

**Tentative Rulings for April 15, 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.*

---

---

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

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

# **Tentative Rulings for Department 501**

Begin at the next page

(37)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Santos v. Palogix International Limited**  
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG03568

Hearing Date: April 15, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: 1) Cross-Defendant Olman Santos' Demurrer to the Cross-Complaint  
2) Cross-Defendant DJT Transport, Inc.'s Demurrer to the Cross-Complaint

**Tentative Ruling:**

To continue the matters to Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501, in order to allow cross-defendants to meet and confer in person or by telephone, as required. If this resolves the issues, cross-defendants shall call the court to take the demurrers off calendar. If it does not resolve the issues, counsel for cross-defendants shall file a declaration on or before April 25, 2026, stating, in detail, the efforts made.

**Explanation:**

Code of Civil Procedure section 435.5 makes it clear that meet and confer must be conducted "in person, by telephone, or by video conference." (*Id.*, subd. (a).) The moving party is not excused from this requirement unless they show that the plaintiff failed to respond to the meet and confer request or otherwise failed to meet and confer in good faith. (*Id.*, subd. (a)(3)(B).) While counsel indicates a meet and confer letters was sent to plaintiff's counsel, this does not comply with the requirement that meet and confer occur either in person or by telephone. The parties must engage in good faith meet and confer, in person or by telephone or video conference, as set forth in the statute. The court's normal practice in such instances is to take the motion off calendar, subject to being re-calendared once the parties have met and conferred. However, given the congestion in the court's calendar currently, the court will instead continue the hearing to allow the parties to meet and confer, and only if efforts are unsuccessful will it rule on the merits.

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 4/10/2026.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)



