

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

1 PR12773 Estate of Charles Clifford Collins, Jr

03/19/2026

Christopher Corbett

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Charles Clifford Collins

Letters of Administration

FURTHER

03/19/2026 Petition

File Tracking

03/24/2026 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 hearing on a petition to admit a foreign will to probate, and to issue Letters of Testamentary for the petitioning personal representative. At the earlier hearing, this Court surmised from a number of recitals contained within the testamentary instrument that the decedent intended for the law of South Carolina to control – and as such certain requirements must be met for this will to be considered self-proving under that law. See CA Probate Code §21103 and SC Probate Code 62-2-503. Since that time, counsel has secured a notarized statement (not drawn under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California) that the will is original and was properly witnessed by the attorney responsible for its drafting. Under the circumstances, this Court sees no issue with making the preliminary finding that there is sufficient evidence to permit its admission to probate – subject of course to any collateral attack by interested persons (ie, David). Notice to David is insufficient. Per Probate Code §8110, David was entitled to at least 15 days' notice before the initial hearing, but only received notice (via mail and email) 9 days' prior. There is no POS regarding the continued hearing date, or attached to the supplemental papers. This is particularly troubling given the false representation made by Attorney Zalenski in the Michigan case that this Court had already admitted the will and issued Letters.

What is the status of the Michigan action?

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

Department 5	July 10, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

2 PR12742	Estate of Donna Proulx			01/14/2026
------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	------------

Tianne Proulx

Attorney: Jason Pink

Donna Proulx

Letters of Administration

FURTHER

01/14/2026 Petition

File Tracking

03/18/2026 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 hearing on a petition to issue letters of administration for an intestate estate. The petition identifies three likely intestate heirs: the petitioner, and two apparent siblings. (According to counsel, all three are "estranged" from one another.) All parties seem to agree that a bond is needed unless all funds are directed via court order into a blocked account and petitioner is granted only limited authority. If the plan is to sell the only estate asset, perhaps the more logical approach would be to appoint all three siblings as co-administrators, retain current counsel, and avoid the issues relating to bond and blocked accounts altogether. This Court would be amenable to waiving the requirement that funds be deposited into a separate interest-earning account and permit them to be deposited into the attorney's client trust account.

Status on settlement?

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

Department 5	July 10, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

3 PR12788	Estate of Laurel Ellen Nelson			04/22/2026
------------------	--------------------------------------	--	--	------------

Emery Eugene Nelson	Attorney: Tamara Polley
----------------------------	-------------------------

Laurel Ellen Nelson

Letters of Administration

FURTHER

04/22/2026 Petition

File Tracking 04/24/2026 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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [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. The previous concerns have been cured and the petition will be approved. Court will set §§ 8800 and 12200 review dates.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

4 PR12782

Estate of Lynn Reed

04/06/2026

Vivian Patricia Reed

Attorney: Jack Klosek

Lynn Reed

Spousal Property Hearing

FURTHER

04/06/2026 Petition

File Tracking

04/09/2026 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 probate by-pass petition to confirm property passing to the surviving spouse. Pursuant to Probate Code §13500, "when a spouse dies intestate leaving property that passes to the surviving spouse under Section 6401, the property passes to the survivor" without the need for formal administration. Probate Code §6401 then describes three different types of property subject to potential by-pass, to wit:

- Community property, 100% of which vests directly in the surviving spouse;
- Quasi-CP, 100% of which vests directly in the surviving spouse; and
- Separate property, 50% of which vests directly in the surviving spouse.

As set forth in the petition, APN 043-760-008/009 was acquired while decedent and petitioner were married but taken in decedent's name alone "as his sole and separate property." As explained by the courts in *In re Brace* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 903 (at 931-934), and *Estate of Wall* (2021) 68 Cal.App.5th 168 (at 174-175), in a proceeding involving heirs, the form of title held by decedent controls. This means that petitioner is presently entitled to only 50% of APN 043-760-008/009. Since she is seeking an order confirming 100% of APN 043-760-008/009, she is required to establish "by clear and convincing evidence" that decedent did not hold "full beneficial title." See Evidence Code §662. Petitioner offers evidence that the loan was assumed in decedent's name because he had better credit, but the loan and recorded title are two distinct things (which petitioner seems to conflate). Once the loan attached to the property, decedent was free to transfer by interspousal deed his interest into the community – yet he decided not to do that. Moreover, he decided not to create a will that would have made plain his alleged plan of action.

