsel with a proposed order implementing this Court's brilliant plan to bypass the testamentary quasi-spendthrift trust. Per the will, petitioner is arguably already entitled to \$25,000 in living expenses for 2023, 2024, 2025, and 2026 so long as she was receiving "education" on a part time basis. Since decedent did not define "education" as enrollment in any formal institution of higher learning, petitioner is free to make the argument that she has been educating herself on a part-time basis since her father's passing, and is thus immediately entitled to \$100,000 plus "education costs" in the form of statutory legal fees owing to Attorney Song, for a grant total of nearly \$115,000. She is also entitled to another "one-third" which this Court estimated to be \$140,000, giving petitioner a current entitlement of \$255,000. When decedent established this testamentary will process, he believed that either his brother or his best friend would agree to serve as executor. As it turns out, both of them declined to serve, which gave petitioner immediate priority to assume the personal representative role. See Probate Code §8441(b). Since the decedent did not forget to nominate petitioner (§8421), or authorize his nominees to select another (§8422), this will has no executor, and as such there is no person appointed to serve as settlor for a testamentary trust. Without a settlor for a trust, there is no devisee, which causes the gift to transfer "in the manner provided in Section 240." §21110(a). That would send the gift via intestacy, which appears to be petitioner. §6402. Alternatively, someone could petition this Court for appointment to fill the vacancy as trustee (§15660(d)), but nobody has. It seems petitioner would most likely nominate herself to serve as trustee over anyone else. In addition, the testamentary trust decedent envisioned was "revocable," which means petitioner could set it up and knock it right down. §15402. Moreover, decedent did not require a spend thrift clause (§15301), so the purpose of this particular delay trust is unclear. Pursuant to Family Code §§ 7502 and 7505(c), "the parent has no control over the property of the child" and "the authority of a parent ceases on the child attaining the age of majority." Although it appears that both petitioner and Attorney Song might be willing to delay receipt of their funds, there is no equity in that. As such, assuming petitioner appears at the hearing and responds to this Court's inquiry appropriately, the distribution from the estate shall be to petitioner directly, which shall include the immediate right to liquidate the assets as she sees fit. Petitioner will remain personally responsible to pay Attorney Song.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

7 PR12722

In Matter of Marcia M Perdue Revocable Trust

10/21/2025

Keith Lunney

Attorney: Jason Pink

Petition Hearing

FURTHER - confirm trust assets

10/21/2025 Petition

File Tracking

12/05/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."

Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:

<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWVFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All

matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

Before the Court this day is the continued hearing on a petition to declare a one-half interest in APN 021-030-005-000 an asset of the Marcia M. Perdue Revocable Trust dtd 10/28/19. A trial court may make a transfer of assets into an irrevocable trust beyond the life of the surviving settlor, pursuant to §856, if the settlor(s) presently own(s) the asset in question, the settlor(s) created a trust with themselves as trustor, and there exists sufficient evidence to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the settlor(s) intended said property to be held in that trust but failed to make a legal record transfer by mistake, surprise, excusable neglect or innocent omission. See, e.g., *Carne v. Worthington* (2016) 246 Cal.App.4th 548, 558-560; *Ukkestad v. RBS Asset Finance, Inc.* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 156, 160-161; *Estate of Powell* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1434, 1443; *Estate of Heggstad* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 943, 950-951.

Here, settlor created and funded an inter vivos revocable trust in 2019 with shares of corporate stock, two bank accounts, and "any and all other real and personal property belonging to the Trustor not specifically described herein, excluding those assets for which beneficiary designations have been created as part of the Trustor's estate plan." At the time she created this trust, she owned the subject property with Kirk Kuykendall "as joint tenants." Because joint tenancy includes a right of survivorship (see §§ 683, 683.2), it would qualify as an asset already burdened by a beneficiary designation and not amenable to a transfer here. However, on 04/21/2025, a grant deed was recorded transferring Kirk's interest from himself to his own inter vivos trust, with a notation that the deed was intended to "break that joint tenancy." Although simply recording a deed does not itself sever a joint tenancy (see §683.2(c)(1) and (2)), all interested parties here have now signed stipulations agreeing that the severance was effective to preserve the trustor's 50% interest therein. In so doing, Ryan and Patrick have effectively waived any claim they have to the property, and surrender such to Mark and Matthew. With that, this Court is amenable to entering the order as prayed.

# Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

## Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

8 PR12687

In the Matter of The Bogan Trust dated October 1, 2004

08/12/2025

Kristi A. Horwitz

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Petition Hearing

FURTHER for Accounting

08/12/2025 Petition

File Tracking

08/14/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 the continued initial hearing on a petition seeking to compel an accounting and other information from the acting trustee. Service has been made, triggering the trustee's obligation to file a written objection or response thereto. See CRC 7.801. If no response is forthcoming, it is this Court's usual process to install a limited-purpose receiver and reserve surcharges for another day. See CCP §564(b)(9); Probate Code §17206. Although the trustees indicated that they had all "the paperwork" needed to respond to the request, there is nothing in the court file since the last hearing showing compliance or whether judicial intervention is still needed.



Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

9 PR12601 The Estate of Laurie Ann Rock

02/19/2025

Laurie Rock

Robert G. Rock

Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

Final Distribution Hearing

02/19/2025 Petition

File Tracking

03/17/2025 High Density

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, 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 the initial hearing on a petition to settle the account and approve the proposed distribution of the estate. If no objection is made before or at the hearing by decedent's adult children, this Court will proceed to approve the petition even though the following anomalies are noted for the record:

- The fee basis is overstated by \$5,000 because a "seller credit" on the sale of the real property is the equivalent of a further loss on the sale;
- Without assessing the propriety of the amount sought as extraordinary fees, those fees should be borne by petitioner alone because those fees are not "to the advantage of the estate [or] in the best interests of the persons who are interested in the estate." Probate Code §10811(c)(3). It is also not credible that petitioner planned to run a spousal petition and quit claim his interest to the children (giving them each \$35,000) when he is seeking his own statutory fee here for no real effort. There was nothing stopping him from running the spousal petition in the first instance.

As noted, if the heirs are not concerned enough to appear, the petition may nevertheless be approved.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	January 23, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	---------------------------	-----------	------------

10	PR12114	Conservatorship of Julio C Acosta, Jr	05/11/2022
----	---------	---------------------------------------	------------

Julio C Acosta	Pro Per
----------------	---------

Julio C Acosta	Pro Per
----------------	---------

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

05/11/2022 Petition

File Tracking

02/11/2025 High Density

This is the annual review of the general conservatorship over the person and estate. Previous VMRC reports have been requested to determine the conservatee's qualifications for a promotion to a limited conservatorship, but the court file does not reflect receipt of any such report. Court will await updated investigator report.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

11 PR12180 Guardianship of Dominic De la Rosa, et. al.

10/07/2022

Jessica Hendrickson

Pro Per

Dominic De la Rosa

Sophia De la Rosa

Anthony De la Rosa

Jinee Deschler

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

10/07/2022 Petition

File Tracking

01/29/2025 From Court-Civil on Calendar

No appearance is necessary.

The Court, having received and reviewed the GC-251 with attachments for all three wards, concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianship remains necessary and/or convenient for all three wards, and that the guardian continues to meet the wards' best interests. Court intends to set an annual review date, and to start aligning Dominic's with the natural termination of his guardianship in May of 2028.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

12 PR11524 Guardianship of Elishia Towler, et al

02/16/2018

Naome St Germane

Pro Per

Elishia Towler

Kylee Towler

Darlene Martinez

Review Hearing

Confirm Termination

02/16/2018 Petition

File Tracking

10/25/2024 High Density

No appearance is necessary.

There being no petition on file to extend the guardianship beyond the ward's 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, this guardianship has terminated by operation of law. This case may now be closed.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

13 PR11794 Guardianship of Leila Rose Klaverweiden

02/21/2020

Curtis Cashen

Carol Cashen

Leila Rose Klaverweiden

Carol Ann Cashen Pro Per

Curtis James Cashen Pro Per

Leila Rose Klaverweiden

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

11/09/2022 Petition

File Tracking

01/30/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR11527

No appearance is necessary.

The Court, having received and reviewed the GC-251 with attachments, concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianship remains necessary and/or convenient, and that the guardians continue to meet the ward's best interests. Court intends to set an annual review date.

