

TENTATIVE RULINGS for CIVIL LAW and MOTION
July 26, 2016

Pursuant to Yolo County Local Rules, the following tentative rulings will become the order of the court unless, by 4:00 p.m. on the court day before the hearing, a party requests a hearing and notifies other counsel of the hearing. To request a hearing, you must contact the clerk of the department where the hearing is to be held. Copies of the tentative rulings will be posted on Yolo Court's Website, at www.yolo.courts.ca.gov. If you are scheduled to appear and there is no tentative ruling in your case, you should appear as scheduled.

Please take note that Yolo Superior Court is now located at 1000 Main Street, in Woodland.

Telephone number for the clerk in Department Eleven: (530) 406-6843

TENTATIVE RULING

Case: City of Woodland v. Crum
CV ED 16-558

Hearing Date: July 26, 2016 Department Eleven
9:00 a.m.

Plaintiff City of Woodland's motion for an order for possession is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff has satisfied the elements of Code of Civil Procedure section 1255.410(d)(2). (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1230.010, et seq., 1240.110, et seq.; Gov. Code, §§ 37350.5, 40404; Decl. of David B. Wraa, ¶¶ 1-3, Exh. B; Decl. of Ken Hiatt, ¶¶ 1-19.)

If no hearing is requested, this tentative ruling is effective immediately. No formal order pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.1312, or further notice is required.

TENTATIVE RULING

Case: City of Woodland v. Milton
CV ED 16-557

Hearing Date: July 26, 2016 Department Eleven 9:00 a.m.

Plaintiff City of Woodland's unopposed motion for an order for possession is **GRANTED**. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1230.010, et seq., 1240.110, et seq., 1255.410, subd. (d)(1); Gov. Code, §§ 37350.5, 40404; Decl. of David B. Wraa, ¶¶ 1-3, Exh. B; Decl. of Ken Hiatt, ¶¶ 1-19.)

If no hearing is requested, this tentative ruling is effective immediately. No formal order pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.1312, or further notice is required.

TENTATIVE RULING

Case: **Ramos Oil Co., Inc. v. Amiri**
Case No. CV CV 10-1246
Hearing Date: July 26, 2016 Department Eleven 9:00 a.m.

Movants Nasrin Amiri and Star Holding Co., LLC's motion for a protective order as to the order of examination directed to them is **DENIED**. Movants fail to show that any of the stated grounds warrant a protective order as to the order of examination. (Code Civ. Proc., § 708.200.)

However, because movants have offered uncontradicted evidence that compliance with the subpoena duces tecum would be oppressive and unduly burdensome, the motion for a protective order as to the subpoena is **GRANTED**. (*Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Superior Court (Rolfe)* (1968) 263 Cal.App.2d 12, 19; *West Pico Furniture Co. of Los Angeles v. Superior Court (Pacific Finance Loans)* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 407, 419.)

The notice of motion does not provide notice of this Court's tentative ruling system as required by Local Rule 11.4(b). Counsel for moving party is ordered to notify the opposing party or parties immediately of the tentative ruling system and to be available at the hearing, in person or by telephone, in the event the opposing party or parties appear without following the procedures set forth in Local Rule 11.4(a).