Nevertheless, since petitioner is described as a "borrower" on the refi Deed of Trust (doc 2019012334), claims that the down payment was from her own separate property source (see Para 3), and some portion of the debt presumably was paid down using community funds, it does appear as though petitioner acquired some beneficial title which would be recognized in family court. See Family Code §§ 760, 803, 2640. A supplemental declaration from petitioner clearly addressing her beneficial interest in the property will be needed. Moreover, additional effort to locate and give notice to the residual heirs is required.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

5 PR12791 In Re: Marsha E. Shipper Family Trust

05/04/2026

Marcella D. Shipper

Attorney: Brandon Meyer

Petition Hearing

FURTHER - confirming trust assets

05/04/2026 Petition

File Tracking

05/05/2026 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 declare APN 064-420-033 an asset of the subject trust – which is presently irrevocable following the passing of the surviving settlor.

In this case, it is evident that the settlor intended the subject property to be held in trust. First, Article VIII of the trust instrument gave the trustee specific administrative direction regarding the subject property. Second, Article XIII X-1 of the trust instrument gave the trustee authority to add existing real property to the trust, and the settlor already owned the subject property at the time the trust was established. Third, just prior to her passing, the settlor executed a grant deed actually transferring the subject property to the trustee of the trust. Thus, by all accounts, the settlor meant for this property to be in trust.

However, jurisdiction here is unclear since the acting trustee appears to reside in Oregon (see verification), which means that the administration is arguably taking place in Oregon (see §17002). Moreover, for reasons which escape this Court, the settlor had but one main physical asset – a home in California – and yet elected to have her trust controlled by Oregon law (see Article XV. M.). Some states have expressly adopted California's Heggstad rule, others have not. Counsel will need to brief this Court on whether Oregon would permit a posthumous transfer in trust.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

6 PR12718 In Re: The Harry A. McCune, JR. Living Trust

10/14/2025

Kelsey McCune Cossel

Attorney: Jason Pink

Matthew McCune

Pro Per

Petition Hearing

FURTHER - confirm trust assets

10/14/2025 Petition

File Tracking

10/16/2025 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 hearing on a petition to declare APN 599-111-09-00 and APN 500-141-12- 00 assets of the Harry A, McCune Jr Living Trust dtd 12/01/2012. The trust is presently irrevocable following the passing of the sole settlor.

In California, a trial court may make a transfer of assets into an irrevocable trust beyond the life of the last settlor, pursuant to §856, if the last settlor presently owns the asset in question, the settlor created a trust to hold said asset, and there exists sufficient evidence to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the settlor intended the asset to be held in that trust but failed to make an effective 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; *Kucker v. Kucker* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 90, 95; *Estate of Powell* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1434, 1443; *Estate of Hegstad* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 943, 950-951.

In this case, both the trust instrument itself, and the attached Schedule of Assets, specifically reference both parcels. Moreover, the settlor actually prepared and caused to be recorded quit claim deeds for both properties transferring them into the subject trust, though each deed contained an error in the APN. This Court has no trouble concluding that the subject properties were intended to be held in trust, and that the failure to vest was only by decedent's mistake. The transfer can and should be made. However, decedent passed away in 2013, and there is no evidence provided with the petition that the properties are currently held in decedent's name. Petitioner offers an email from the county assessor stating that APN 500-141-12-00 is still in decedent's name, but nothing with regard to APN 599-111-09-00.

