

TENTATIVE RULINGS for CIVIL LAW and MOTION
August 18, 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 Ten: (530) 406-6722

TENTATIVE RULING

CASE: Arnold v. All Phase Security, Inc.
Case No. CV CV 15-1661

Hearing Date: August 18, 2016 Department Ten 9:00 a.m.

Plaintiffs John A. Arnold and Debi S. Arnold's application for a right to attach order is **GRANTED**. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 482.030 et seq., 483.010 et seq., 484.010 et seq.; Decl. of Michael v. Brady, ¶¶ 1-9.) The amount to be secured by the attachment is \$330,000. Plaintiffs are directed to submit a proposed order with the court. The order will be signed upon plaintiffs' filing of a \$10,000 undertaking. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 489.210, 489.220, subd. (a).)

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: Burton v. City of Davis Waste Water Treatment Plant
Case No. CV CV 14-1170

Hearing Date: August 18, 2016 Department Ten 9:00 a.m.

Defendants City of Davis and County of Yolo's motions for summary judgment are **CONTINUED** on the Court's own motion to be heard on August 23, 2016, at 9:00 a.m. in Department 11.

TENTATIVE RULING

Case: Richmond-Luwisch v. Richmond
Case No. CV PT 15-1411

Hearing Date: August 18, 2016 Department Ten 9:00 a.m.

Respondent Pamela Richmond's motion for attorneys' fees is **GRANTED**. (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.6, subd. (s).) Petitioner Scott Richmond Luwisch does not dispute any specific entries or

show that any of the entries are erroneous, excessive, or unreasonable. His references to counsel's work as "shoddy" are not sufficiently specific to support an objection to the fees claimed. (Petitioner's Objections, ¶¶ 2, and 3 (page 3); *Jones v. Union Bank* (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 542, 550.)

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.