

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

1 PR12703

Estate of Dave Kamps aka David Kamps aka David John Kamps

09/22/2025

Diane J Pasma

Attorney: Eric Capron

David John Kamps

Determine Succ to Real Property

FURTHER

09/22/2025 Petition

File Tracking

09/24/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR12708

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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

No appearance is necessary.

This is the continued hearing on a probate avoidance by-pass petition to determine testate succession to a decedent's purported primary residence. Notice to all of the interested persons appears to be satisfied. See §§ 13151(b) and 13153. The legal basis for the putative succession (§13152(a)(4)) is by Last Will & Testament, and a review of the proffered instrument provides a satisfactory prima facie showing of validity and due execution for that will to be admissible (though a DE131 would be ideal). This Court will accept petitioner's sworn statement that "the described real property was the decedent's primary residence" (§13152(a)(3)) even though her statement technically fails to establish personal knowledge of that fact. The only unforgivable issue at the time was an absence of competent proof that the residence was "property of the decedent" at the time of his passing (§§ 13152(a)(3), 13154(b)(4)). Petitioner has since supplemented the petition with a noncertified title guarantee confirming vestiture in the decedent's sole name at the time of his passing (and henceforth). With this additional evidence, the petition is ready for approval. The order will be signed this date. Petitioner shall arrange for the certified copy as will be needed to effectively transfer title.

Petition granted.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

2 PR12439

Estate of Gerald Duane Campbell

03/27/2024

Jeffrey Campbell

Attorney: Carrie McKernan

Gerald Duane Campbell

Vickie L Campbell

Pro Per

Final Distribution Hearing

FURTHER

03/27/2024 Petition

File Tracking

01/30/2025 From Court-Probate on Calendar

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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Before the Court this day is the continued hearing on the final petition to close this intestate estate and approve the proposed distribution to four heirs with allowance of fees and costs. At the prior hearing, this Court addressed the missing supplemental DE-160 covering the \$100,000 inheritance, the tax implications for the proposed gift/assignment, and the proposed surcharge against Vicki for her early partial distribution (rather than a reduction in the gross estate). Based on counsel's candor, this Court continued the hearing to permit Vicki time to object. Since that hearing, counsel has filed a supplemental DE-160 and a supplement to the petition itself. Also occurring in the intervening weeks: Vicki filed an objection. The objection does not include a proof of service, so this Court will proceed as if petitioner's silence in the face of the objection is due to petitioner's ignorance of the objection rather than his acquiescence. This Court would appreciate a written response to the objection, which presents a prima facie basis for challenging the proposed surcharge.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

3 FL19312

Wynter Garcia vs. Lily HensleyNewquist

11/18/2025

Wynter Garcia

Pro Per

Lily HensleyNewquist

OSC Hearing - TRO/Domestic Violence

to trail PR12704

11/18/2025 Petition

File Tracking

11/21/2025 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.

This hearing is actually set for 10:00 a.m., not 8:30 a.m.

It is related to a pending petition to establish a guardianship.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

4 PR12607

In re: The Berchtold Living Trust

02/18/2025

Richard Berchtold

Attorney: Anthony Johnston

Dannie Berchtold

Petition Hearing

FURHTER - Full Report From Receiver

02/18/2025 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Before the Court this day is the continued hearing on a trust petition to compel reporting/accounting, and distribution, with possible surcharge against the "acting" trustee or suspension thereof. At issue is trust administration for the better part of a decade by one of two co-trustees, despite the statutory obligation that both must act (see §§ 15620 and 16402(b)). Petitioner is represented by counsel, and effectively abdicated his role as co-trustee to his brother. Respondent is self-represented and, in this Court's estimation, largely unqualified to perform the fiduciary management requirements of a trustee. This Court appointed a limited-purpose receiver to prepare an accounting and make recommendations for distributions and potential surcharge, if any. The Court is awaiting receipt of that report.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

5 PR12714

In Re: The Hauschildt 1994 Revocable Trust

10/09/2025

Jimmie Nixon

Attorney: Michael Germain

Petition Hearing - Other

PC17200

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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWVFsUT09>. [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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is petition for relief and instruction relating to a parent trust (the Hauschildt 1994 Revocable Trust) and a putative sub-trust created by amendment thereto (referred to as the “Horse-Around Ranch Trust”). This Court shall refer to the parent trust as “Family Trust” and the sub-trust as “Ranch Sub-Trust”. This Court just received a proposed stipulation from certain interested parties herein, purporting to resolve most of the issues presented in the petition for relief and instructions. While this Court is certainly grateful for any proposed resolution from the parties, and has considered the substance thereof, it is not clear to this Court that the proposed stipulation would bind every interested party – as noted hereinafter.