Objection to the petition was previously filed, but ostensibly resolved by way of a settlement agreement. There is no dismissal of the objection itself, but the attorney responsible for that filing has already substituted out. Petitioner has supplied this Court with a copy of the settlement agreement and an invitation to read it to see if it resolves the objection, This Court respectfully declines the invitation to do that independent work. Assuming the objector will not appear to be heard, the objection will be deemed withdrawn and the petition granted once the issue of concurrent ownership of both parcels is resolved.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

7 PR12351 In the Matter of Alice C. Hardin Trust

10/30/2023

James Hardin

Pro Per

Ariane H. Matschullat

Attorney: Joseph Doherty

Rowena H. Garon

Attorney: Joseph Doherty

Alice C. Hardin

Jon Hardin

Attorney: Leighton Burrey

Dambacher, Trujillo & Russell,
APLC

Debra Hardin

Attorney: John Minton

Debra Hardin

Attorney: Asher Anderson

Review Hearing

12/13/2023 Accounting: Other

File Tracking

06/25/2025 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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09>. [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.

Outstanding Expenses Estimates:

- Attorney Fees: \$ 20,000.00 Need declaration
- Receiver Fees: Unknown Need declaration
- Photo Fees: \$ 12,000.00 Approved
- Hope Lane Clean: \$ 28,000.00 Approved unless outsiders object
- Cabin Fees: \$ 3,000.00 Approved
- Ariane Equal: \$150,000.00 Approved
- Oakside Equalization Approved (\$35,000 x 6 nonparticipating = \$210,000)
- Quarry bought by Ariane: Approved (\$10,000 x 6 nonparticipating = \$60,000)
- Tuttletown bought by Ariane: Approved (\$3,600 x 6 nonparticipating = \$21,600)

Funds on hand: \$518,000.00 (approx.) - \$210,000 - \$150,000 - \$60,000 - \$21,600 - \$12,000 - \$3,000 - Fees - \$28,000 = **ZERO left over.** Time to end the sibling rivalry and move on.

Jeanette Equalization?

- Filed statement with Court but not yet imaged or served on all parties.

Beneficiary	Distribution	x9392	x4473	Cabin	Quarry	TT	Hope
Debra	\$250,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	-----
Corinne	\$250,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	-----
James	\$250,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	-----
Jon	\$250,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	-----
Jeanette	\$250,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	\$90,000?
Rowena	\$285,000 (Oakside)	☒	☒	☒	\$10,000	\$3,600	-----
Ariane	\$100,000 (cash)	☒	☒	☒	in kind	in kind	-----

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

8 PR12799 In the Matter of Kristine Lynn McNeal

04/17/2026

Todd Mc Neal

Attorney: Brandon Meyer

Kristine Lynn McNeal

Chad McNeal

Attorney: Brandon Meyer

Determine Succ to Real Property

FURTHER

04/17/2026 Petition

File Tracking

04/20/2026 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.

As previously observed, this is a creative two-pronged petitions with the singular aim of moving APN 048-730-028-000 into decedent's inter vivos trust. First, petitioners are seeking an order of succession, directing by will the decedent's alleged primary residence into her inter vivos trust from 2005. Second, petitioners are also seeking a *Heggstad* order declaring the subject property to be an asset of the trust.

As for the §13151 portion, although one's "primary residence" can differ from one's last residence (ie, assisted living, hospice), there must still be some permanency or continuing expectation of periodic return associated with the former. See, e.g., CCP §704.995; Govt. Code §244; Veh. Code §516; *Estate of Wardani* (2022) 82 Cal.App.5th 870, 882-883; *Marriage of Amezquita & Archuleta* (2002) 101 Cal.App.4th 1415, 1419-1420; *Kibbee v. Blue Ridge Ins. Co.* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 53, 61-62; *DeMiglio v. Mashore* (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 1260, 1268. The reference to decedent packing up her Reno residence and moving out to California given the timing between when she closed escrow and when she died is further supported by the declaration from her son explaining the unfortunate circumstances. Given that she actually died here in California, owning a primary residence in California, and having vacated her apartment in Reno, the subject property was her primary residence and succession is proper.

