

**Tentative Rulings for June 2, 2026**  
**Department 403**

**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.

25CECG02282      *Amar Daroch v. FRGM LLC* is continued to Tuesday, July 14, 2026 at 3:30 p.m. in **Department 502**

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

# **Tentative Rulings for Department 403**

Begin at the next page

(34)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***Tiwana v. Muskan Food & Fuel, Inc.***  
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG01290

Hearing Date: June 2, 2026 (Dept. 403)

Motion: Demurrer and Motion to Strike Third Amended Complaint of Defendants Rajdeep Singh, Navdeep Singh, and Muskan Food & Fuel, Inc.; Joinder by Defendant Gurmej Singh.

**Tentative Ruling:**

To strike the Third Amended Complaint, filed without leave of court, in its entirety, without prejudice to plaintiff's right to file a motion for leave to amend under Code of Civil Procedure section 473. (Code Civ. Proc. § 436, subd. (b).) To find the demurrer to the Third Amended Complaint moot.

**Explanation:**

A defendant may move to strike a pleading or allegations from a pleading in two situations: (a) the allegation is "irrelevant, false, or improper" or "superfluous" or "abusive" and (b) where the "pleading was not drawn in conformity with the laws of the state or a court rule." (Code Civ. Proc. § 436, subd. (a), (b).)

On September 3, 2025, the court issued its ruling sustaining the demurrer of defendants Rajdeep Singh, Navdeep Singh, and Muskan Food & Fuel, Inc. to the First Amended Complaint. The court granted leave to amend the complaint to allow plaintiff to cure the defects identified in the demurrer with the exception of the Tenth Cause of Action. On September 23, 2025 plaintiff filed the Second Amended Complaint. Subsequently, on December 3, 2025 plaintiff filed the Third Amended Complaint. Leave of court to file the Third Amended Complaint was not sought by stipulation of the parties or by noticed motion.

Defendants' motion to strike argues that causes of action were added in the Third Amended Complaint not previously pled in the First Amended Complaint and for which leave to amend was not granted. The court agrees and finds further that the entire Third Amended Complaint filed without leave of court is subject to strike as not filed in conformity with Code of Civil Procedure section 472, allowing amendments to the complaint once before the filing of a responsive pleading. The First Amended Complaint was filed June 4, 2025 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 472. The right to amend without leave of court is limited to the original complaint and does not extend to amended complaints. (*Hedwall v. PCMV, LLC* (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 564, 571.)

Therefore, the Third Amended Complaint was not drawn in conformity with Code of Civil Procedure section 472, subdivision (a) and is stricken.



(48)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***P.C., a minor, by and through this Guardian ad litem, Salina Colin v. Fresno Unified School District et al.***

Superior Court Case No. 24CECG04090

Hearing Date: June 2, 2026 (Dept. 403)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant. (Code of Civil Proc., § 372; Probate Code, § 2504.) Petitioner is directed to file new proposed orders within five days of service of the order by the clerk. No appearances necessary.

To set a status conference for Wednesday, August 26, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in **Department 502**, for confirmation of deposit of the funds into a blocked account. If the Acknowledgment of Receipt of Order and Funds for Deposit in Blocked Account (MC-356), is filed at least five court days before the hearing, the status conference will come off calendar.


**Explanation:**

The petition appears to be sufficiently stated and the proposed court order approving the disposition of proceeds appears complete. However, a completed proposed order to deposit funds in a blocked account (MC-355) must be filed.

The court notes that the petition contained a request for all funds to be disbursed to petitioner Salina Colin to provide for plaintiff P.C.'s needs. As the proposed order does not address or reflect such a disposition, the court disregards the request.

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:          on     6-1-26    .

(Judge's initials) (Date)

