

**Tentative Rulings for October 15, 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.*

25CECG01764      Wells Fargo Bank N.A. v. Key Island, LLC

---

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

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

## **Tentative Rulings for Department 503**

Begin at the next page

(37)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Nirvail Singh v. Sandeep Singh**  
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG03123

Hearing Date: October 15, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motion: By Intervenor for Leave to Amend

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant. Intervenor is granted leave to file its First Amended Complaint in Intervention within 10 days of the clerk's service of the minute order. New allegations/language must be set in **boldface** type.

**Explanation:**

On November 19, 2024, the Court granted Intervenor National Liability and Fire Insurance Company leave to intervene in this action. On July 24, 2025, Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. Intervenor seeks to amend its complaint in intervention accordingly. Trial courts have discretion to permit amendments to pleadings in the interest of justice. (Code Civ. Proc., § 473; *Hirsa v. Superior Court* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 486, 488.) There is a strong policy favoring liberality regarding amendments to pleadings. (*Foxborough v. Van Atta* (1994) Cal.App.4th 271, 230.) Here, the amended complaint in intervention is to correspond with the amended complaint. The Court grants the motion for leave to file an amended complaint in intervention.

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 10/13/2025.  
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(47)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Benny Valles, JR v Mary Haynes**  
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG00474

Hearing Date: October 15, 2025 (Dept. 503)

Motion: (1) By Plaintiff to Compel Responses to Special Interrogatories, Set One from each Defendant, and (2) by Plaintiff to Deem Admitted the Admissions in Request for Admissions, Set One from each Defendant

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant. Within 10 days of the clerk's service of this minute order, defendants Jeffrey Valles and Mary Haynes shall serve verified responses to the Special Interrogatories, Set One.

The truth of the matters specified in the Requests for Admission, Set One, are to be deemed admitted unless defendants serve, before the hearing, proposed responses to the requests for admission that are in substantial compliance with Code of Civil Procedure section 2033.220.

To impose reasonable sanctions in the sum of \$620 against defendants Jeffrey Valles and Mary Haynes and in favor of plaintiffs, Benny G. Valles, Jr and Karen M. Valles, and to be paid to plaintiffs' counsel within 30 days of service of the minute order by the clerk.

**Explanation**

On May 23, 2025, plaintiffs propounded the First Set of Special Interrogatories and the First Set of Requests for Admission on defendants, due June 23, 2025. No responses to either have been provided.

Accordingly, an order compelling plaintiff to provide responses without objections (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 2030.290, subd. (a), 2031.300, subd. (a)), is warranted. Similarly, plaintiffs' motion to deem admitted the request for admission, set one, must be granted. (Code of Civ. Proc., § 2033.280; see also *St. Mary v. Superior Court* (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 762, 778.), unless responses in substantial conformity with Code of Civil Procedure section 2033.220 are served prior to the hearing.

The court may award sanctions against a party that fails to provide discovery responses. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2023.010, subds. (d), (h).) The court must impose a monetary sanction against the party or attorney, or both, whose failure to respond necessitated the motion to deem matters admitted. (Code Civ. Proc., §2033.280, subd. (c).) Where responding party provided the requested discovery after the motion to compel was filed, the court is authorized to award sanctions. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1348(a).)

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: JS on 10/13/2025  
(Judge's initials) (Date)