As for the *Heggstad* portion, a trial court may make a transfer of assets into an irrevocable trust beyond the life of the last settlor, pursuant to §856, if the last settlor presently owns the asset in question, the settlor created a trust to hold said asset, and there exists sufficient evidence to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the settlor intended the asset to be held in that trust but failed to make an effective transfer by mistake, surprise, excusable neglect or innocent omission. See, e.g., *Came v. Worthington* (2016) 246 Cal.App.4th 548, 558-560; *Ukkestad v. RBS Asset Finance, Inc.* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 156, 160-161; *Kucker v. Kucker* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 90, 95; *Estate of Powell* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1434, 1443; *Estate of Heggstad* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 943, 950-951. The trust permits such transfers and it certainly appears as though that was her ultimate plan. The petition is granted here as well.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

9 PR10510

Conservatorship of Carol A. Egan

10/02/2009

Reginald Chisholm

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Diane Egan-Dies

Carol A. Egan

Pro Per

Linda Daniels

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

10/02/2009 Petition

File Tracking

07/17/2024 High Density

Per request of court investigator, hearing continued to July 31, 2026, at 10 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

10 PR11778 Conservatorship of Elias Antonio Zapata

01/22/2020

Linda Smith

Pro Per

Elias Antonio Zapata

Accounting Hearing

4th

01/22/2020 Petition

File Tracking

07/16/2024 High Density

Court is awaiting annual accounting.

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

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

11 PR12797	Conservatorship of Emily Victoria Knoles		05/18/2026
------------	--	--	------------

Darla Marie Barton	Pro Per
--------------------	---------

Emily Victoria Knoles	Attorney: Carrie McKernan
-----------------------	---------------------------

Appoint Conservator - Temporary Conservatorship

05/18/2026 Petition

File Tracking 05/19/2026 High Density

Awaiting acceptance from appointed counsel and investigator's report.

New petition for appointment as GAL set for hearing next week.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

12 PR11276

Conservatorship of Justin Arndt-Linsley

02/01/2016

Peggy Arndt

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Helen Linsley

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Justin Linsley Arndt

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

FURTHER

02/01/2016 Petition

File Tracking

07/03/2024 High Density

Other Cases

PR11277

PR11278

PR11279

PR11892

Per request from court investigator, based on discovery that conservatee has been moved without court permission to a new residence, hearing will be continued to July 31, 2026, at 10 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

13 PR11918

Conservatorship of Kerry Swenson

02/11/2021

Kathleen Jacobson

Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

Kerry Swenson

David Kirkpatrick

Attorney: Timothy Trujillo

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

09/20/2024 Petition

File Tracking

11/19/2024 High Density

Per request of court investigator, hearing continued to July 31, 2026, at 10 a.m.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

14 PR11661

Conservatorship of Kyle Hanna

04/12/2019

Brett Hanna

Pro Per

Kyle Hanna

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

04/12/2019 Petition

File Tracking

07/27/2024 High Density

Resignation?

Pursuant to Probate Code §2660:

“a conservator may at any time file with the court a petition tendering the resignation of the conservator. Notice of the hearing on the petition shall be given for the period and in the manner provided in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 1460) of Part 1. The court shall allow such resignation when it appears proper, to take effect at such time as the court shall fix, and may make any order as may be necessary to deal with the conservatorship during the period prior to the appointment of a new conservator and the settlement of the accounts of the resigning conservator.”

Pursuant to Probate Code §§ 2681-2682:

“A petition for appointment of a successor conservator may be filed by the conservatee, the spouse or domestic partner of the conservatee, a relative of the conservatee, any interested person, friend or entity/agency. The petition shall request that a successor conservator be appointed for the person or estate, or both, and shall specify the name and address of the proposed successor conservator and the name and address of the conservatee.”

