

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

3 CV66368	Andrew Campana vs. Granite Construction, Inc. et al	08/20/2024
	Andrew Campana	Attorney: Tomas Ross
	Granite Construction, Inc.	Attorney: Ross Lampe
	Granite Construction, Inc.	Attorney: Justin Muro
	Granite Construction Supply	Attorney: Ross Lampe
	Granite Construction Supply	Attorney: Justin Muro
	Tyler Ryan Creason	Attorney: Annalisa Zulueta
	Tyler Ryan Creason	Attorney: Mizeille Avina
	Motion Hearing - Summary Adjudication	
	re: Respondent Superior	
	Trial Setting	

08/20/2024 Complaint

File Tracking 08/11/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: [https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.[Passcode: 123456]). All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a personal injury action stemming from a notable automobile accident near Summerville High School. While this Court retains the negligent entrustment cause of action under submission, the parties are here to argue the theory of liability tethered to respondeat superior.

- I. Does everyone agree that this accident was sufficiently off-the-clock to trigger the general “going and coming” exception to vicarious liability?
- II. Assuming the answer is yes:
 - Was use of the vehicle subject to the *required vehicle* exception to the exception because the employee was required to bring that particular vehicle to the job site?
 - Was use of the vehicle subject to the *incidental benefit* exception to the exception because there was a quantifiable benefit to the employer in having this particular employee driving this particular vehicle?
 - Was use of the vehicle subject to the *special errand* exception to the exception because he was doing something specific at the express behest of the employer?

Does the new decision in Chang v. So Cal Permanente Group (2026 WL 1145986) impact this case since one could argue the employee was “hybrid” under the circumstances?

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

6 CV65594 Darren Dolbeare vs. Charles McMahon 09/25/2023

Darren Dolbeare

Attorney: Lilian Sedaghat

Charles McMahon

Case Management Conference

Final - Zoom Approved.

09/25/2023 Complaint

File Tracking

07/11/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: [https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnYdzZ6VnBXWVFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnYdzZ6VnBXWVFsUT09.[Passcode: 123456]). All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a personal injury action stemming from an automobile accident that occurred on Tuolumne Road on 09/24/2021. A lawsuit was filed, but little has occurred since then. The following represents the salient timeline of events:

- 09/25/2023: Lawsuit ostensibly filed (pleading not signed)
- 12/29/2023: Plaintiff/counsel fail to appear at CMC
- 02/06/2024: Counsel files declaration falling on sword and explaining that error was result of abrupt departure from firm of handling attorney; advises that a skip trace and service effort is out;
- 08/05/2024: Counsel files a motion to withdraw. Motion was denied for both procedural and substantive defects.
- 11/08/2024: Court sets OSC to strike the complaint, sura sponte, for failing to affix a required signature;
- 12/13/2024: Counsel fails to appear for OSC to strike complaint; second hearing is scheduled;
- 01/29/2025: Counsel files declaration attributing scheduling error to departure of attorney one year prior (despite recent appearances by other attorney in firm);
- 05/01/2025: Plaintiff/counsel file application for service via publication; application is denied for want of due diligence and exhaustion of other options;
- 07/28/2025: Counsel files second motion to withdraw, containing many of the same procedural and substantive defects. Hearing continued;
- 12/23/2025: Plaintiff/counsel file second application for service via publication; application is denied as Union Democrat not a paper likely to provide actual notice to defendant in South Dakota;
- 01/06/2026: Counsel files proof of service reflecting personal service upon defendant at a location in South Dakota.

Despite routine concessions made by this Court to give counsel the grace counsel sought, this case is nearing the three-year mark with nothing more than an imperfect proof of service. Counsel has now filed another motion to withdraw, set for June 3. This Court will likely grant that request, but notes that a dismissal of the entire case is on the horizon.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

7 CV67220

Michelle Johnson vs. Robert White et al

05/02/2025

Michelle Johnson

Attorney: John Montevideo

Robert White

Paradise Shores, LLC

Attorney: David Casady

Motion Hearing - Compel Answers to Interrogatories

Motion Reserved by Plaintiff 619 984 4232 TK

Motion Hearing - Compel

requests for admission

Motion Hearing - Compel

for production of documents

Motion Hearing - Compel

responses to special interrogatories

05/02/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/09/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: [https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.[Passcode: 123456]). All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a personal injury action arising out of a dog bite. Before the Court this day are discovery motions filed by plaintiff, seeking from co-defendant Robert White *further* responses to the following: form interrogatories, special interrogatories, requests for admissions and document production. Both sides agree that code-compliant responses are presently in the hands of plaintiff, and that these motions are substantively moot. Where the parties differ is with regard to the propriety of sanctions imposed upon defendant for the admitted delay.

