

**TENTATIVE RULINGS for LAW and MOTION**  
**November 4, 2025**

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](http://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.

Telephone number for the clerk in Department Eleven	(530) 406-6843
Telephone number for the clerk in Department Fourteen	(530) 406-6800

**TENTATIVE RULING**

**Case:** **Dang v. California Department of Transportation**  
**Case No. CV-2022-1740**

**Hearing Date:** **November 4, 2025** **Department Eleven** **9:00 a.m.**

---

Plaintiff Audrey Jade Dang’s request for judicial notice is **GRANTED**. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, 453.)

Plaintiff’s motion for leave to file first amended complaint is **GRANTED**. (Code Civ. Proc., § 473, subd. (a)(1).) “Generally, leave to amend should be liberally granted.” (*Miles v. City of Los Angeles* (2020) 56 Cal.App.5th 728, 739.) While “unwarranted delay justifies denial of leave to amend,” plaintiff has sufficiently explained her delay in seeking leave to amend. (*Ibid.*; Roussas decl., ¶¶ 6-7.) Further, plaintiff complied with the procedural requirements for requesting leave to amend. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1324; Roussas decl., ¶¶ 3-9, Exhibits A-I.) Finally, it is in the interest of justice to allow plaintiff to amend her complaint. (Code Civ. Proc., § 473, subd. (a)(1); *Morgan v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County* (1959) 172 Cal.App.2d 527, 530; see also *Laabs v. City of Victorville* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1242, 1258; Roussas decl., ¶¶ 3-4 & 8-9, Exhibits F & G.) However, there is significant prejudice to defendants, given their pending motions for summary judgment and the upcoming trial date. (See *Melican v. Regents of University of California* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 168, 175; see, e.g., Johnson decl., ¶ 4.) Therefore, as a condition of the amendment, the Court will continue trial and permit defendants to refile their motions for summary judgment. (Code Civ. Proc., § 473, subd. (a)(2).)

Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to file the proposed first amended complaint, lodged with her motion, by **November 7, 2025**. (Roussas decl., ¶ 9, Exhibit G.) The motion for summary judgment hearings set for November 13, 2025, and December 11, 2025, are **VACATED**.

A Trial Setting Conference is now set for **March 30, 2026**, at 9:00 am in Department 11. The parties are ordered to meet and confer to arrive at a trial date or dates that work for all parties, and to agree on the expected length of trial from motions in limine through closing arguments for all parties.

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

**TENTATIVE RULING**

**Case:** T.O. v. County of Yolo et al.  
Case No. CV-2022-1885

**Hearing Date:** November 4, 2025      **Department Eleven**      **9:00 a.m.**

Plaintiff T.O.’s request for judicial notice is **GRANTED**. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, subd. (d), 453.)

Defendant County of Yolo’s motion for judgment on the pleadings is **DENIED**. (Code Civ. Proc., § 438.)

The Court finds that defendant has not met its burden to show the first amended complaint fails to state facts sufficient to support a cause of action against defendant. (Gov. Code, §§ 815.2, 815.6; see *State of California v. Superior Court* (1984) 150 Cal.App.3d 848, 854 [Government Code section 815.6 contains a three- pronged test for determining whether liability may be imposed on a public entity]; see also *Hood v. Gonzales* (2019) 43 Cal.App.5th 57, 73 – 74 [every brief should contain a legal argument with citation of authorities on the points made and if none is furnished on a particular point, the court may treat it as waived and pass it without consideration]; FAC, ¶¶ 18, 21.)

The Court also finds that defendant fails to show it is entitled to discretionary act immunity as a matter of law. (Gov. Code, §§ 815.2, 820.2; *Runyon v. Superior Court* (1986) 187 Cal.App.3d 878, 882; see *D.G. v. Orange County Social Services Agency* (2025) 108 Cal.App.5th 465, 473 – 474, citing *Johnson v. State of California* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 782, 794–795, fn. 8 [the decision to apply discretionary act immunity requires a two-part analysis, with the second part of the analysis being a determination as to whether the employee who made the decision at issue “actually reached a considered decision knowingly and deliberately encountering the risks that give rise to plaintiffs complaint.”]; accord *Scott v. County of Los Angeles* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 125, 140 – 141.) Plaintiff alleges that defendant was put on notice of plaintiff’s alleged sexual abuse at the foster home where plaintiff was placed, and nothing was done; thus, there are no discretionary acts that have been alleged. (FAC, ¶ 29.)

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

**TENTATIVE RULING**

**Case:** **Vlasov et al. v. Bee World Inc., dba Sunrise Logistics et al.**  
**Case No. PR-2024-3364**

**Hearing Date:** **November 4, 2025** **Department Fourteen** **9:00 a.m.**

---

The petitioner, Irina Vlasov, and the minor, Alena Vlasov, are **DIRECTED TO APPEAR** (in person or by Zoom) (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 7.952; YCR 2.4.) If the parties fail to appear at the hearing and the Court has not excused their personal appearance, the petition will be denied without prejudice. No request for a hearing is required.

**TENTATIVE RULING**

**Case:** **Vlasov et al. v. Bee World Inc., dba Sunrise Logistics et al.**  
**Case No. PR-2024-3364**

**Hearing Date:** **November 4, 2025** **Department Fourteen** **9:00 a.m.**

---

The petitioner, Irina Vlasov, and the minor, Andrew Vlasov, are **DIRECTED TO APPEAR** (in person or by Zoom) (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 7.952; YCR 2.4.) If the parties fail to appear at the hearing and the Court has not excused their personal appearance, the petition will be denied without prejudice. No request for a hearing is required.