Up first is the need to fill the vacancy in the Family Trust. David was the sole successor trustee of the Family Trust, and passed away on 09/21/2025. The law provides that “if the trust instrument names the person to fill the vacancy, the vacancy shall be filled as provided in the trust instrument.” Probate Code §15660(b). In the original instrument, the settlors nominated Alvin, then Shari, then Wells Fargo Bank, the serve in the office of sole successor trustee. Nineteen (19) iterations later, the surviving settlor nominated David and Mark Olson to serve as co-trustees – with Eric Carlson serving as back-up. Although an argument can be made that Eric is only back-up to Mark (see Art. IV.A.), Para 5 reaffirms consistent provisions from the 18th Amendment, which had Eric serving as back-up for *either* of the co-trustees. Thus, it reasonably appears that the settlor generally intended the Family Trust to be administered by two whenever a professional was available. Have Mark Olson and Eric Carlson declined to serve? If so, “on petition of any interested person, the court may, in its discretion, appoint a trustee to fill the vacancy.” §15660(d). It is not clear whether Heather is an interested person (§48) if her sole interest was David’s life estate (it does not appear that the settlor intended to give Heather her own life estate since Laram had to survive *David* to inherit, not Heather). Who are the beneficiaries of the Family Trust, and why are they not seeking appointment?

As for the Ranch Sub-Trust, the settlor directed that the assets of the trust be utilized “as a museum for public viewing or as private assets for the private viewing of her family, for profit or not” in the trustee’s sole discretion. The assets could be invested, or sold, in the sole discretion of the trustee. Although the settlor did not clearly identify beneficiaries of the Ranch Sub-trust, she did provide that if the sub-trust was “unsustainable” that the assets could be sold and the proceeds distributed 1/3 to Alvin, 1/3 to David, and 1/3 to the grandchildren. The Family Trust did not instruct who should be the beneficiaries of the Ranch Sub-Trust, or how the trust res would be distributed (although Art. II.D. could be read as adopting intestacy for that sub-trust). Although the settlor has sufficiently described a reasonably ascertainable group of individuals intended to benefit from the Ranch Sub-Trust (see §15205 and *Reagh v. Kelley* (1970) 10 Cal.App.3d 1082, 1088), if the sub-trust fails, the assets therein simply get distributed via the amended Article II (which appears to have a very similar intended distribution).

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

6 PR12702 Conservatorship of Avery Jones

09/22/2025

Patrick Jones

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Melissa Jones

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Avery Jones

Appoint Conservator

FURTHER

09/22/2025 Petition

File Tracking

10/01/2025 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.

This is the continued hearing on a petition to establish a limited conservatorship over the person and estate of a young male by his parents, who seek additional authority to exert power over the "seven" areas of independence unique to limited conservatorships. The court investigator has already been appointed, and is preparing a report for the Court. At the prior hearing, this Court engaged the proposed conservatee with his statutory rights regarding the establishment of a conservatorship. The Court was unable to determine whether counsel was needed or could be waived, and trailed the issue to this date.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

7 PR7726

Conservatorship of Melissa R. Stone

03/20/1995

Michelle J. Stone

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Melissa R. Stone

Attorney: Carrie McKernan

Richard Stone

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Review Hearing

Accounting 17th

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

FURTHER

10/07/2022 Accounting: Other

File Tracking

12/10/2024 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=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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Annual Review: The Court, having received and reviewed the investigative report, intends to find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for many of her personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; (2) the conservatee is substantially unable to manage any of her finances or resist undue influence; and (3) a general conservatorship of the estate is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee’s protection, taking into consideration her abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. While a general conservatorship of the person may still be warranted, this Court would encourage the parties look for ways to graduate the conservatee to a limited conservatorship of the person. As the conservators, this Court has no reservations regarding their service over the person, but notes that their service over the estate is currently the subject of a pending objection and challenge. The Letters will be extended on an interim (six month basis).

