

**Tentative Rulings for March 17, 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.

24CECG04077      *Anthony Villarreal v. Angel Landeros* is continued to Tuesday, April 28, 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: ***In re: Zakira Perry***  
Case No. 26CECG00880

Hearing Date: March 17, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim of Zakira Perry

**Tentative Ruling:**

To deny the Petition to compromise the minor's claim of Zakira Perry, without prejudice.

**Explanation:**

Petitioner seeks to have the settlement money paid directly to the parent of the minor rather than deposited into blocked account in the name of the minor until she reaches the age of 18. Probate Code sections 3401 and 3402 do provide a procedure to allow payment of the money directly to the parent of the minor, providing certain conditions have been met.

Under Probate Code section 3401, subdivision (a), "[w]here a minor does not have a guardian of the estate, money or other property belonging to the minor may be paid or delivered to a parent of the minor entitled to the custody of the minor to be held in trust for the minor until the minor reaches majority if the requirements of subdivision (c) are satisfied."

"This section applies only if both of the following requirements are satisfied: (1) The total estate of the minor, including the money and other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in value. (2) The parent to whom the money or other property is to be paid or delivered gives the person making the payment or delivery written assurance, verified by the oath of such parent, that the total estate of the minor, including the money or other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in value." (Prob. Code, § 3401, subd. (c), para. breaks omitted.)

Here, petitioner has not submitted a declaration signed under penalty of perjury stating that the total estate of the minor, including the money and other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed \$5,000. Nor has she provided any evidence that she gave the person making the payment a written assurance, verified under oath, that the total estate of the minor, including the money or property to be paid to the parent, does not exceed \$5,000.

Also, there is no attachment 18b(5) to the Petition, which specifies the name and address of the parent and the money to be delivered. The proposed order also does not state the name and address of the parent to whom the money will be paid. The order



(03)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***In re: Jarod Perry***  
Case No. 26CECG00889

Hearing Date: March 17, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim of Jarod Perry

**Tentative Ruling:**

To deny the Petition to compromise the minor's claim of Jarod Perry, without prejudice.

**Explanation:**

Petitioner seeks to have the settlement money paid directly to the parent of the minor rather than deposited into blocked account in the name of the minor until he reaches the age of 18. Probate Code sections 3401 and 3402 do provide a procedure to allow payment of the money directly to the parent of the minor, providing certain conditions have been met.

Under Probate Code section 3401, subdivision (a), "[w]here a minor does not have a guardian of the estate, money or other property belonging to the minor may be paid or delivered to a parent of the minor entitled to the custody of the minor to be held in trust for the minor until the minor reaches majority if the requirements of subdivision (c) are satisfied."

"This section applies only if both of the following requirements are satisfied: (1) The total estate of the minor, including the money and other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in value. (2) The parent to whom the money or other property is to be paid or delivered gives the person making the payment or delivery written assurance, verified by the oath of such parent, that the total estate of the minor, including the money or other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in value." (Prob. Code, § 3401, subd. (c), para. breaks omitted.)

Here, petitioner has not submitted a declaration signed under penalty of perjury stating that the total estate of the minor, including the money and other property to be paid or delivered to the parent, does not exceed \$5,000. Nor has he provided any evidence that he gave the person making the payment a written assurance, verified under oath, that the total estate of the minor, including the money or property to be paid to the parent, does not exceed \$5,000.

Also, there is no attachment 18b(5) to the Petition, which specifies the name and address of the parent and the money to be delivered. The proposed order also does not state the name and address of the parent to whom the money will be paid. The order



(37)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Cruz v. Mortgage Default Services, LLC**  
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG03048

Hearing Date: March 17, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: by Plaintiff to Quash Deposition Subpoenas

**Tentative Ruling:**

To continue the matter to Tuesday, April 14, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501. Plaintiff is to file an amended proof of service no later than April 3, 2026. Additionally, the court is concerned that this motion is moot following the judgment signed February 10, 2026. Plaintiff may file a supplemental brief, not to exceed seven pages, no later than April 6, 2026, addressing whether the motion is moot. Alternatively, plaintiff may withdraw his motion in the event he agrees that it is moot.

**Explanation:**

Defective Proof of Service

The proof of service does not state the address where the declarant mailed the documents to or from nor does it indicate the parties served. For the address from which the declarant mailed the documents, the proof of service only states the documents were deposited in the United States Post Office, but does not state which Post Office. There is no information regarding who was served or where they were served. The court is continuing this matter so that plaintiff can file an amended proof of service providing all the required information. In the event an amended proof of service is not timely filed, the motion will be denied.

Moot

Additionally, the motion appears to be moot. Plaintiff cites to Code of Civil Procedure sections 995.930, 995.940, and 995.950 for the position that a timely objection was not made to the posting of the bond. No authority is cited to for the position that the subpoenas are early because Labbett has yet to prevail in any matter justifying judgment collection discovery. Also, since this motion was filed, Labbett did prevail on a summary judgment motion. Thus, this motion appears to have been made moot.

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 3/13/2026.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)



(20)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Moore v. HSRE Pacifica Fresno OPCO LP, et al.**  
Superior Court Case No. 23CECG04737

Hearing Date: March 17, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motions: by Plaintiffs Steven Moore and Kevin Moore Motions to  
Compel Further Responses from

**Tentative Ruling:**

To continue the hearing to April 21, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501. This continuance applies to the four motions to compel further responses (filed on July 18, 2025) from plaintiffs Steven Moore and Kevin Moore to Requests for Production of Documents, Set One.

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 3/13/2026.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)