Pursuant to CRC 3.1348(a), "the court may award sanctions under the Discovery Act in favor of a party who files a motion to compel discovery, even though the requested discovery was provided to the moving party after the motion was filed." Under the Civil Discovery Act, sanctions may be imposed for failing to respond to an authorized method of discovery. See CCP §2023.010. The Code further provides with specific regard to RPDs that sanctions may be imposed when a party provides a response within seven days of the date initially set for hearing on the motion to compel. CCP §2023.050(a)(2). That did not occur here, so plaintiff's request for sanctions defaults to CCP §§ 2030.300(d), 2031.310(h), and 2033.290(d) – which provide for the imposition of reasonable sanctions absent one of two exceptions. First, that the responding party acted with "substantial justification." The term "substantial justification" means "well-grounded in both law and fact," and requires the responding party to show that its challenged response was valid/adequate at the time. *City of Los Angeles v. Superior Court* (2017) 9 Cal.App.5th 272, 291; in accord, *Deck v. Developers Investment Co., Inc.* (2023) 89 Cal.App.5th 808, 833 [burden responding to discovery is not justification for delays]. Defense counsel concedes that the objection-only response was merely to preserve objections and that counsel was not expecting actually stand on objection-only responses. Second, that "other circumstances" make the imposition of a sanction "unjust." The unjust exception is generally triggered where the party to be sanctioned is impoverished and monetary sanctions "would cause a hardship disproportionate to the discovery misuse." *Kwan Software Engineering, Inc. v. Hennings* (2020) 58 Cal.App.5th 57, 77; see also *Marriage of Hoch* (2026) 119 Cal.App.5th 80, 89. There is no indication here that the sanction would run against defendant personally, and in fact it will not because all defense counsel had to do to avoid the present conundrum was to file a motion for a protective order and halt the discovery train.

Counsel's hourly rate of \$300 is quite reasonable, as is his time estimate of 2.5 hrs for each motion. That brings the sanction request to \$810 for each motion.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 8:30 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

8 CV67334 Thomas Knowlton vs. Henry Speeth

06/11/2025

Thomas Knowlton

Attorney: Colin Jones

Henry Speeth

Attorney: Marissa
Vandersluys

Henry Speeth

Attorney: Marissa
Vandersluys

Case Management Conference

FURTHER - Zoom Approved

06/11/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

07/22/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: [https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXVWFsUT09.[Passcode: 123456]). All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a personal injury action, arising out of an automobile accident. Before the Court this day is defendant’s unopposed motion to compel plaintiff’s attendance at an independent medical examination with a neuropsychologist. The parties do not disagree regarding the propriety of an IME in the abstract; rather, they apparently disagree over plaintiff’s right to audiotape the examination and/r receive copies of testing material. Of note, the court file does not contain any opposition from plaintiff, so the “disagreement” appears to be illusory. Moreover, the court file does not appear to house any protective order, so this Court cannot tell if it is “protective” enough.

This Court is aware of the holding in *Randy’s Trucking, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2023) 91 Cal.App.5th 818, and other cases. As noted last year by the Iowa Supreme Court in *Burton v. West Bend Mutual Ins. Co.*, 17 N.W.3d 340, 345 (2025): “these cases allow disclosure based on a balancing of one party’s need for the information against the ethical restraints imposed on licensed psychologists, the commercial interests of the testing companies, and the need to protect the scientific validity of the testing instruments – which could be impaired from wide disclosure of the testing material.” However, the holding of *Randy’s* is often overstated, as the Court itself observed (sat 848):

“Defendants and amici curiae urge us to create a bright-line rule limiting transmission of neuropsychological and psychological testing materials and raw test data, as well as audio recordings of examinations, to licensed neuropsychologists or psychologists ... The Legislature, however, has not codified the expert-to-expert limitation advocated by defendants and amici curiae. On this writ, our role is simply to determine whether, based on the rules of evidence, the trial court abused its discretion in ordering transmission of these materials to plaintiffs’ attorney subject to a protective order.”

The trial court in that case made a decision to permit the dissemination of a recording and testing data. Since plaintiff has not objected to defendant’s request for the opposite, *Randy’s* is not dispositive except to note that this is an issue vested with the trial court. This Court sees no reason to permit audio recording, or transmission of testing data, at all absent a specific request from the plaintiff, and so far the plaintiff has not made such a request.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

9	CV67306	Richard Lee Lasater vs. James Gianelli et al		05/29/2025
----------	----------------	---	--	------------

Richard Lee Lasater	Pro Per
James Gianelli	Attorney: Jason Sommer
Kate Powell Segerstrom	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
Jefferey Kaufman	Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Case Management Conference

FURTHER -
CSSS placed on motion calendar
Demurrer

to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint

05/29/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 07/22/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

No appearance is necessary. This Court, having previously sustained the demurrer from all three defendants without leave to leave, no longer requires a CMC or further hearings. Defendants would probably be wise to eventually submit a proposed judgment, but that is of course up to them.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

11	CV66853	Rogel Mercado Mercado Gonzalez vs. El Che Corporation		01/15/2025
----	----------------	--	--	------------

Rogel Mercado Mercado Gonzalez Attorney: David Bibiyan

El Che Corporation Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Diestel Turkey Ranch Attorney: Nathan Austin

El Che Corporation Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Case Management Conference

Further

01/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/11/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: [https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMTONwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.\[Passcode: 123456\]](https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMTONwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09.[Passcode: 123456]). All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a putative class action wage/hour dispute. At last, both employers have been served and made general appearances. A response to the cross-complaint will be needed soon, but in the interim if the parties are actively engaged in the discovery process and wish to postpone any motion to certify a class, that is acceptable. See CRC 3.762(e) and 3.764(b).