Pursuant to Probate Code §2920(b):

“The public guardian shall apply for appointment as conservator of the person, the estate, or the person and estate, if the court so orders. The court may make an order under this subdivision on motion of an interested person or on the court's own motion in a pending proceeding or in a proceeding commenced for that purpose. The court shall order the public guardian to apply for appointment on behalf of any person domiciled in the county who appears to require a conservator, if it appears that there is no one else who is qualified and willing to act, and if that appointment as conservator appears to be in the best interests of the person. However, if prior to the filing of the petition for appointment it is discovered that there is someone else who is qualified and willing to act as guardian or conservator, the public guardian shall be relieved of the duty under the order. The court shall not make an order under this subdivision except after **notice** to the public guardian for the period and in the manner provided for in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 1460) of Part 1, **consideration** of the alternatives, and a **determination** by the court that the appointment is necessary.”

Pursuant to Probate Code §1863(h):

“If a petition for termination pursuant to Section 1861 is uncontested and states facts showing that both the conservator and conservatee wish to terminate the conservatorship and the conservatorship is no longer the least restrictive alternative for the conservatee's protection, the court may terminate the conservatorship without an evidentiary hearing.”

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

15 PR11278

Conservatorship of Samuel Arndt-Linsley

02/01/2016

Peggy Arndt

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Helen Linsley

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Samuel Linsley Arndt

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

FURTHER

02/01/2016 Petition

File Tracking

07/03/2024 High Density

Other Cases

PR11276

PR11277

PR11279

Court is awaiting receipt of investigator's report.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

16 PR12265 Conservatorship of Sarah Ashley Longeway

04/10/2023

Deanna Fields Pro Per

Stephanie Wise Pro Per

Sarah Ashley Longeway Pro Per

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

04/10/2023 Petition

04/10/2023 Petition

Other Cases
PR11560

File Tracking

07/28/2023 Civil Division

No appearance is needed.

The Court, having received and reviewed the investigative report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that the conservatee still meets the statutory requirements for a limited conservatorship of the person, that a limited conservatorship of the person remains the least restrictive alternative for her protection, and that the co-conservators are serving the conservatee's best interests. Court intends to set an annual review date.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

17 PR11279

Conservatorship of Victorreeia Arndt-Linsley

02/01/2016

Peggy Arndt

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Helen Linsley

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Victorreeia Linsley Arndt

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

FURTHER

02/01/2016 Petition

File Tracking

07/03/2024 High Density

Other Cases

PR11276

PR11277

PR11278

No appearance is needed.

The Court, having received and reviewed the investigative report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that the conservatee still meets the statutory requirements for a general conservatorship of the person, that a general conservatorship of the person remains the least restrictive alternative for her protection, and that the co-conservators are serving the conservatee's best interests. Court intends to set an annual review date.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

18 PR12128 Guardianship of Addilyn Michelle Ann Powell, et al.

06/08/2022

Lauretta Carr

Pro Per

Robert Carr

Pro Per

Addilyn Michelle Ann Powell

Brooklyn Delilah Ann Powell

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

06/08/2022 Petition

File Tracking

07/27/2024 High Density

Related to PR11554 and PR11603.

No appearance is needed.

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

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

19 PR12283 Guardianship of Allison Nicole Gayle

05/22/2023

Nicole Camara

Pro Per

Allison Nicole Gayle

Pro Per

Cassandra Vigardt

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

05/22/2023 Petition

File Tracking

09/16/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR12284

Related to PR12284.

No appearance is needed.

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

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

20 PR11554 Guardianship of Elizabeth Powell et al.

05/14/2018

Lauretta Carr

Pro Per

Elizabeth Powell

Billy Turner

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

05/14/2018 Petition

File Tracking

07/27/2024 High Density

Other Cases

FL15090

PR11603

Related to PR12128 and PR11603.

No appearance is needed.

