

Tentative Rulings for March 11, 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.*

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

(37)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Vartanian v. Boyd**
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG02564

Hearing Date: March 11, 2026 (Dept. 503)

Motion: Cross-Defendant Sona Vartanian's Demurrer to the First Amended Cross-Complaint

**If oral argument is timely requested, it will be entertained on
Wednesday, April 1, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 503.**

Tentative Ruling:

To order the motion off calendar.

To stay the matter pending the appeal. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 128, 916.)

Explanation:

On May 30, 2025, Plaintiff/Cross-Defendant Sona Vartanian filed a complaint against Laura Boyd, Pamela Reich, and Shane Reich alleging defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and breach of fiduciary duty. On December 3, 2025, the court granted motions to strike ("anti-SLAPP") as to each defendant. (Minute Order, December 3, 2025.) The motions were granted without leave to amend as to the causes of action for defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress, but with leave to amend as to the cause of action for breach of fiduciary duty. On December 15, 2025, Vartanian filed a Notice of Intent to Not Amend, reserving appellate rights. On January 23, 2026, she filed her Notice of Appeal in this action.

While the anti-SLAPP motions were still pending, on November 4, 2025, Defendant/Cross-Complainant Pamela Reich filed a First Amended Cross-Complaint against Vartanian alleging that she conspired to commit and/or aided and abetted breaches of fiduciary duties and financial elder abuse.

On December 8, 2025, Vartanian filed her demurrer to the First Amended Cross-Complaint. In light of the Notice of Appeal filed January 23, 2026, the court evaluates whether it has jurisdiction to proceed.

A trial court is divested of its jurisdiction upon appeal of any matter that is related to the appeal, subject to certain exceptions. (Code Civ. Proc., § 916.) While a complaint and cross-complaint are treated as independent actions for most purposes, judgment on these actions is unified for the purposes of appeal. (*Rethers v. Rethers* (1956) 140 Cal.App.2d 28, 30.) Where a complaint and cross-complaint involve the same parties,