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

12	CV67750	Roger Daniel Mercado Gonzalez vs. El Che Corporation, Et Al		10/20/2025
----	---------	--	--	------------

Roger Daniel Mercado Gonzalez	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
--------------------------------------	---------------------------

El Che Corporation, et al.	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

Diestel Turkey Ranch	Attorney: Nathan Austin
-----------------------------	-------------------------

El Che Corporation	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
---------------------------	---------------------------

Case Management Conference

Further

10/20/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

11/14/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a PAGA suit, related to #11. At last, both employers have been served and made general appearances. A response to the cross-complaint will be needed soon, but in the interim it appears as though the parties are actively engaged in the discovery process. Court intends to continue the CMC.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

14	CV67643	Javier Rodriguez Soltero et al vs Jayco RV, Inc et al		09/16/2025
-----------	----------------	--	--	-------------------

Javier Rodriguez Soltero	Attorney: Lawrence Hutchens
Jayco RV, Inc	Attorney: Vincent Axelson
Stier's RV Center, LLC	Attorney: Vincent Axelson
Ashley R Rodriguez	Attorney: Lawrence Hutchens

Case Management Conference
Further - Trial Setting

09/16/2025 Petition

File Tracking 09/16/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a lemon law action.

Parties are ready for dates:

Full CMC

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Time estimate?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)
- Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

15	CV66328	Susan K. Schweickert et al vs. Stanley Ray Parrish et al		08/08/2024
----	---------	---	--	------------

Susan K. Schweickert Attorney: Sally Chenault

Susan K. Schweickert, Trustee of the Schweickert Living Trust, dated June 30, 2003 Attorney: Sally Chenault
Stanley Ray Parrish

Stanley Ray Parrish, Trustee of the Stanley R. Parrish Living Trust dated September 3, 2003

Hannah Garcia

DOE, LLC a California Limited Liability Company
Hannah Garcia

Pro Per

Susan Schweickert Attorney: Sally Chenault

Richard Schweickert Pro Per

Review Hearing

Settlement?

08/08/2024 Complaint

File Tracking 08/12/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that “no appearance is necessary.” Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWF5UT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a dispute involving real and personal property remaining from a dissolved LLC and related business constructs. There appears to some uncertainty regarding how best to divide the remaining items of personal property, even though Para 3 of the settlement agreement appears to deal with this very issue. If the impasse remains, someone will need to file a §664.6 motion to enforce the settlement as written, and perhaps propose a few minor facilitating terms. See, e.g., *Terry v. Conlan* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 1445 [ambiguity as to who would manage property rendered settlement unenforceable]; *Lindsay v. Lewandowski* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1618 [failure to include the formula for payment terms/structure left agreement unenforceable].

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

17	CV66936	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Suzanne Louise Dudeck, MD		01/28/2025
-----------	----------------	---	--	-------------------

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Tiffany Pack
-------------------------------	------------------------

Suzanne Louise Dudeck

Review Hearing

Settlement Status? If filled no appearances are necessary

01/28/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/08/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a collections case specially set to the L&M calendar as a courtesy to the parties who have shown diligence in attempting to reach a settlement of this dispute. Parties to advise.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

18	CVL67145	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Brittney A. Burd		04/08/2025
-----------	-----------------	--	--	-------------------

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Harlan Reese
-------------------------------	------------------------

Brittney A. Burd	Attorney: Timothy Reed
-------------------------	------------------------

Motion Hearing - Other

to Deem Requests for Admissions Admitted/Nonappearance

04/08/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

04/17/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cnlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

This is a collections case. Before the Court this day is an unopposed motion to deem RFAs admitted. The motion cannot be heard this day because the proof of service accompanying the motion contains the wrong address for defense counsel, arguably explaining why the motion is unopposed. In fact, upon close inspection, it appears that the discovery itself was mailed to the wrong suite number, which may explain the "radio silence" from defense counsel. It appears to this Court that plaintiff will have to start all over with this discovery effort.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026	8:30 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

19	CV66461	WESCO Distribution, Inc. vs. Alternate Power Solutions Inc et al	09/23/2024
----	---------	---	------------

WESCO Distribution, Inc. Attorney: Yet Not Entered

**Alternate Power Solutions Inc. a
California Corporation
an individual**

Western Surety Company, a South Dakota surety Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Case Management Conference

Further

09/23/2024 Complaint

File Tracking 07/09/2025 High Density

Case notes are not tentative rulings. Parties and counsel are expected to appear unless this note indicates that "no appearance is necessary." Unless directed otherwise, all participants may appear via Zoom: <https://tuolumne-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615813960?pwd=NTRMT0NwMDg5cmlYdzZ6VnBXWWFsUT09>. [Passcode: 123456]. All matters set for hearing in Department 5 are assigned to that department for all pre-trial purposes. Parties retain the right under Cal. Const. art VI §21 to decline consent to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem. By participating in the first hearing, or electing not to attend after due notice, parties are deemed to have stipulated to the Commissioner serving as a Judge Pro Tem for the entire case. See CRC 2.816.

