

Tentative Rulings for September 1, 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.

25CECG02375 *Farias v. General Motors, LLC* is continued to Tuesday, October 6, 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

(34)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Hernandez v. State Center Community College District, et al.***
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG00846

Hearing Date: September 1, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: by Defendant to Compel Further Deposition Testimony and
Production of Documents

Tentative Ruling:

To deny Defendant State Center Community College District's motion to compel answers to depositions questions as to questions nos. 9, 10, and 11.

To find the remainder of the motion moot in light of the parties' representations that they reached a resolution prior to the hearing of this motion.

Explanation:

The deposition of Plaintiff Rozanne Hernandez commenced on October 28, 2025. During the course of the deposition several categories of questions were unanswered by plaintiff on advice of counsel and objections were raised with respect to the production of certain categories of documents requested with the notice of deposition. Defendant State Center Community College District ("SCCCD") filed the motion at bench to compel a further response to eleven deposition questions and four categories of documents. During the pendency of the motion the parties continued to meet and confer and plaintiff served further responses to written discovery and submitted to a second day of deposition resolving the disputes raised in this motion with respect to all but three deposition questions.

The three questions at issue pertain to plaintiff's personal relationship with non-party Robert Pimentel. Defendant argues the information relating to the nature of the relationship is relevant as a potential alternative cause of plaintiff's emotional distress. Plaintiff stands on her privacy objections raised during the deposition.

SCCCD contends plaintiff has opened the door into discovery regarding alternate causes of her emotional distress by seeking damages for emotional injuries in this action. (*Vinson v. Superior Court* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 833, 840.) However, the questions at issue bear no obvious connection to plaintiff's emotional distress. "[A]n implicit waiver of a party's constitutional rights [to privacy] encompasses only discovery directly relevant to the plaintiff's claim and essential to fair resolution of the lawsuit." (*Id.* at p. 842, citation omitted.) Defendant has provided no evidence beyond speculation that an alleged intimate relationship with a non-party was a cause of the same emotional distress plaintiff alleges in this action.

As the questions bear no direct relevance to plaintiff's claims of discrimination and hostile workplace based on gender, age, and race or her related claims of retaliation,

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.

Issued By: KCK **on** 08/31/26
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(29)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Villagomez v. Villagomez**
Superior Court Case No. 22CECG00485

Hearing Date: September 1, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motions (x2):	Motion to Amend Expert Designation Motion to Reopen Discovery
---------------	--

Tentative Ruling:

To take both motions off calendar, as no moving papers have been filed.

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: KCK on 08/31/26.
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(29)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Mukai v. Nonini***
Superior Court Case No. 23CECG05196

Hearing Date: September 1, 2026 (Dept. 501)

Motion: Motion to Take Deposition

Tentative Ruling:

To take off calendar, as no moving papers have been filed.

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: KCK **on** 08/31/26
(Judge's initials) (Date)