Accounting Issue: 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) on behalf of the conservatee, with additional questions presumably posed to the conservators. 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 ordinary services. See CRC 7.756. Parties have requested time to resolve the accounting concern, but mechanics of resolution must be addressed or the objection will need to be ruled upon via the summary process.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

8 PR12276

Conservatorship of Tyler Wine

05/10/2023

Sylvia Wine

Pro Per

Tyler Wine

Pro Per

Raymond G. Wine

Pro Per

Review Hearing - Investigator Report - PR Code 1850

05/10/2023 Petition

File Tracking

12/27/2024 From Court Legal Document 5

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=NTRMT0NwMDg5cniYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09. [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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Annual Review: This is a limited conservatorship over the person of a young man who was previously the subject of a contested proceeding. Following an evidentiary hearing in which both parents pursued competing petitions, this Court issued a written ruling granting mother's petition with §2351.5 powers, but preserving father's authority to have visits with the conservatee. This solution has apparently worked well for the family. This is the first full annual review. Although the investigative report is not yet on file for review, this Court will likely find by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the conservatee is unable to provide properly for many of his personal needs for physical health, food, clothing, or shelter; and (2) a limited conservatorship with additional powers is the least restrictive alternative needed for the conservatee's protection, taking into consideration his abilities and capacities with current and possible supports. An annual review would be warranted.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

9 PR12736 Conservatorship of: Larry Richard Barr

12/03/2025

Larry Kevin Barr

Pro Per

Petition Hearing - Temporary Conservatorship

12/03/2025 Petition

File Tracking

12/04/2025 LP Labels Needed

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 establish a temporary (and eventual permanent) conservatorship over the person and estate of an elderly individual who apparently now resides in Nevada. Given the size of the estate, and the tenor/tone of the family messages attached to the petition, it would appear to this Court that conflict will permeate. To reduce acrimony as much as possible, it is best to start on a perfect foundation: the petition has a number of imperfections.

First, the petition identifies a co-equal kin that will likely not consent to petitioner's nomination of himself to serve as conservator. See Probate Code §1811(a).

Second, notice of the hearing must be provided to those persons identified in the petition, and there is no proof of such notice in the court file. See Probate Code §§ 1260, 1822.

Third, both the petition and the citation must be properly served upon the proposed conservatee at least 15 days before the hearing, and there is no proof of that in the court file. See Probate Code §§ 1260, 1824.

Fourth, this court only has jurisdiction (1) if California is the proposed conservatee's home state, (2) if California is a "significant-connection state" and the proposed conservatee does not have a home state, or (3) if California is a "significant-connection state" and the proposed conservatee's home state has expressly declined to exercise jurisdiction. Probate Code §1993. When did the proposed conservatee move to Nevada, and is there substantial evidence concerning the proposed conservatee still here in California? Has anyone filed for conservatorship in Nevada?

Fifth, petitioner is seeking permission to control the proposed conservatee's medical decision-making and care, but to do so the petition must include a capacity declaration. Probate Code §1890(c).

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

10 PR11471

Guardianship of Aleaya Ocanas, et al.

08/15/2017

Nancy Rogerson

Pro Per

Aleaya Ocanas

Destany Ocanas

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

08/15/2017 Petition: Other

08/15/2017 Petition

File Tracking

01/03/2025 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is a guardianship involving two minor children. Pursuant to Probate Code §1513.2(a), every year the guardian shall complete and return to the court a status report (GC-251). The court clerk is required to provide a reminder to the guardian, along with a blank GC-251, which did occur herein on 10/15/2025. There is no report on file, which requires an appearance by the guardian.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

11 PR12170

Guardianship of Andrew Hiller

09/22/2022

Anthony Sampson

Pro Per

Andrew Hiller

Pro Per

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

09/22/2022 Petition

File Tracking

02/03/2024 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=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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

No appearance is necessary.

The Court, having received and reviewed the GC-251 with attachments, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianship remains necessary/convenient and that the guardian continues to serve the ward’s best interests. Court will set the annual review date.

Clerk’s office will provide notice.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

12 PR12704

Guardianship of Clemintine Lynn Garcia

09/23/2025

Wynter Garcia

Pro Per

Clementine Lynn Garcia

Bernard Garcia

Pro Per

Appoint Guardian

Long Term

09/23/2025 Petition

09/23/2025 Petition

File Tracking

09/30/2025 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is the continued hearing on a petition to establish a guardianship over a newborn, filed by the paternal grandparents after receiving a short-term Family Safety Plan from Calaveras County CWS. Father consents to guardianship; Mother does not. Testimony was taken on 10/03/2025 from representative with Calaveras County CWS and Social Services regarding the alleged mistreatment by Mother. In order to avoid Calaveras initiating a §300 petition, the decision was made to establish the interim guardianship with the Family Safety Plan as the backdrop, and to complete a full investigation here. Court investigator has been appointed and report is anticipated soon.

Related to FL19312.