Review hearing. Default packet reviewed and minor adjustments are required.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

20	CVL66873	Accelerated Inventory Management, LLC vs. Heather Smith	01/07/2025
----	----------	---	------------

**Accelerated Inventory
Management, LLC
Heather Smith**

Attorney: Flint Zide

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier 1 - CRC 3.740

01/07/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/11/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 01/07/2025
- Defendant Served: 07/30/2025
- # of Hearings (incl this): 4
- Amount in Controversy: \$7,555.93
- OSC Issued on: 03/10/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$500 sanction; set Tier II OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

21	CVL66949	Accelerated Inventory Management, LLC vs. Todd Taylor	02/03/2025
----	----------	---	------------

**Accelerated Inventory
Management, LLC
Todd Taylor**

Attorney: Hada Fernandez

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier II - CRC 3.740

02/03/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

03/17/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 02/03/2025
- Defendant Served: not
- # of Hearings (incl this): 3
- Amount in Controversy: \$9,797.75
- OSC Issued on: 03/11/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$750 sanction; set Tier III OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

22	CVL67874	Ally Bank vs Leah F Davis	12/08/2025
----	----------	---------------------------	------------

Ally Bank

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Leah F Davis

Case Management Conference

12/08/2025 Petition

File Tracking

12/24/2025 High Density

This is a collections case. Shortly after plaintiff secured entry of default, defendant filed for bankruptcy protection. This case is STAYED. A review hearing will be set for 10/07/2026 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
23 CV67988	American Express National Bank vs. Semion Godin		01/12/2026
	American Express National Bank Attorney: Eric Jun		
	Semion Godin		
	Case Management Conference		
01/12/2026	Complaint	File Tracking 01/28/2026 High Density	

This is a breach of contract action. Pursuant to CRC 3.110, plaintiff was required to effectuate service upon the defendant within 60 days. That has not yet occurred. According to the CMC statement, plaintiff has no idea where to find defendant. The CMC will need to be continued. Court will refrain from setting an OSC at this time.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

24	CVL67110	American Express National Bank vs. Maria Ramirez	03/27/2025
----	----------	--	------------

American Express National Bank Attorney: Robert Cox

Maria Ramirez

Review Hearing

03/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 04/04/2025 High Density

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting, in part because neither side appeared at the last CMC.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
25 CVL67747	American Express National Bank vs. Robert Offermann		10/20/2025
	American Express National Bank Attorney: Aaron Baldaro		
	Robert Offermann		
	Case Management Conference - Collections Case CRC 3.740		
10/20/2025	Complaint	File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density	

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is here for an initial CMC. Based on plaintiff's statement, it appears that the parties may still be working out a settlement. Court is amenable to a continuance of the CMC if the parties as are inclined.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

26	CVL67173	Bank of America, N.A. vs. Carla L. Craig		04/16/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

Bank of America, N.A.

Attorney: David McGaffey

Carla L. Craig

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier 1- per CRC3.740

04/16/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

04/28/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/16/2025
- Defendant Served: 05/16/2026
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$5,150.46
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$500 sanction; set Tier II OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

27	CVL67193	Bank of America, N.A. vs. Reid T. Hillemeier		04/21/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

Bank of America, N.A.

Attorney: Brian Langedyk

Reid T. Hillemeier

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Tier 2 - per CRC3.740

04/21/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

04/29/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/21/2025
- Defendant Served: no
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$6,572.77
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$750 sanction; set Tier III OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

29	CVL67546	Bank of America, N.A. vs. Robert Filko		08/12/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

Bank of America, N.A.	Attorney: Harvey Moore
------------------------------	------------------------

Robert Filko

Case Management Conference

Further

08/12/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/14/2025 High Density

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is here for a continued CMC. Based on plaintiff's statement, it appears that the handling attorney remains unaware of the fact that defendant filed an answer, despite this Court's previous advisement. It further appears that defendant may have filed for bankruptcy. The status of this case will need to be further explored and clarified.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

31 CV67496

Jeffrey Braeger vs. General Motors LLC

07/30/2025

Jeffrey Braeger

Attorney: Michael
Rosenstein

**General Motors LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company**
Case Management Conference

Attorney: H. Efstratis

Further

07/30/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/04/2025 High Density

This is a lemon law case.

