

Tentative Rulings for March 4, 2026
Department 503

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.*

25CECG02330 *Estrada v. Carlin* (Dept. 503)

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 503

Begin at the next page

(03)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Hacienda Homeowners for Justice v. La Hacienda Mobile Estates, LLC***
Case No. 23CECG01440

Hearing Date: March 4, 2026 (Dept. 503)

Motion: Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal Record Documents Containing Personal and Financial Information

Tentative Ruling:

To deny plaintiffs' motion to seal record documents without prejudice, as plaintiffs have not filed a noticed motion, points and authorities brief, or any declarations to support their request to seal the documents. Thus, plaintiffs have not satisfied the requirements of the California Rules of Court, rules 2.550 and 2.551, regarding sealing documents. If plaintiffs wish the seal documents, they must file a noticed motion pursuant to rules 2.550 and 2.551.

Also, the court is not permitted to issue an order sealing documents based on an agreement or stipulation alone. (Cal. Rule of Court, rule 2.551 (a).) Therefore, the court hereby vacates its order dated February 23, 2026, which erroneously granted the request to seal the documents based on the parties' stipulation.

Explanation:

Under the California Rules of Court, rule 2.551 (a), the court is not allowed to seal records based on an agreement or stipulation. The party seeking to seal the records must file a noticed motion with points and authorities and supported by declarations showing good cause to seal the records. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.551 (a), (b).) The court must also make specific findings before sealing records, as set forth in Rule of Court 2.550(d) and (e).

"In *NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 20 Cal.4th at pages 1217–1218, 86 Cal.Rptr.2d 778, 980 P.2d 337, the California Supreme Court identified the constitutional requirements applicable to a request to seal court records as follows: '[B]efore substantive courtroom proceedings are closed or transcripts are ordered sealed, a trial court must hold a hearing and expressly find that (i) there exists an overriding interest supporting closure and/or sealing; (ii) there is a substantial probability that the interest will be prejudiced absent closure and/or sealing; (iii) the proposed closure and/or sealing is narrowly tailored to serve the overriding interest; and (iv) there is no less restrictive means of achieving the overriding interest.'" (*Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 1273, 1279.)

Here, the parties have not filed a motion, declarations, or points and authorities to meet their burden of showing that the records should be sealed, and the court cannot seal the records based on the parties' stipulation alone. Also, it does not appear that the parties' request to seal the documents here actually solves the problem they are trying

(46)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Nannette Regua v. Sandy Romero Crane**
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG01430

Hearing Date: March 4, 2026 (Dept. 503)

Motion: Application for Judgment

Tentative Ruling:

To enter judgment against Anthony Romero aka Tony Romero, pursuant to the parties' stipulation for judgment. Plaintiff must submit a revised proposed judgment in line with the court's ruling by Friday, March 13, 2026 at 5:00 p.m.

To deny the application for default judgment, without prejudice, as to the testate and intestate successors of Manuel and Victoria Romero, all persons unknown claiming any legal or equitable right, and DOES 1-20.

To grant judicial notice of Exhibit M: Anthony Romero's Disclaimer of Interest and Stipulation for Judgment. To deny judicial notice of all other requested items.

Explanation:

Stipulated Judgment against Anthony Romero

On September 9, 2024, plaintiff Nannette Regua filed "Anthony Romero's Disclaimer of Interest and Stipulation for Judgment." Pursuant to this agreement, defendant Anthony Romero stipulates and agrees to judgment in favor of plaintiff as to all three causes of action.

"THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE THAT judgment may be entered in this matter quieting title in favor of Plaintiff, reforming the Grant Deed, and declaring that defendant Anthony Romero has no right, title, or interest in the Property. No monetary judgment or costs shall be awarded in this proceeding against defendant Anthony Romero. IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED."

Insufficient Evidence and Declarations in Support of Prove Up

A party seeking a default judgment on declarations must use mandatory Request for Entry of Default (Application to Enter Default) (form CIV-100), and among the documents filed must include a brief summary of the case and declarations or other admissible evidence in support of the judgment requested, with exhibits as necessary. (Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 3.1800(a).)

Here, plaintiff's application is solely supported by the documents and declarations attached to the Request for Judicial Notice. Judicial notice of such documents here is

