

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

8:30 a.m.

1. **Estate of Erickson (PR12721).** No appearance is necessary. This is the initial hearing on a father's petition for Letters of Administration to manage his son's intestate estate. Notice and publication have been accomplished, as have nominations, bond waivers, and acceptance of duties. The Court intends to grant the petition, sign the Order, issue the Letters (once received), and set §§ 8800/1220 review dates.
2. **Estate of Pomeroy (PR12644).** No appearance is necessary. This was to be the scheduled §8800 review hearing, but a final I&A is already on file.
3. **Estate of Durbin (PR12647).** For the most part this petition for final distribution is acceptable. However, two items need clarification. First, the petition indicates \$288,188.25 (all liquid) as the fee basis, but only \$72,589.79 being distributed to the sole beneficiary. Presumably there was a sizable encumbrance on the residence when sold, but that is not mentioned. Even though petitioner has waived the accounting, §10954(c) requires petitioner to explain "the basis for determining the amounts" payable for compensation and CRC 7.550(b) still requires petitioner to provide "information as to assets on hand" – meaning an explanation as to why the amount is not immediately understandable is still required. Most practitioners include the seller's closing statement as an exhibit, connect the basic dots. Second, there is a potential defect with the "assignment" from Cheryl. According to the Will, she is entitled to an equal share of all residuary tangible personal property – both that is inside, and outside, the primary residence (see Art. III.D. and Art. IV.A.). Her "assignment" (which is in actuality a disclaimer) is limited to "the contents of the real property" – which addresses only Art. IV.A. Although the I&A permits an inference that the estate does not hold any personal property that would qualify under Art. III.D., it is not immediately clear to this Court whether Cheryl has disclaimed *everything* as stated in Para 23.
4. **Estate of Fuego (PR12715).** 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). 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

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

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. A scintilla of evidence should be included to permit at least a basic finding.

Next, there is a possible concern regarding notice. Pursuant to §8110, direct notice must be provided to (1) each intestate heir of the decedent, (2) each person designated in the will to receive something, and (3) anyone ever nominated to serve as executor. Assuming petitioner handled the heir portion correctly, people mentioned in the will include Guenter (deceased), Tamara (deceased), Serge (deceased), Markus, Giovanni, "the children", "the grandchildren", "nieces in France", "nieces in England", Interfaith, Thierry, Tuolumne Memorial Museum, Visiting Nurses, and Columbia Monuments (though this last one is questionable). Since the dispositive directions in the will leave much discretion to the personal representative, it is critical to over-include. See Probate Code §1202.

Finally, there is 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 is absolutely required.

5. **Estate of Belletto (PR12514).** This is the §12200 review hearing. The Court file does not contain a petition for final distribution or a status report seeking additional time for administration. Counsel to advise.
6. **Estate of Burman (PR12470).** This probate action was released into the wild on 05/15/2024. Pursuant to Probate Code §§ 12200-12201, petitioner had twelve (12) months from then to file a petition for final distribution or a status report explaining the condition of the estate, the reasons why the estate cannot be distributed and closed, and an estimate of the time needed to close administration of the estate. For those needing to file a status report, this Court has created a very fine local form (TUO-PR-125) to ease the effort. A review of the court file reveals a glaring absence of either the final petition or a status report – for now the second time. Given the modest size of this estate, further delays may expose counsel to a §12205 fee reduction.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

7. Estate of Higgins (PR12328). This is a petition for final distribution. Counsel will need to clarify how both of the FTB creditor claims were resolved. While the claims were “withdrawn” by the creditor, the notice of withdrawal indicates that the claims were “satisfied” which permits an inference that the estate paid them. A simple supplement will suffice. The larger issue, which petitioner is no doubt aware of but declined to highlight, is the cumbersome obligation of funding a trust for petitioner’s sole benefit. Per the will, petitioner is entitled to:

- Education costs plus \$25,000 in living expenses for 2023, 2024 and 2025, 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 \$75,000 plus “education costs” in the form of statutory legal fees owing to Attorney Song, for a grant total of nearly \$90,000.
- One-third of the balance of the inheritance upon reaching the age of 25, which she states has already occurred. Allow it is a little tricky to follow the accounting provided in the petition, it appears to this Court that the net value of this estate – after accounting for petitioner’s \$90,000 (*supra*) and statutory fees and costs – is roughly \$420,000. That means petitioner is currently entitled to another \$140,000, giving petitioner a *current* entitlement of \$230,000.
- The remainder of the inheritance after petitioner reaches the age of 30, via a testamentary trust, established *by the executor of the will* for the petitioner’s sole benefit. 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,

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

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.”

Whatever motivated decedent to insert provisions for delayed distribution to his daughter, those concerns are not sufficient to create what amounts to a restraint on alienation. This estate has zero liquidity, and only the trustee has the authority to sell trust assets to pay petitioner the \$230,000 she is already owed. In addition, Attorney Song is also presently owed money. 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.

