

Tentative Rulings for September 22, 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.

24CECG03310	<i>Hovannisian v. Comerica Bank</i> is continued to Tuesday, October 27, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 502.
-------------	--

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

Tentative Rulings for Department 502

Begin at the next page

(47)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Solar Tech Energy Systems, Inc. v. Muyu Wu**
Superior Court Case No. 26CECG00952

Hearing Date: September 22, 2026 (Dept. 503)

Motions(x3): Cross-Defendant Solar Tech Energy Systems, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Arbitration and Request for Stay
Defendant Palmetto Solar LLC's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Request for Stay
Defendant and Cross-Complainant Muyu Wu's Motion to Stay Action Pending Arbitration

Tentative Ruling:

To grant all three motions and stay the action.

Wu filed no opposition to Solar Tech Energy Systems, Inc.'s ("Solar Tech") Motion to Compel Arbitration. Nor did Wu file an opposition to Palmetto Solar LLC's Motion to Compel Arbitration. Instead, Wu filed her own Motion to Stay Action Pending Arbitration and previously commenced an AAA arbitration asserting the same claims alleged in her Cross-Complaint. The parties therefore do not dispute the dispositive point: every claim remaining in the Cross-Complaint should be resolved in arbitration.

Accordingly, this action is stayed pending the completion of arbitration.

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: img on 9-21-26
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(37)

Intended Ruling

Re: **Noah Williams**
Superior Court Case No. 26CU02276

Hearing Date: September 22, 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 September 16, 2026, according to the petition, the minor has fully recovered from injuries. Petitioner has attached medical records following the accident in which the minor was diagnosed with a hip contusion and petitioner was advised to follow up if pain persisted. There are no medical records or declarations indicating the minor recovered from this injury.

Additionally, while reimbursement for medical expenses is not sought, there are no records demonstrating that all medical expenses were satisfied.

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: img on 9-21-28
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(36)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Mohammed v. Maple Apartment Group, LLC, et al.**
Superior Court Case No. 23CECG04543

Hearing Date: September 22, 2026 (Dept. 502)

Motion: by Defendant Regency Property Management to Enforce Settlement

Tentative Ruling:

To deny as moot. (Code Civ. Proc., § 664.6.)

Explanation:

Defendant Regency Property Management ("Defendant") seeks to enforce a settlement entered with plaintiff Raj Mohammed ("Plaintiff"). The court initially notes that the names of the parties are handwritten and difficult to ascertain. The agreement appears to provide: "This Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement (the Agreement) is entered into as of this 15 day of October 2023 by and between Raj Mohammed and Fresno 62 Investments, LLC, Fresno Property Management Corp., Maple Apartment Group, LLC "Defendants" (hereinafter collectively referred to as "the Parties")." (Peel Decl., ¶ 3, Ex. B, ¶ 1.) It is further noted that the signature line for defendants is left blank and there is no reference to the moving parties' attorney in the agreement. Thus, it is unclear if the moving defendant, Fresno Regency Property Management, is actually a party to the settlement agreement presented. Nonetheless, on April 14, 2026, the matter as to Defendant was dismissed.

The terms of the settlement provide that the matter stay active until the settlement is completed. (Peel Decl., ¶ 3, Ex. B, ¶ 10.) From the terms of the settlement, the entry of a dismissal of Defendant suggests that Plaintiff believes the matter is concluded. Accordingly, the motion is denied as moot. The request for attorney fees is denied as Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed the action as to Defendant and Defendant does not appear to be a party to the settlement agreement presented.

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: img on 9-21-26
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(37)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Ban v. Ming**
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG04019

Hearing Date: September 22, 2026 (Dept. 502)

Motion: By Defendant/Cross-Complainant for an Order Deeming Admissions Admitted and for Monetary Sanctions

Tentative Ruling:

To grant defendant/cross-complainant Roem Ming's request to deem Requests for Admissions admitted. The truth of the matters specified in the Requests for Admissions, Set One, are to be deemed admitted unless plaintiff/cross-defendant Jian Ban serves, before the hearing, a proposed response to the Requests for Admission that is in substantial compliance with Code of Civil Procedure section 2033.220.

To impose monetary sanctions in favor of defendant/cross-complainant Ming and against plaintiff/cross-defendant Ban. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2023.010, subd. (d), 2030.290, subd. (c), 2031.300, subd. (c).) Ban is ordered to pay \$400 in sanctions to the Law Offices of Cathy Cowin, within 30 days of the clerk's service of the minute order.

Explanation:

Requests for Admissions

Defendant served Requests for Admissions on Plaintiff on July 15, 2026. As of August 20, 2026 no responses had been received. The court has no information that any responses have been received as of the date of this ruling.

Failure to timely respond to requests for admissions results in a waiver of all objections to the requests, and upon proper motion the court *shall* deem them admitted. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.280.) The statutory language leaves no room for discretion. (*Tobin v. Oris* (1992) 3 Cal.App.4th 814, 828.) However, the court may relieve the party who fails to file a timely response if, before entry of the order deeming the requested matters admitted, the party in default 1) moves for relief from waiver and shows that the failure to serve a timely response was due to "mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect; and 2) the party has served a response in "substantial compliance with Code of Civil Procedure Section 2033.220. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.280(a)-(c); see *Brigante v. Huang* (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1569, 1584.) Here, no responses have been received to date.

Sanctions

Sanctions are mandatory against a party whose failure to respond timely necessitates a motion to deem admitted. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2033.280, subd. (c).)

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1030(a), this also applies where no opposition to the motion was filed. The sanction amount awarded allows \$60 in filing fees. The court finds it reasonable to allow for a total of one hour for preparation of the motion at the hourly rate of \$340 provided by counsel. Therefore, the amount in sanctions is \$400. In the event a hearing is necessary, the court will consider the costs incurred as a result.

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: img on 9-21-26
(Judge's initials) (Date)