Parties are ready for dates:

Full CMC

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Time estimate?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)
- Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

32 CV65506	California Department of Forestry vs. Dutton Landscape Services et al		08/16/2023
------------	--	--	------------

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Attorney: Evan Eickmeyer

Dutton Landscape Services

Ryan Dutton

D.R. Attorney: Bethany Lukitsch

D.R. Attorney: Kamran Ahmadian

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Jason DiGioia

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Gregory Prongos

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Andria Jaramillo

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Jason DiGioia

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Gregory Prongos

Charmaine Turpin-Erwin Attorney: Andria Jaramillo

Dutton Landscape Services

Ryan Dutton

D.R. Attorney: Bethany Lukitsch

D.R. Attorney: Kamran Ahmadian

Review Hearing

Dismissal Filed?

10/27/2023 Cross Complaint

File Tracking 08/08/2025 High Density

This case settled some time ago. Recently, plaintiff filed a dismissal of its complaint, but the cross-complaints filed 10/27/2023 and 11/17/2023 (there may have been an attempt to dismiss the latter on 01/31/2025, but that was rejected by the clerk's office).

Parties to advise. If no parties appear, the Court will enter a dismissal of both cross-complaints and the case at large.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

33	CVL67864	Capital One, N.A., vs. Andreas Divaris		11/04/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

Capital One, N.A., successor by merger to Discovery Bank Attorney: Hootan Atefyekta

Andreas Divaris

Case Management Conference

11/04/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 12/23/2025 High Density

No appearance is necessary. On 03/24/2026, defendant filed a motion to compel contractual arbitration of this collection case. That hearing is set for May 20. The court file does not contain any opposition (yet), but this CMC will be continued to align with the hearing on that motion, to wit: 05/20/2026 @ 8:30 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

34	CVL67214	Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. vs. Jeannine Ratliff	04/25/2025
----	----------	--	------------

Credit Corp Solutions, Inc. Attorney: Megan Gramlich

Jeannine Ratliff

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

OSC - Tier 2 per CRC 3.740

04/25/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 05/02/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/25/2025
- Defendant Served: no
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$1,591.29
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$750 sanction; set Tier III OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

35	CVL67205	Discover Bank vs. Steve Siville		04/24/2025
----	----------	---------------------------------	--	------------

Discover Bank

Attorney: Peter Tran

Steve Siville

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

OSC - Tier 1 per CRC3.740

04/24/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

05/01/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/24/2025
- Defendant Served: 05/27/2026
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$8,219.15
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$500 sanction; set Tier II OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

36	CV67873	CJ Doe, Jr a minor v Sonora Elementary School District et. al.	12/08/2025
----	---------	---	------------

CJ DOE Attorney: Christopher Wood

Sonora Elementary School District Attorney: Anthony DeMaria

Mary Winifred McGrew

CJ Doe Attorney: Christopher Wood

Sonora Elementary School District Attorney: Anthony DeMaria

Mary Winifred McGrew

Cheryl Griffiths Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Case Management Conference

Motion Hearing - Other

Petition for Relief from Claim Filing Requirements and Order Permitting Late Claim
Set per MO

02/10/2026 Cross Complaint

File Tracking 12/24/2025 High Density

Heard at 8:30 a.m.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

37 CV67431

Darren Duez vs. Hugo Alejandro Mata Arreola

07/17/2025

Darren Duez

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Hugo Alejandro Mata Arreola

North River Insurance Company

Evrard Concrete Inc.

Evrard Landscape and Hardscape

Western Surety Company

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Trial Setting

Zoom Approved

07/17/2025 **Complaint**

File Tracking

07/18/2025 High Density

This is a construction defect case involving a residential swimming pool, and some vague reference to a fire. While all named defendants have now appeared, there is a “Merco” defect in the appearance of Evard Concrete which will need to be cured unless expressly waived by all parties. Otherwise, the court is prepared to discuss trial dates.

Full CMC

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Time estimate?
 - Plaintiff
 - Defendant
- Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)
- Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

38	CV67636	Mark Anthony Dunaway vs. Megan Nicole Mantzouranis	09/12/2025
-----------	----------------	---	-------------------

Mark Anthony Dunaway	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-----------------------------	---------------------------

Megan Nicole Mantzouranis

Case Management Conference

FURTHER - ZOOM APPROVED

09/12/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 09/16/2025 High Density

Plaintiff is directed to send Notice and Acknowledgement to PO Box 5488, Sonora CA 95370 first along with publication.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

39	CV67962	Megan Gallegos vs. Peter Edward Bippart, MD	01/02/2026
----	---------	--	------------

Megan Gallegos

Attorney: James Arrasmith

Peter Edward Bippart, MD

Adventist Health Sonora

Case Management Conference

01/02/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

01/12/2026 High Density

No appearance is necessary.

This is a medical malpractice action. The parties were scheduled to participate in a CMC this day, but at present there is a demurrer on calendar. That demurrer is set to be heard on a non-civil calendar, but as a courtesy to the parties it can remain as scheduled. There is no opposition filed, and no FAC mooted the motion, so it is unclear what plaintiff was intending to do with the demurrer. However, the CMC for this day will be moved to 05/15/2026 at 8:30 am to align with the demurrer hearing.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

40 CV67781 Anna Gilles vs. Foothill Sierra Pest Control

10/28/2025

Anna Gilles

Attorney: Yet Not Entered

Foothill Sierra Pest Control

Attorney: Scott Ward

Trevor Cuthill

Attorney: Scott Ward

Case Management Conference

Further - OSC Sanction Def. Counsel?

