

**Tentative Rulings for September 9, 2025**  
**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.*

24CECG03603      *Cruz v. Bibiano* (Dept. 503)

---

The court has continued the following cases. The deadlines for opposition and reply papers will remain the same as for the original hearing date.

24CECG03223      *Paula Yang v. Yolo Sushi Bar & Karaoke* is continued to Thursday, September 18, 2025, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 503.

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

## **Tentative Rulings for Department 503**

Begin at the next page

(46)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***Arevkht Khachatryan v. BMW of North America, LLC***  
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG00499

Hearing Date: September 9, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motion: by Defendant BMW of North America, LLC  
(1) to Compel Deposition of Plaintiff Arsen Antonyan  
(2) to Compel Deposition of Plaintiff Arevkht Khachatryan  
(3) to Compel Vehicle Inspection

**Tentative Ruling:**

To take all motions off calendar due to defendant's failure to comply with Local Rule 2.1.17.

**Explanation:**

Defendant BMW of North America, LLC ("defendant") moves to compel the depositions of both plaintiffs, Arsen Antonyan and Arevkht Khachatryan ("plaintiffs"), as well as to compel a vehicle inspection of the Subject Vehicle. Defendant brings these motions under Code of Civil Procedure sections 2025.450 and 2031.300, respectively. Code of Civil Procedure section 2025.450 provides that a deposing party may move for an order compelling a party deponent's attendance and testimony if the party noticed for deposition fails to serve a valid objection and further fails to appear for or proceed with the examination. Under Code of Civil Procedure section 2031.300, a party making a demand for inspection may move for an order compelling response to the demand if the party to whom the demand is directed fails to serve a timely response.

"No motion under sections 2017.010 through 2036.050, inclusive, of the California Code of Civil Procedure shall be heard in a civil unlimited case unless the moving party has first requested an informal Pretrial Discovery Conference with the Court and such request has either been denied and permission to file the motion is granted via court order or the discovery dispute has not been resolved as a result of the Conference and permission to file the motion is expressly granted. This rule shall not apply [to]... Motions to compel the deposition of a duly noticed party or subpoenaed person(s) who have not timely served an objection pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 2025.410; [and] Motions to compel initial responses to...requests for production." (Fresno Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 2.1.17.)

Here, Defendant served its notices on plaintiffs on April 8, 2025. (Telkikar Decls., ¶ 3, Exhs. A.) Plaintiffs timely objected to the depositions, and responded with objections to the vehicle inspection. (*Id.*, ¶ 4, Exhs. B.) The timeliness and validity of the plaintiffs' objections are not contested by defendant. As such, these motions do not fall under any exception to Fresno Superior Court Local Rule 2.1.17, and defendant is required to first request an informal Pretrial Discovery Conference and obtain leave to file the instant

motions to compel. Accordingly, the motions are improperly before the court and shall not be heard. The motions are ordered off calendar.

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:** JS **on** 9/5/2025.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(47)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Jose Ramirez Nunez vs Kamren Taylor**  
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG02483

Hearing Date: September 9, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motion: Petition for compromise for Marcos Abraham Ramirez

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant petition. Order signed. No appearance necessary. The court sets a status conference for Tuesday December 9, 2025, at 3:30 p.m., in Department 503, for confirmation of deposit of the minors' funds into the blocked accounts. If Petitioner files the Acknowledgment of Receipt of Order and Funds for Deposit in Blocked Account (MC-356) at least five court days before the hearing, the status conference will come off calendar.

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:** JS on 9/5/2025.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(36)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***Bairos, et al. v. Pitman, et al.***  
Superior Court Case No. 15CECG02642

Hearing Date: September 9, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motions (x3): Petitions for Compromise of Minors and Disabled Adult

**Tentative Ruling:**

To continue the matter to Thursday, October 9, 2025, in Department 403, at 3:30 p.m., to allow petitioners an opportunity to file the proposed structured settlement agreements for minors Peyton Pederson and Kennedy Fontes. All paperwork must be filed no later than on Thursday, October 2, 2025.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1312 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: JS on 9/5/2025 .  
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(27)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: ***In re Joycelyn Anderson***  
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG03873

Hearing Date: September 9, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant the petition. Order Signed. No appearances necessary.

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: JS on 9/8/2025.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)