

Tentative Rulings for June 2, 2026
Department 502

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.

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 24CECG03246 | <i>Pablo Meza v. City of Sanger</i> is continued to Thursday, June 4, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 502. |
| 24CECG03956 | <i>David Valencia Arevalo v. General Motors LLC</i> is continued to Thursday, June 4, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 502. |
| 25CECG05615 | <i>NNN Capital Fund I, LLC v. Bmark 2018-B7 East Street, LLC</i> is continued to Tuesday, June 23, 2026 at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501 |

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

Tentative Rulings for Department 502

Begin at the next page

(37)

Intended Ruling

Re: ***In the Matter of Gomez***
Superior Court Case No. 26CU00752

Hearing Date: June 2, 2026 (Dept. 502)

Motion: Expedited Petition to Compromise Claim of Minor

Tentative Ruling:

To deny the petition, without prejudice, for the reasons explained below. In the event that oral argument is requested the minor is excused from appearing.

Explanation:

As identified in the Intended Ruling issued May 22, 2026, according to the petition, the minor has fully recovered from injuries including bilateral ear pain, neck pain, and lower back pain received in a car collision on January 16, 2025. The minor is to receive a gross settlement of \$15,000 with the balance of the settlement after attorney fees and litigation costs to be deposited in a blocked account. There are several issues with the petition that prevent approval.

The Petition indicates that the balance will be deposited into a blocked account. Petitioner failed to include Attachment 19b(2) to identify where these funds will be deposited.

The Petition at Item 9a indicates that the minor has recovered completely from her injuries, however, the most recent doctor's report, from December 17, 2025, indicates the minor is still experiencing bilateral ear pain and moderate neck and back pain. Dr. Roofian advised follow up for the ear pain with an ear, nose, and throat specialist. There is no indication of any further treatment or that the ear pain resolved. There is no declaration from the petitioner confirming the minor's injuries resolved without further treatment or a well-child visit with her regular doctor dated after December 17, 2025.

The Petition requests expenses in the amount of \$432.80. Counsel generally claims these fees include fees for obtaining medical records and billing, document preparation, postage and delivery expenses, telephone and communication expenses, and administrative costs. No itemized statement was provided. The court does not intend to approve charges against the minor's recovery that are unreasonable. (Prob. Code, § 3601.)

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