8. **Estate of Bain (PR12032).** No appearance is necessary – but should petitioner elect to appear via Zoom, this Court would simply like to say “Hallelujah.” This seemingly-innocuous intestacy action, with only one notable asset, was released in to the wild on 02/04/2022. It was quickly followed by years of civil litigation (CVL64760, CV64737), and a year of market stagnation, until the property was finally sold. The petition is acceptable in all respects, and the Court intends to grant the petition in whole.
9. **In re Purdue Revocable Trust (PR12722).** Before the Court this day is a petition to declare a one-half interest in APN 021-030-005-000 an asset of the Marcia M. Purdue 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

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

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." It is not clear to this Court that the joint tenancy was effectively severed. See §683.2(c)(1) and (2). It matters because (1) the trust may be entitled to the whole of APN 021-030-005-000, not just 50%, and (2) if there is a joint tenancy, the sole beneficiaries are Mark and Matthew, whereas if not the sole beneficiaries are Ryan and Patrick. While this Court has no problem transferring some/all of APN 021-030-005-000, the amount transferred may be viewed as a determination of the related question about the effect of the severance, so that question will need to be answered definitively first (unless the four interested parties can agree).

10. **Claim of H.G. (PR12729).** This is a petition to approve a proposed compromise of a minor's personal injury claim release and settlement. The underlying incident involved a broken femur sustained at a martial arts studio, followed by two additional lower limb fractures during the therapeutic recovery process. 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). Petitioner has standing. As for the merits, 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. Petitioner has elected to sue only the individual responsible for the original injury at the martial arts studio, and not cast blame on the physical therapy provider for allowing the child to fall riding a stationary bike three weeks post-ORIF. The defendant here, another child, is covered by his parents' homeowners policy with Coverage E limits of \$300,000. The petition does not provide enough facts vis-à-vis liability to permit this Court to perform an independent assessment regarding the degree of liability, but the nature of the injuries sustained by the plaintiff and the risk of future impediments puts this close in the high range of \$750,000. It is entirely possible that liability issues may exist, and it may also be that counsel decided the parents do not have sufficient assets to go outside the policy limited, but it would have been helpful for some discussion of these to be included so this Court would know the issues were at least considered. Nevertheless, all things being equal, a policy limits settlement with a small percentage carved out for a parent to cover expenses is reasonable.
11. **In re McCune Living Trust (PR12718).** No appearance is necessary. Petitioner's ex parte application for a continuance is granted. The hearing is reset to 01/30/2026 at 8:30 a.m.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

- 12. In re Coelho Living Trust (PR12719).** This is a petition to claw-back funds distributed to beneficiaries, allegedly in error. The math error stems from the sale of 130 acres in Hilmar, California, owned in part by the trust (having one defined set of beneficiaries) and in part by an LLC (with a similar, but not identical, set of members). According to the trustee, the trust beneficiaries received a little too much money because the escrow folks did not catch the fact that the trust's 35% only attached to 58% of the 130 acres (ie, APN 045-091-017, not 045-091-017 + 045-091-018). In other words, the LLC members should have received a larger slice of the pie. The only person deeply impacted by this math error are Allison and Natalie (Dom's kids), because they were only trust beneficiaries and *not* LLC members. Alan – who is being asked to refund \$1,914.06 – filed objections to the petition, as well as his own petition accusing the acting trustee (Veronica) of mismanagement and conflicts of interest in the manner in which she administered the trust. The petitions were originally filed in Merced County, even though it appears that a significant part of the trust administration was taking place here in Tuolumne County. The action has since been transferred here.

The petition taking issue with Veronica's handling of the sale of the 130-acre property is apparently the subject of civil litigation in Stanislaus County (CV-24-005236). That seems odd. It is either a issue with trust administration, or it is a civil dispute outside the trust arena. The petition also accuses Veronica of a breach of trust for having failed in basic math, but the remedy for that is not nothing; instead, the remedy is to determine if relief is warranted, and if Veronica should be surcharged the legal fees associated with correcting the error. After all, even if the escrow people messed up, "the trustee is liable to the beneficiary for an act or omission of an agent employed by the trustee in the administration of the trust that would be a breach of the trust if committed by the trustee where the trustee delegates to the agent the authority to perform an act that the trustee is under a duty not to delegate [and] where the trustee does not periodically review the agent's overall performance." §16401(b). Distribution amounts are solely within the trustee's duty to ascertain, not outside escrow people. Was there a Notice of Proposed Action covering the amounts of the preliminary distribution?