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

10/28/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

11/14/2025 High Density

This is the continued hearing in a wrongful termination case involving a myriad of claims made by the plaintiff against her employer and what appears to be a co-worker. It is generally alleged that the co-worker subjected plaintiff to an unwanted, and certainly weird, interaction involving a banana. After reporting the incident to management, *plaintiff* was terminated.

An earlier CMC was aborted due to defense counsel's absence – prompting counsel for plaintiff to request sanctions. The salient history is as follows:

- On 10/31/2025, defendant received a service package, which included date of the initial CMC on the TUO-CV-100;
- On 01/27/2026, defense counsel filed and served a CMC statement indicating an intention to appear in person at the initial CMC;
- On 02/04/2026, defense counsel received via email a CMC statement from plaintiff's counsel, indicating his intention to appear at the initial CMC by telephone;
- Defense counsel did not appear at the initial CMC. Counsel states in his declaration that his office inadvertently removed the hearing from the office calendar, but does not say when that occurred or what other case was in fact removed from calendar, if that was in this courthouse, or any other information. The opposing declaration is too vague to find that the absence was anything but ordinary attorney error – which CCP §473(b) does not provide safe passage for.
- In terms of the amount, counsel's time estimate devoted to the initial hearing (1.6 hrs) is probably accurate but the case notes posted online in advance of that hearing clearly indicated that the CMC was likely to be continued anyway. Thus, there was no need to "prepare" anything of substance for the hearing. Thirty minutes was more than enough brain power. As for the fee, while plaintiff's counsel no doubt commands \$900/hr down on South Fig, up here in the sticks he going rate for employment discrimination is \$450/hr (max). Defense counsel shall immediately cut a check to plaintiff's counsel for \$225.00 pursuant to CRC 2.30 and 3.722(c).

CMC

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

- Trial: _____(Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)
- Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

42	CV68260	Elizabeth Haskell vs. Empower Solar Inc et al		03/30/2026
----	---------	---	--	------------

Elizabeth Haskell	Attorney: Horace Meeks
-------------------	------------------------

Empower Solar Inc

Empower Home Services

Jonathon Coffman

Malina Boyd

Case Management Conference - CMC-Delay Reduction

03/30/2026 Complaint

File Tracking

04/02/2026 High Density

This is a dispute regarding the installation of solar panels. Given how recently this case was commenced, the CMC was clearly set too soon in error. Given the infancy of this litigation, Court intends to continue the CMC.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

43 CV66414	Nicole Huebner vs. FCA US, LLC		09/05/2024
------------	--------------------------------	--	------------

Nicole Huebner	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
----------------	---------------------------

FCA US, LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
-------------	---------------------------

Review Hearing

Dismissal?

09/05/2024 Complaint

File Tracking 02/11/2025 High Density

This is a lemon law case.

On 10/31/2025, plaintiff filed a Notice of Conditional Settlement of the Entire Case. Therein, she indicated that a dismissal would be filed “no later than 03/03/2026.” Pursuant to CRC 3.1385(c)(2), “if the plaintiff or other party required to serve and file a request for dismissal within 45 days after the dismissal date specified in the notice does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed.” The declaration from plaintiff’s counsel does not provide good cause for a delayed dismissal. She states simply that “the damages portion of this matter has been resolved” – which of course was resolved back in the fall of 2025, promoting the notice of settlement. She further states that there is to be a motion for fees/costs to be filed, but this Court does not have a copy of any settlement agreement showing that the issue of fees and costs was carved out of the settlement and expressly reserved for future law and motion. Moreover, what have the parties been doing since November?

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

44	CV67618	Delbert Jolly vs. David Pedersen, et al		09/05/2025
----	---------	---	--	------------

Delbert Jolly	Pro Per
David Pedersen	Attorney: David Johnston
Guy Benning	Attorney: David Johnston
George Walker	
Lavonne Benning	Attorney: David Johnston
Case Management Conference	
Further	

09/05/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 09/10/2025 High Density

This is ostensibly a case for quiet title, although the operative pleading is not verified. There are averments supporting claims for various types of easements (most notably by implication or necessity), which defendants allege were lost by nonuse or adverse possession. Co-defendant Walker has passed away and was dismissed. The other three have answered. Who actually owns the subject property claimed to be the servient tenement?

Full CMC:

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)

Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

MSC available in Dept 2 or 5.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

45	CVL66471	JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. vs. Jeff Mason	09/17/2024
----	----------	---	------------

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Harvey Moore
----------------------------------	------------------------

Jeff Mason	Attorney: Robert Shepard
-------------------	--------------------------

Review Hearing

Settlement?

09/17/2024 Complaint

File Tracking 04/04/2025 High Density

Case to be dismissed with §664.6 reservation.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

46	CVL67001	JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. vs. Marianne Horvath		02/18/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Attorney: Linda Doan
---------------------------	----------------------

Marianne Horvath	Attorney: Stanley Apps
------------------	------------------------

Review Hearing

Dismissal filed?