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

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

21 PR12606

Guardianship of Emanuel Cezar Ayala-Baxter

02/26/2025

James Michael Baxter

Pro Per

Linda Baxter

Pro Per

Emanuel Cezar Ayala-Baxter

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

02/26/2025 Petition

File Tracking

04/16/2025 High Density

Court investigator continuing to unwrap ward's residence and anomalies regarding his care.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5		July 10, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
22	PR12538	Guardianship of Gracelynn Harwell, et al.		10/14/2024
		Daniel Rutherford	Attorney: Jessie Castellano	
		Gracelynn Harwell		
		Aspen Rutherford		
		Otis Rutherford		
		Kathleen Rutherford	Attorney: Jessie Castellano	
		Jeena Eunice	Pro Per	
		Michael Rutherford	Pro Per	
		Hearing: Other		
		Trial Setting - Appoint Long Term Guardian/ Move Away		
10/14/2024	Petition		File Tracking 02/04/2025 High Density	
10/14/2024	Petition			

Court intends to delay trial setting briefly in order to appoint counsel for the children. The request by the parents to continue this hearing is moot.

Pursuant to Probate Code §1470(a), “the court may appoint private legal counsel for a ward if the court determines the person is not otherwise represented by legal counsel and that the appointment would be helpful to the resolution of the matter or is necessary to protect the person's interests.”

- Counsel is warranted here because this is (1) a petition to establish a permanent guardianship, (2) a petition to terminate a temporary guardianship, and (3) a petition to establish a foreign residence (§2352) of proposed wards. Simply stated, the upcoming trial – combining all three petitions – will be life-altering for these children, and they deserve to have an adult voice.

The fees incurred “shall be paid by the parents of the minor (or the minor’s estate). If a ward is furnished legal counsel for a guardianship proceeding, the court shall determine whether the parents are financially unable to pay all or a portion of the cost of counsel appointed pursuant to this section. Any portion of the cost of that counsel that the court finds the parents are unable to pay shall be paid by the county.” §1470(b), (c)(3).

Per CRC Rules Appendix E, the parents are eligible to shift the cost to the county if they receive public assistance, are within 125% of the federal poverty guideline, or lack disposable income beyond necessities of life. Court will inquire of objectors’ ability to cover private counsel costs for children.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

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

23	PR11603	Guardianship of Jason Lauren Powell	09/24/2018
----	---------	-------------------------------------	------------

Robert Carr	Pro Per
-------------	---------

Lauretta Carr	Pro Per
---------------	---------

Jason Lauren Powell

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

09/24/2018 Petition: Other

09/24/2018 Petition

Other Cases

FL15090

PR11554

File Tracking

07/27/2024 High Density

Related to PR12128 and PR11554.

No appearance is needed.

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

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

24 PR12603

Guardianship of Kensley France

02/25/2025

Linda France

Pro Per

Kyle Cox

Pro Per

Kensley France

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

02/25/2025 Petition

File Tracking

04/11/2025 High Density

Guardians are ordered to appear and give testimony which explains the inconsistent and incomplete answers provided in their GC-251 reports regarding this one ward.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

25 PR12717 Guardianship of Mia Ellyana Faith O'Connor

10/14/2025

Bonnie Ellen O'Connor Pro Per

Faith O'Connor Pro Per

Mia Ellyana Faith O'Connor Pro Per

Michelle O'Connor

Appoint Guardian

FURTHER

10/14/2025 Petition

10/14/2025 Petition

File Tracking

10/23/2025 High Density

Petition to terminate temporary guardianship.

Consider appointment of minor's counsel.

Home study of mother's current residence; order substance testing?

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

26 PR12284 Guardianship of Timothy Hickie

05/22/2023

Nicole Camara

Pro Per

Timothy Hickie

Pro Per

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

05/22/2023 Petition

File Tracking

09/16/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR12283

Related to PR12283.

No appearance is needed.

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

If guardian appeared, inquire re: adoption.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Consolidated Calendar

Commissioner Steven Streger

Department 5

July 10, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

27 PR12325 In The Matter John Landrum Martin III

09/19/2023

Melissa Hunter Martin

Attorney: James Cilley

John Landrum Martin

Accounting Hearing

FURTHER

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

12/18/2025 Petition

File Tracking

02/14/2025 From Court-Probate on Calendar

No appearance is needed.

The Court, having received and reviewed the accounting, intends to approve the accounting in all respects and to set an annual accounting date.