Parties will be invited to address the Court regarding (1) the scope of discovery needed to ready both petitions for resolution, (2) whether one or both petitions can be resolved using the Probate summary procedures (§§ 1022, 1046, 9620) or if live witness testimony is needed, and (3) how much administration remains to be completed for this trust to be closed.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

- 13. Estate of Nichols (PR12016).** This is a petition for final distribution which too has been active for several years. The end is quite welcome. The petition is as complex as the proceedings leading hereto, but for the most part will pass muster. There are only a few items to discuss. First, the basis for statutory fees is not \$717,376.15. That was the number in the I&A when the estate included, among other items, a one-half interest in a Kubota tractor (\$9,750.00), APN 058-080-009-530 (\$219,000.00), and a one-third interest in APN 058-060-001-000 (value unclear but perhaps in the range of \$120,000.00). At the end of the day, the estate *lost* all three of these assets, but “gained” its independent interest in the new version of APN 058-080-009-000, which petitioner estimates (without a probate referee appraisal) to be valued at \$455,000.00. Petitioner will need to file an updated I&A; the claim that one is not needed (see Para 13) is simply erroneous. Second, with regard to the request for extraordinary fees, there is no question in this Court’s mind that extraordinary effort was made to save the home and create a settlement agreement involving a lot line adjustment, and that counsel’s hourly rate (\$400) is reasonable in this market for that kind of work. However, since \$400/hr is on the high side for this community, one would expect very efficient services – and some billing statement entries suggest perhaps a bit more urgency was warranted. For example: three hours for an ex parte application to approve the settlement, where a Stip/Order would have sufficed; almost nine hours on the settlement agreement; and four hours for the settlement proposal letter. With an appropriate haircut, this Court can get behind \$14,000 in fees.

10:00 a.m.

- 14. Marriage of Anderson (FL12701).** See # 31.
- 15. Conservatorship of AJ Crowe (PR9778).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator’s report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for his personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee’s protection, taking into consideration his abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Court intends to set for annual review.
- 16. Conservatorship of AR Kohler-Crowe (PR10381).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator’s report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for her personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee’s protection, taking into consideration her abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Court intends to set for annual review.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

17. **Conservatorship of BM Kohler-Crowe (PR9006).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator's report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for her personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; (2) the conservatee is substantially unable to manage her finances or resist undue influence; and (3) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee's protection, taking into consideration her abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Court intends to set for annual review.
18. **Conservatorship of JA Kohler-Crowe (PR9964).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator's report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for his personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee's protection, taking into consideration his abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Court intends to set for annual review.
19. **Conservatorship of Harris (PR11200).** The Court is awaiting an updated 1850 report, but anticipates graduating the conservatee to a limited conservatorship at this time and a possible transfer to the county of her current residence.
20. **Conservatorship of J Kohler-Crowe (PR10654).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator's report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for his personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee's protection, taking into consideration his abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Although this conservatee is residing outside the extended family residence, the conservator is acting in the conservatee's best interests with his current placement. Court intends to set for annual review.
21. **Conservatorship of KC Kohler-Crowe (PR11454).** The Court, having received and reviewed the court investigator's report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for his personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a general conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee's protection, taking into consideration his abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. Although this conservatee is residing outside the extended family residence, the conservator is acting in the conservatee's best interests with his current placement. Court intends to set for annual review.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

22. **Conservatorship of Stone (PR7726).** This is a conservatorship of long-standing here in the community, in which annual accountings have generally been approved without much scrutiny. On 04/22/2025, the co-conservators submitted their 17th annual accounting for approval. It came the attention of this Court that the annuity income stream has changed, necessitating a hard look at the fiduciary fees, conservator stipends, conservatee charge-offs, and the like. As warranted by statute, this Court appointed counsel for the conservatee to review the accounting in more detail. Appointed counsel has since filed an objection to the accounting (§2622), with additional questions presumably posed to the conservators. Do the conservators intend to file a response/opposition to the objections (§2622.5(b))? Since the 16th accounting ran through 06/30/2022, and the Court approved monthly fees through 01/09/2023, this Court intends to consider the objection reserved through 01/10/2023. It is further noted that §2623 only allows “such compensation for services rendered by the conservator as the court determines is just, reasonable, and in the best interest of the conservatee,” and that family is usually not compensated for such services. For a list of standards to consider, see CRC 7.756. Parties to address mechanics of resolution.
23. **Guardianship of Miller (PR10760).** No appearance is necessary. The Court, have received and reviewed the GC-251 reports with attachments, intends to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianships remain necessary/convenient and that the guardian is continuing to serve the best interests of the wards. Court intends to set annual review date in early May of 2026 to align with the termination by operation of law.
24. **Guardianship of Rivera (PR11862).** Trial setting re: parental termination in favor of guardian adoption. Closed proceeding. Based on the pre-trial briefing, it appears that the sole basis for the petition to terminate Father’s parental rights is Family Code §7822(a)(3) and (b): “One parent has left the child in the care and custody of the other parent for a period of one year without any provision for the child’s support, or without communication from the parent, with the intent on the part of the parent to abandon the child.” “A finding pursuant to this chapter shall be supported by clear and convincing evidence.” Family Code §7821. See *Conservatorship of O.B.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 989, 1005; *In re Baby Girl M.* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 1528, 1535-1536. Do the parties wish to waive the appointment of a guardian ad litem for the child under Family Code §7804? Do the parties wish to waive the re-appointment of a court investigator upon the petition under Family Code §7850, which would include to right to have a recommendation therein per Family Code §7851? Are petitioners prepared to cover Family Code §7851.5 investigative fee? Do the parties waive time in terms of the trial precedence, which is generally 45 days from when the opposition to the petition is received per Family Code §7870. Per §7890, all children should be interviewed, and children over the age of 10 must be heard in termination proceedings. Minor’s counsel shall advise how testimony will be received. See §7892 and CRC 5.250.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