02/18/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

03/17/2025 High Density

This is a collections case. According to the CMC statement, the parties “have agreed to a tentative repayment plan” – which is like agreeing to maybe be pregnant. Either there is a settlement, or there is not. Since a Notice of Conditional Settlement was filed on 10/03/2025, that the amended CIV-110 easily permits dismissal with a \$664.6 reservation, this Court has a practice of proceeding via CCP §128 to dismiss these cases and only activate if the settlement goes south.

Court will set an OSC re dismissal for 06/03/2026 @ 10:00 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

48 CV66986	Anthony Kilgore vs. First Light Resorts, LLC, et al.		02/21/2025
------------	--	--	------------

Anthony Kilgore	Attorney: Bradley Chase
-----------------	-------------------------

First Light Resorts, LLC, et al.

Case Management Conference

Further

02/21/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 03/17/2025 High Density

This is a wage/hour dispute. At previous CMCs, the parties indicated they would file a stipulation to stay the representative PAGA claims in order for plaintiff to arbitrate his individual claims first. No stipulation has ever been filed. This case is now more than one year old, and all that has occurred is dismissal of the class claims.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

49	CV66453	Linda Mason vs. Ashley Menking		09/19/2024
----	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------

Linda Mason

Attorney: Jonathan Kashani

Ashley Menking

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

CRC 3.110

09/19/2024 Complaint

File Tracking

08/11/2025 High Density

This is personal injury action arising out of an automobile accident. This is now the 6th hearing in the case in which the defendant has yet to be served. Plaintiff is reminded that she has burned half of her CCP §583.210 window.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

50	CV67054	Ida Maria May vs. Rush Creek Lodge, LLC, Evergreen Destination		03/14/2025
----	---------	--	--	------------

Ida Maria May Attorney: Aimee Newberry

Rush Creek Lodge, LLC dba Rush Creek Lodge & Spa, Attorney: Lee Sherman

Rush Creek Lodge, LLC dba Rush Creek Lodge & Spa, Attorney: Vivian Tran

EverGreen Destination Holdings LLC, dba Evergreen Lodge Case Management Conference Attorney: Lee Sherman

Further

03/14/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 03/17/2025 High Density

This is a premises liability, personal injury action.

Full CMC:

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

Trial: _____(Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)

Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

MSC available in Dept 2 or 5.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

51 CV67925	Debra Mendoza et al vs Sonora SNF Operations LLC et al	12/17/2025
	Debra Mendoza	Attorney: Kirsten Fish
	Sonora SNF Operations LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	Sonora Operations Holdings LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	CH Cafive Holdings LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	Witzcorp LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	IY Evergreen CA Holdings LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	Evergreen Healthcare Group	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	Evergreen Healthcare LLC	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	Yisroel Herzka	
	Yitzchok Yenowitz	
	Genesis Leininger	Attorney: Yet Not Entered
	HCCPC	
	Arron Mendoza	Attorney: Kirsten Fish
	Joseph Mendoza	Attorney: Kirsten Fish
	Case Management Conference	

12/17/2025 Petition

File Tracking 12/24/2025 High Density

This is a wrongful death and elder abuse case. It appears from a review of the court file that all parties have appeared and answered.

Full CMC:

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)

Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

MSC available in Dept 2 or 5.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

52	CVL67077	Mercury Insurance Company vs. Bonifacio Urquidez et al	03/17/2025
-----------	-----------------	---	-------------------

Mercury Insurance Company	Attorney: Mark Nivinkus
----------------------------------	-------------------------

Bonifacio Urquidez

Elva Velasquez Enriquez	Attorney: Jesse Ortiz
--------------------------------	-----------------------

Case Management Conference

Spanish Interpreter?

03/17/2025 Complaint

File Tracking
08/08/2025 High Density

This is a subrogation action stemming from an automobile accident.

Full CMC:

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

Trial: _____ (Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)

Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

MSC available in Dept 2 or 5.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
54 CVL67597	Portfolio Recovery Services, LLC vs. Jennifer Serpa Brewster		08/29/2025
	Portfolio Recovery Services, LLC Attorney: Donald Sherrill		
	Jennifer Serpa Brewster		
	Case Management Conference		
08/29/2025	Complaint	File Tracking 10/08/2025 High Density	

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
55 CVL67624	Portfolio Recovery Services, LLC vs. Michael Brewster		09/05/2025
	Portfolio Recovery Services, LLC Attorney: Donald Sherrill		
	Michael Brewster		
	Case Management Conference		
09/05/2025 Complaint		File Tracking 10/08/2025 High Density	

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

56	CV67582	Carla Ruhs-Nelson et al vs. Andrew Riehl et al	08/27/2025
-----------	----------------	---	-------------------

Carla Ruhs-Nelson	Attorney: Bruce Ahnfeldt
--------------------------	--------------------------

Douglas Nelson	Attorney: Bruce Ahnfeldt
-----------------------	--------------------------

Andrew Riehl	Attorney: Michael Budra
---------------------	-------------------------

Mother Lode Coffee Roasting Co., Inc.	Attorney: Sumair Sandhu
--	-------------------------

Case Management Conference

08/27/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/28/2025 High Density

This is a personal injury action arising out of a collision between a vehicle and a pedestrian.