On 11/18/2025, paternal grandmother (guardian 1) filed a DVRO against Mother "due to mother being aggressive, making threats to kill people in our home, making threats to take [the child] and run." Full DV-TRO granted as to petitioner and all members of household – including the ward. Evidentiary hearing was continued pending resolution of guardianship petition. DV-116 continued to this date.

Court will need to conduct hearing, send back to Dept 2 or DV-116 with return to Dept 2.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

13 PR10715

Guardianship of Connor Jacob Stacy

05/06/2011

Carole Kohler-Crowe

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Cheryl Kohler-Crowe

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Connor Jacob Stacy

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

05/06/2011 Petition

File Tracking

01/03/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR10759

FL12717

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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is a guardianship involving one minor child (though part of a much larger probate family). Pursuant to Probate Code §1513.2(a), every year the guardian shall complete and return to the court a status report (GC-251). The court clerk is required to provide a reminder to the guardian, along with a blank GC-251, which did occur herein on 10/15/2025. There is no report on file, which requires an appearance by the guardian.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

14 PR12445

Guardianship of Haliann Vazquez, et. al.

04/08/2024

Trudy Reynosa

Pro Per

Haliann Vazquez

Izabel Vazquez

Joe Reynosa

Pro Per

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

FURTHER

04/08/2024 Petition

File Tracking

08/06/2024 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=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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is a guardianship involving co-guardians and two minor children. Pursuant to Probate Code §1513.2(a), every year the guardian shall complete and return to the court a status report (GC-251). The court clerk is required to provide a reminder to the guardian, along with a blank GC-251, which did occur herein on 06/03/2025. There is no report on file, which requires an appearance by the guardian. The guardians missed one hearing due to a medical issue, but to date have not complied with no explanation provided to this Court. Pursuant to §1513.2(a), "if the court is unable to obtain this information within 30 days after the date the status report is due, the court shall either order the guardian to make himself or herself available to the investigator for purposes of investigation of the guardianship, or to show cause why the guardian should not be removed." Pursuant to §1513.1(a), "the court may order reimbursement to the court or to the county in the amount of the assessment, unless the court finds that all or any part of the assessment would impose a hardship on the ward or the ward's estate." In other words, investigative costs may be payable by the parents if compliance is not forthcoming.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

15 PR12699

Guardianship Of Ivy Rose Griffin, et. al

09/17/2025

Rosemary Griffin

Pro Per

Appoint Guardian

Long Term

09/17/2025 Petition

File Tracking

09/19/2025 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is the continued hearing on the maternal grandmother’s petition to establish a guardianship for two young children – with the consent of the biological mother. According to petitioner, the proposed wards have been residing with her for two months, and that the biological father is presently unfit to parent. The court investigator has been appointed, and is working her way through the backgrounds. Biological father objects to the guardianship. Father lives in Alameda County. Maternal grandmother resides in Groveland with children. Father apparently has full legal and full physical custody of children via a custody case in Alameda County – which this Court has requested Father provide copies of. Petitioner informs the Court that a CPS worker in Alameda County instructed her to apply for guardianship here in Tuolumne County. Jurisdiction to be decided. Still awaiting court investigator report.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

16 PR11221

Guardianship of Kayleigh R. James, et al

08/28/2015

Troy Stanley

Pro Per

Jennifer Powers

Pro Per

Kayleigh R James

Aubrey A Willis

Michael James

Pro Per

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

08/28/2015 Petition: Other

08/28/2015 Petition

File Tracking

12/12/2023 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

No appearance is necessary.

The Court, having received and reviewed the GC-251 with attachments for both wards, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianship remains necessary/convenient and that the guardians continue to serve the wards' best interests. Court will set the annual review date.

Clerk's office will provide notice.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

17 PR12730 Guardianship of Kendra Lynn Taylor

11/07/2025

Tina Terradista Pro Per

Kendra Lynn Taylor Pro Per

Appoint Guardian

FURTHER

11/07/2025 Petition

File Tracking

11/14/2025 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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

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. Petitioner advised at the prior hearing that she has had trouble giving the required notice. Petitioner advises that there was a prior guardianship (PR11259), which is still active and has a review date set for 03/20/2026. The appropriate process here is to have PR12730 dismissed and to treat the new petition as a petition to substitute in as successor guardian following a vacancy in that position pursuant to Probate Code §2670. Although a nonrelative guardianship has additional requirements (see §1541), the Department of Social Services has yet to complete an investigation in this case and the court's own investigator is more than capable of handling a succession guardian application.