25. **Guardianship of Smith (PR12161).** No appearance is necessary. The Court, have received and reviewed the GC-251 reports with attachments, intends to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianships remain necessary/convenient and that the guardian is continuing to serve the best interests of the wards. Court intends to set annual review date.
26. **Guardianship of Gonzalez et al (PR12541).** Extended temporary guardianship for paternal grandmother awaiting report from investigator regarding bio father's stability.
27. **Guardianship of Gevock (PR12664).** Due to the absence of participation from the parents, Court must await investigative report before requiring the minor child to relocate from Lathrop (see Family Code §3041).
28. **Guardianship of Klaverweiden (PR11791).** This is a petition for approval of legal fees incurred by counsel for the guardian in preparing accountings and various other items. Pursuant to Probate Code §2642, "an attorney who has rendered legal services to the guardian may petition the court for an order fixing and allowing compensation for such services rendered to that time. Upon the hearing, the court shall make an order allowing such compensation as the court determines reasonable to the attorney for services rendered to the guardian [and] the compensation so allowed shall thereupon be charged against the estate." Pursuant to TCSC Local Rule 6.18.0.d: "the Court will evaluate the services as a whole rather than designate part of the services as 'ordinary' and part of the services as 'extraordinary.'" In this instance, the guardianship estate contains roughly \$58,000, and the lawyers would like \$14,340.00 for services to date. At first this seems rather high, but given that it covers work from 2019 to present day, it really only comes to \$2,400/yr (give or take). Since the account grew by \$10,000 last year, the cost of doing business is more than offset by the prudent investment. The fees are approved.
29. **Guardianship of Taylor (PR12730).** This is a petition to establish a guardianship, filed by a family friend. There is no proof of having given notice to either biological parent, or any family member within the second degree. The ward's maternal grandparents are reportedly deceased, but no word on the paternal grandparents or on the ward's adult siblings. Social Services was appointed to perform the mandated investigation.
30. **Guardianship of Stevens (PR11478).** Court is awaiting the annual report from the guardians.
31. **Guardianship of Anderson (PR12690).** Discuss investigative report with parties.

Department 5 Probate Notes for Friday, December 5, 2025

Probate Notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are still expected to appear for the hearings unless the Probate Note specifies otherwise. Unless indicated otherwise, all parties and counsel are authorized to appear via Zoom 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 so stating clearly at the outset of the first hearing in the case. By participating in the 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 entirety of the case. See CRC 2.816.

- 32. In re Baby A.S.T-S (PR12735).** This is a petition to establish the time and place of birth. The petition is incomplete as the referenced declarations and medical records are not in fact attached to the petition or supporting declaration. The matter will need to be continued for the paperwork to be on file.
- 33. In re Hauschildt Revocable Trust (PR12714).** This is a petition to fill a vacancy in the office of trustee, and to give instructions regarding a number of different administrative tasks associated with the subject trust. Due to the press of business, the volume of material to digest, and the number of different requests included within the single petition, the hearing hereon will be continued to 12/19/2025 at 8:30 a.m.

1:30 p.m.

- 34. Petition of Michael W (CV67356).** Nonconfidential petition to change last name; publication complete; voir dire.
- 35. Petition of Sarah C (CV67635).** Nonconfidential petition to change last name; no proof of publication; voir dire premature.
- 36. Petition of Ashley G (CV67720).** Nonconfidential petition to change last name; publication complete; voir dire.
- 37. Petition of John M. (CV67731).** Nonconfidential petition to change last name; publication complete; voir dire.
- 38. Marriage of Smith (FL13935).** Trial on spousal support reduction off-calendar.
- 39. Petition of Amber S. (CV67277).** Nonconfidential petition to change last name of minor child; no consent from one parent; best interests analysis required; publication complete; voir dire.