Full CMC:

- Is the case fully at issue?
- Are all parties present or defaulted?
- Any plans to add parties or amend/attack the pleadings?
- Any related cases?
- Amount in controversy?
- Jury demanded?
- Time estimate?

Trial: _____(Mon @ 8:00 a.m. Dept 3)

Thursday Prior @ 3:30 p.m. Trial Readiness Conference/Confirmation

MSC available in Dept 2 or 5.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

57	CVL67553	State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins Co vs. Matthew Aaron Spiller		08/15/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company Matthew Aaron Spiller	Attorney: Richard Mahfouz
---	---------------------------

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

Settlement? OSC Tier 1

08/15/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 08/20/2025 High Density

No appearance is necessary.

The plaintiff, having filed a Notice of Conditional Settlement of the Entire Case on 02/20/2026, triggered a rescission of the pending OSC re Sanctions and a setting of a different OSC re Dismissal for 08/05/2026 @ 10:00 a.m. Clerk to give notice.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

58	CVL67150	Synchrony Bank vs. Eric Wistrand		04/09/2025
----	----------	----------------------------------	--	------------

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Hootan Atefyekta

Eric Wistrand

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

OSC - Tier 2 per CRC3.740

04/09/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

04/17/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/09/2025
- Defendant Served: no
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$2,417.63
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$750 sanction; set Tier III OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

59	CVL67184	Synchrony Bank vs. Edward C. Hernandez		04/18/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Megan Gramlich

Edward C. Hernandez

OSC Hearing - Sanctions

OSC - Tier 2 per CRC3.740

04/18/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

04/28/2025 High Density

Collections case:

- Litigation Commenced: 04/18/2025
- Defendant Served: no
- # of Hearings (incl this): 2
- Amount in Controversy: \$6,652.22
- OSC Issued on: 02/26/2026
 - Response: none

Impose \$750 sanction; set Tier III OSC for 07/01/2025 @ 10 a.m.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

60	CVL67452	Synchrony Bank vs. Jaime Cardoza	07/16/2025
----	----------	---	------------

Synchrony Bank

Attorney: Megan Gramlich

Jaime Cardoza

Pro Per

Case Management Conference

Further

07/16/2025 Complaint

File Tracking

08/28/2025 High Density

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting.

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

Department 5

May 6, 2026 10:00 am

DA Case #

Date Filed

61 CV66275

Ronald Tacker vs. The Michaels Organization, LLC et al

07/12/2024

Ronald Tacker

Attorney: Shaun Setareh

**The Michaels Organization, LLC,
a New Jersey limited liability
company**

Attorney: Cary Palmer

**Michaels Management Services,
LLC, a New Jersey limited
liability company**

Case Management Conference

Further

07/12/2024 **Complaint**

File Tracking

08/08/2025 High Density

This is a wage/hour class action. The lead claim is sited in San Bernardino, and was recently settled. Preliminary approval has been provided, and a final approval hearing is set for August.

Since this case was effectively joined in the lead case, is there any reason why this action cannot be dismissed without prejudice at this time?

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

62	CVL67590	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. vs. Robert Ballash		08/25/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

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

Robert Ballash

Case Management Conference

Further

08/25/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 10/08/2025 High Density

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:00 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

63	CVL67457	Wells Fargo Bank, NA vs. Jebediah Scoggins		07/21/2025
----	----------	---	--	------------

Wells Fargo Bank, NA	Attorney: Tiffany Pack
-----------------------------	------------------------

Jebediah Scoggins	Pro Per
--------------------------	---------

Case Management Conference

Further - Bankruptcy filed? Set Trial?

07/21/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 07/24/2025 High Density

This is a collections case, governed by the standard case management conditions given defendant's general appearance. The matter is overdue for trial setting. Unless defendant did indeed proceed with bankruptcy, a trial date will be set.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

66	CVL67805	Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC vs. Philip Carrillo		11/04/2025
----	----------	--	--	------------

Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC Attorney: David McGaffey

Philip Carrillo

Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

11/04/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density

Set review hearing and OSC re Tier I sanction for 12/02/2026 @ 10 am.
Clerk to give notice.

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

Department 5	May 6, 2026 10:03 am	DA Case #	Date Filed
---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	-------------------

69	CVL67803	Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC vs. Enrique Insilan	11/04/2025
----	----------	--	------------

Portfolio Recovery Associates, Attorney: David McGaffey
LLC
Enrique Insilan
Review Hearing - Collections Case CRC 3.740

11/04/2025 Complaint

File Tracking 11/14/2025 High Density

Set review hearing and OSC re Tier I sanction for 12/02/2026 @ 10 am.
Clerk to give notice.

