

Tentative Rulings for December 18, 2025
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.

23CECG05268 *Parminder Kaler v. Carmax Auto Superstores, Inc.* is continued to Wednesday, December 31, 2025, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 501.

25CECG04077 *In RE: The Petition of CBC Settlement funding, LLC* is continued to Wednesday, January 7, 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

(20)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Wheeler v. Spane et al.**
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG02378

Hearing Date: December 18, 2025 (Dept. 501)

Motion: by Defendant Jessica Felmus for Protective Order

Tentative Ruling:

To deny.

If oral argument is timely requested, such argument will be entertained on Friday, December 19, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 501.

Explanation:

Local Rule 2.1.17(A) provides, subject to limited exceptions that do not apply here, "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."

Jessica Felmus moves for a protective order staying all discovery until she has exhausted her challenges to the pleadings. The motion is brought pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 2030.090, 2031.060, and 2033.080, clearly bringing the motion within the scope of Rule 2.1.17. Felmus filed the motion without first requesting a Pretrial Discovery Conference.

Moreover, the motion is untimely – it must be made *before* the deadline to respond, not after responses have been served. (See Code Civ. Proc., §§ 2030.290, subd. (a), 2031.060, subd. (a), and 2033.080, subd. (a).) Having responded, the ball is in plaintiffs' court to move to compel further responses. And Felmus failed to show that she met and conferred in an effort to resolve the issue outside of court. (Ibid.) The only meet and confer mentioned is plaintiffs' 9/18/25 meet and confer letter. (Felmus Decl., ¶ 4, Exhs. A, B.) Felmus apparently did not meet and confer at all regarding the protective order prior to filing the motion. For these reasons the motion is denied.

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: DTT **on** 12/11/2025 .
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(35)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Hedrington v. Woolman et al.***
Superior Court Case No. 25CECG01717/COMPLEX

Hearing Date: December 18, 2025 (Dept. 501)

Motion: by Plaintiff Orlonzo Hedrington to Compel Initial Responses to Request for Production from Nonparty Holt Lumber, Inc.

Tentative Ruling:

To deny.

If oral argument is timely requested, such argument will be entertained on Friday, December 19, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 501.

Explanation:

Plaintiff Orlonzo Hedrington ("plaintiff") seeks to compel responses to an inspection demand against **nonparty** Holt Lumber, Inc. (Hedrington Decl., ¶ 2.) However, plaintiff moves under portions of the Civil Discovery act pertaining to **parties** to the action. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2031.010 *et seq.*) Even had Holt Lumber, Inc., been a party to this action, inspection demands by a plaintiff are allowed only after 10 days after service of summons, or appearance, by a party. (*Id.*, § 2031.020, subd. (a).) Nonparty discovery is otherwise governed by Code of Civil Procedure section 2020.010 *et seq.* which is not referenced in the moving papers. The discovery in question is not attached, and therefore does not provide further clarification. The motion is denied.

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: DTT on 12/16/2025.
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(27)

Tentative Ruling

Re: **Jesus Bise v. Henry Cox / Lead Case**
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG01018

Hearing Date: December 18, 2025 (Dept. 501)

Motion: General Motion - Interpleader

Tentative Ruling:

The motion is taken off calendar as it does not appear from the court's record that moving papers were filed.

If oral argument is timely requested, such argument will be entertained on Friday, December 19, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 501.

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: DTT on 12/17/2025.
(Judge's initials) (Date)