All filings in PR12730 shall be transferred over to PR11259. PR12730 shall be dismissed. All future filings shall bear the case number PR11259.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

18 PR11482 Guardianship of Reanna McLoughlin and Griffin McLoughlin 09/12/2017

Reanna Lillie McLoughlin

Griffin Wayne McLoughlin

Alicia Marie Henderson Attorney: Danny Cochetas

Randolph Clinton Henderson Attorney: Danny Cochetas

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

09/12/2017 Petition: Other

09/12/2017 Petition

File Tracking

11/19/2024 Civil Calendar

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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

No appearance is necessary.

The Court, having received and reviewed the GC-251 with attachments for both wards, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the guardianship remains necessary/convenient and that the guardians continue to serve the wards' best interests. Court will set the annual review date.

Clerk's office will provide notice.

P.S. The wards have achieved some fairly stellar academic marks. The Court looks forward to their final guardianship hearing next year before aging out.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

19 PR10759

Guardianship of Sarah J. Kohler-Crowe

09/13/2011

Carole Kohler-Crowe

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Cheryl Kohler-Crowe

Attorney: Jennifer Lothert

Sarah Jane Kohler-Crowe

Review Hearing - Guardian Rept-Probate Code 1513.2

12/11/2013 Petition: Other

File Tracking

01/03/2025 High Density

Other Cases

PR10715

FL12716

CV58922

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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

This is a guardianship involving one minor child (though part of a much larger probate family). Pursuant to Probate Code §1513.2(a), every year the guardian shall complete and return to the court a status report (GC-251). The court clerk is required to provide a reminder to the guardian, along with a blank GC-251, which did occur herein on 10/15/2025. There is no report on file, which requires an appearance by the guardian.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

1:30 pm

DA Case #

Date Filed

21 FL18879

Austin Frederick and Nariah Frederick

12/16/2024

Austin Frederick

Attorney: Hal Channell

Nariah Frederick

Pro Per

Hearing: Other - Sever/Bifurcate

Dissolution /Judgment

12/16/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

09/02/2025 High Density

Other Cases

FL18856

Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." All participants may appear via Zoom: <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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

On 11/26/2024, Mother filed a DVRO in the related action (FL18856). Mother called the police that evening and secured an EPO. The DV-TRO was granted, and included protection for the minor child they share. The DV-140 itself was left blank.

On 12/16/2024, Father filed a petition to dissolve their very brief (22 month) marriage. The child was conceived prior, but born within, wedlock. Father works in pest control, earning \$4,160/month. Mother works only part-time at Columbia College as a student teacher.

On 03/13/2025, the Court (JHGC) awarded Father facetime with the minor child every Mon/Fri at 5pm not to exceed 15 min (the child is not yet 2 yrs old). Father failed to appear for the scheduled mediation. That same day, Father pled guilty in CRF76084 to a reduced 273.5.

On 03/28/2025, the Court (JHGC) awarded Father supervised 2-hr blocks of time with the child, up to 3x/week.

On 05/12/2025, the parties appeared in department 2 for a two-day trial on the DVRO and related visitation concerns. Following the trial, Mother was awarded a 5-year DVRO (no contact, stay away) with a complete DV-140, giving her sole legal and sole physical custody of the minor child. Father was given supervised visits "as can be arranged."

Order from 08/06/2025 suggests that custody and visitation were not intended to be permanent orders, but the DV-140 did not include any carve-outs for parenting time.

Parties to advise what remains of the case and how best this Department can assist in getting the parties over the finish line.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

1:30 pm

DA Case #

Date Filed

22 FL18515

Teresa Garduno Ramirez vs. Fernando Medrano-Tinoco

03/28/2024

Teresa Garduno Ramirez

Pro Per

Fernando Medrano-Tinoco

Review Hearing

Special Set - Resp. Schedule

03/28/2024 Petition

File Tracking

03/29/2024 High Density

Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." All participants may appear via Zoom: <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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Review hearing to determine if visits have gone well based on stipulated agreement.

Mother's RFO to change the agreement, filed the same day agreement was reached, was dropped after she failed to appear at the last hearing.

Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne

Probate Notes

Steven S. Streger, Probate Commissioner

Department 5

December 19, 2025

1:30 pm

DA Case #

Date Filed

23 CV67204

Wayne Russo vs. Robert Patrick et al

04/25/2025

Wayne Russo

Pro Per

Robert Patrick

Mary Helus

Default Hearing

Prove-Up

04/25/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/09/2025 High Density

Parties and counsel are expected to appear for the hearings unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." All participants may appear via Zoom: <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.

Commissioner already serving as Judge for all purposes.

Court was expecting new default prove-up package in light of plaintiff's election to file first amended complaint after taking defendant's earlier default. There is nothing on file.