

**Tentative Rulings for February 19, 2026**  
**Department 501**

**For any matter where an oral argument is requested and any party to the hearing desires a remote appearance, such request must be timely submitted to and approved by the hearing judge. In this department, the remote appearance will be conducted through Zoom. If approved, please provide the department's clerk a correct email address. (CRC 3.672, Fresno Sup.C. Local Rule 1.1.19)**

---

---

There are no tentative rulings for the following cases. The hearing will go forward on these matters. If a person is under a court order to appear, he/she must do so. Otherwise, parties should appear unless they have notified the court that they will submit the matter without an appearance. (See California Rules of Court, rule 3.1304(c).) *The above rule also applies to cases listed in this "must appear" section.*

25CECG02438      *Petroleum Property Holdings, LLC v. Jerry Anthony Dorton* (Dept. 501)

---

---

The court has continued the following cases. The deadlines for opposition and reply papers will remain the same as for the original hearing date.

24CECG02797      *Bee Xiong v. Sidrah Khan, M.D.* is continued to Thursday, March 26, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501.

24CECG02997      *Cocola Broadcasting Companies, LLC v. My Central Valley, LLC* is continued to Thursday, March 26, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501.

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

# **Tentative Rulings for Department 501**

Begin at the next page



(03)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Yang v. Hollis**  
Case No. 25CECG05317

Hearing Date: February 19, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant the Petition to compromise the minor's claim of Jun Qi David Feng. The proposed order has been or will be signed. The matter is off calendar. No appearances are necessary.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

**Tentative Ruling**

Issued By: DTT on 2/17/2026.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(35)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***Hall v. Fresno Unified School District Employee Health Care Plan***  
Superior Court Case No. 20CECG00607

Hearing Date: February 19, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: (1) by Defendant Fresno Unified School District Employee Health Care Plan to Compel Further Responses to Form Interrogatories, Set Two, and Request for Sanctions; (2) by Defendant Fresno Unified School District Employee Health Care Plan to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories, Set Three, and Request for Sanctions; and (3) by Defendant Fresno Unified School District Employee Health Care Plan to Compel Further Responses to Requests for Production, Set Seven, and Request for Sanctions

**Tentative Rulings:**

To grant the motion to compel further responses to Form Interrogatories, Set Two in its entirety.

To grant the motion to compel further responses to Special Interrogatories, Set Three in part, as to Special Interrogatory Nos. 62, 71 and 82.

To deny the motion to compel further responses to Request for Production, Set Seven in its entirety.

To deny the request for sanctions.

**Explanation:**

Defendant Fresno Unified School District Employee Health Care Plan ("defendant") seeks an order compelling further responses from plaintiff Worldwide Aircraft Services, Inc., ("plaintiff") as to Form Interrogatories, Set Two, Special Interrogatories, Set Three, and Request for Production, Set Seven.

The substance of the dispute as to Form Interrogatories, Set Two, are the responses to No. 17.1, as it pertains to answers to requests for admissions that did not result in an unqualified admission. Defendant seeks a further response to No. 17.1 as relates to Requests for Admission, Set Two, Nos. 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16. Though the initial response to No. 17.1 were made when there were no actual responses to the request for admissions (Patel Decl., Ex. I), it appears that plaintiff later amended its responses (*id.*, Ex. L.) This is contested. Plaintiff acknowledges that it should also amend its responses to Form Interrogatories, Set Two, but was not given sufficient time to do so. The motion as it pertains to Form Interrogatories, Set Two, is granted.

As to Special Interrogatories, Set Three, at issue are Nos. 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78 and 80-82.

As to Nos. 48, 49, 51, 54, 57, 64, 67 and 70, these interrogatories seek identification of individuals with categories of knowledge. Plaintiff generally responds with a list of names, and a category of people, such as from Delta Health Systems. Defendant contends that the category of people is not specific enough. To the extent that these categories of people identified are not known to plaintiff that prompted the response of "unidentified representatives", it is not clear how defendant seeks to compel a further response. If plaintiff has not identified these representatives, plaintiff has no names to disclose. The motion is denied as to Special Interrogatories, Set Three, Nos. 48, 49, 51, 54, 57, 64, 67 and 70.

As to Nos. 52, 55, 59, 61, 65, 68, 74, 76, 78, 80 and 81, these interrogatories seek identification of all documents. The responses list categories of documents. Defendant contends that the responses are insufficient because the responses do not identify with type of document, general subject matter, date and authors, addresses and recipients. The call of the interrogatory was to identify, not state all facts. An answer is incomplete if it merely refers to documents without summarizing them. (*Deyo v. Kilbourne* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 771, 783-784.) The responses here summarize the documents. The motion is denied as to Special Interrogatories, Set Three, Nos. 52, 55, 59, 61, 65, 68, 74, 76, 78, 80 and 81.

As to No. 62, the interrogatory called for the identification of documents. The response however merely stated facts in response. The motion is granted as to No. 62.

As to No. 71, the response refers to another response to an interrogatory, which is improper. The motion is granted as to No. 71.

As to No. 82, the response refers to document production as a response. This is a proper response. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2030.230.) However, reference to the section must be made, and the response must specify the writings from which the answer may be derived or ascertained. (*Ibid.*) This specification shall be in sufficient detail to permit the propounding party to locate and to identify, as readily as the responding party can, the documents from which the answer may be ascertained. (*Ibid.*) It is unclear whether reference to documents produced on March 29, 2024, is sufficiently specific, and the response does not refer to Code of Civil Procedure section 2030.230. The motion is granted as to No. 82.

Finally, as to the Requests for Production, Set Seven, the substance of the dispute is the lack of specificity of documents responsive to each request. As defendant submits, each of plaintiff's responses refer to the entirety of prior production as responsive to specific requests. As plaintiff submits, though the responses refer to prior production, the responses also specifically identify what Bates-numbered are responsive. Defendant otherwise fails to sufficiently demonstrate whether the production identified is somehow not responsive to the request. Defendant only expresses frustration at the responses that equate to "go look at what we produced" without any showing how that response is somehow evasive to, for example, Request No. 131 "All DOCUMENTS that support YOUR



(27)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***In re Christy Jean Clark***  
Superior Court Case No. 26CECG00427

Hearing Date: February 19, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim (Minor: Chance Trenton Keohavong)

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant the Petition. The proposed orders have been, or will soon be, signed. No appearances are necessary. The court sets a status conference for Thursday, May 14, 2026, at 3:30 p.m., in **Department 501**, for confirmation of deposit of the minors' funds into the blocked account. If petitioner files the Acknowledgment of Receipt of Order and Funds for Deposit in Blocked Account (MC-356) at least five court days before the hearing, the status conference will come off calendar.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

**Tentative Ruling**  
**Issued By:** DTT on 2/18/2026.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)