If the guardians do appear, Court intends to inquire regarding the ancillary issues raised relating to the ward's sibling Valen and whether a proposed guardianship and/or a CWS referral pursuant to Probate Code §1513(b) is warranted.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	January 23, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	---------------------------	-----------	------------

14	PR11470	Guardianship of Sergio R. De La Rosa	08/11/2017
----	---------	--------------------------------------	------------

Jessica C Robles

Pro Per

Sergio R De La Rosa

Ruben De La Rosa

Review Hearing

Home Study

08/15/2017 Petition: Other

File Tracking

01/14/2025 From Court Legal Document 5

Other Cases

JV7497

This is an established guardianship in which the guardian has recently permitted a family member with behavioral and criminal red flags to occupy the same residence – representing a potentially unsafe situation for the ward. The issues relating to this individual were not voluntarily disclosed on the GC-251 filed 12/29/2025 and only came to light as part of the court investigator’s home study. That individual has prior (JV7936) and pending (CRF78534) charges relating to inappropriate behavior directed at minors – which augments the risk to an impressionable minor in the home.

When a guardian is appointed, he or she cannot be removed except for cause provided by statute. *Guardianship of Davis* (1967) 253 Cal.App.2d 754, 760. Pursuant to Probate Code §2650, a guardian may be removed for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to failing to perform duties suitably, gross immorality, “having such an interest adverse to the faithful performance of duties that there is an unreasonable risk that the guardian or conservator will fail faithfully to perform duties,” and “in any other case in which the court in its discretion determines that removal is in the best interests of the ward.” Although the guardian here is certainly entitled to an evidentiary hearing, the harboring of a potentially dangerous individual in the residence of the ward is prima facie evidence of both gross immorality and a conflict of interest.

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

Department 5		January 23, 2026 10:00 am		DA Case #	Date Filed
15	FL15007	Ryan Royce and Erika Royce			08/16/2017
		Ryan Royce	Pro Per		
		Erika Royce	Attorney: Jessie Castellano		
		Review Hearing - Visitation			
		Special Set, due to fathers schedule			
05/15/2018	OSC Application		<div>File Tracking</div> <div>07/18/2025 Archives-File Imaged</div>		

Review hearing to see how Father’s supervised visits on Thurs evenings have been going and whether the parties can agree to any step-up plan at this time.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

January 23, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

16 CV67798

Petition of Mark A. Villasenor

11/03/2025

Mark A. Villasenor

Pro Per

County of Tuolumne

William Vanderheiden

Tuolumne County Board of  
Supervisors

Jaron E. Brandon

Tuolumne County Health and  
Human Services Agency

Annie Hockett

Review Hearing

Status of housing

11/03/2025 Petition

File Tracking

12/05/2025 High Density

Review hearing to confirm that the conservatee is properly housed.



Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	January 23, 2026	1:30 pm	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------	---------	-----------	------------

17	FL13717	Theodore G. Baca and Trina M. Baca		08/14/2015
----	---------	------------------------------------	--	------------

Theodore G Baca

Pro Per

Trina M Baca

Hearing: Other

Restoration of Former Name

08/14/2015 Petition

File Tracking

06/09/2021 Archives

Application filed 10/20/2025

Judgment entered 12/08/2015 (?!)

Petition filed 08/14/2015 – no request made

# Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

## Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5	January 23, 2026	1:30 pm	DA Case #	Date Filed
--------------	------------------	---------	-----------	------------

18	FL13935	Eveleen Sheehan-Smith and Kevin Smith		12/04/2015
----	---------	---------------------------------------	--	------------

**Evelyn Sheehan Smith**

Attorney: Jameson Adame

**Kevin L Smith**

Attorney: Sally Chenault

**Department of Child Support  
Service**

Attorney: Dept. of Child  
Support Services

**City of Fremont**

**CALPERS**

**Court Trial: Short Cause**

Day 2

Est. Duration: 4.00 Hours

**12/04/2015 Petition**

**File Tracking**

10/14/2022 Family Law Division

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary."

Unless a personal appearance is required, all participants may appear via Zoom without first securing Court permission using this link:

<https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Meeting ID: 161 581 3960; Passcode: 123456]. All

matters set for hearing in Department 5 are presumptively assigned to that department for all 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 thereof, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

Day 2 if needed ...