

TENTATIVE RULINGS for LAW and MOTION
April 2, 2026

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.

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: **Gorenberg v. City of West Sacramento**
Case No. CV2026-0728

Hearing Date: **April 2, 2026** **Department Fourteen** **9:00 a.m.**

Petitioner Carol Gorenberg’s unopposed petition for order relieving petitioner from provisions of Government Code section 945.4 is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. (Gov. Code, § 946.6.) A petition made to the court for an order relieving a petitioner from Government Code section 945.4 requires the petition to show: (1) the application was made to the board under Government Code section 911.4 and was denied or deemed denied; (2) the reason for petitioner’s failure to present the claim within the time limit specified in Government Code section 911.2; and (3) the information required by Government Code section 910. (Gov. Code, § 946.6, subd. (b).) Although petitioner’s petition provides the information required by Government Code section 946.6, subdivisions (1) and (2), the Court finds that the petition fails to provide the information required by Government Code section 946.6, subdivision (3).

The notice of petition provides notice of this Court’s tentative ruling system. However, the notice does not contain the required language pursuant to Local Rule 11.2(b) (as amended, eff. Jan. 1, 2023). Counsel for moving party, or the moving party if unrepresented by counsel, is ordered to notify the opposing party or parties immediately of the tentative ruling system.

If no hearing is requested, and no party appears at the hearing, 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: **Mota v. City of West Sacramento**
Case No. CV2025-1324

Hearing Date: **April 2, 2026** **Department Fourteen** **9:00 a.m.**

Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company’s motion to strike portions of plaintiffs Harold Stark and Lillian Stark’s (collectively, “plaintiffs”) first amended complaint for damages (“FAC”) is **GRANTED IN PART WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 435, 436.) First, pursuant to the parties’ agreement during their phone call on February 12, 2026, the Court strikes, without leave to amend, paragraph 48 of plaintiffs’ FAC. (Schroeder further decl. [filed March 12, 2026], ¶¶ 3-4; Dingwall decl. [filed March 20, 2026], ¶ 3.) Second, as to plaintiffs’ second cause of action, the Court finds that plaintiffs have alleged sufficient facts to show defendant acted with “a conscious disregard of the probability of injury to others.” (*Peterson v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 147, 160; see also *Hoch v. Allied-Signal, Inc.* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 48, 61; Civ. Code, § 3294; FAC, ¶¶ 25-30, 32-37, 41, & 50-55.) While plaintiffs have not alleged “the advance knowledge and conscious disregard, authorization, ratification or act of oppression, fraud, or malice [by] an officer, director, or managing agent of the corporation,” defendant has not established that this information must be alleged in the FAC to assert a request for punitive damages. (Civ. Code, § 3294, subd. (b); see *Cruz v. Homebase* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 160, 167.)

Defendant shall file an answer to plaintiffs’ FAC by no later than **April 13, 2026** (10 days after the hearing). (See Code Civ. Proc., § 472a; see also Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1320(g).)

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: State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Katirewa
Case No. CV2025-0416

Hearing Date: April 2, 2026 Department Fourteen 9:00 a.m.

Parties are **DIRECTED TO APPEAR.**

TENTATIVE RULING

Case: Treadway et al v. Clark Pacific
Case No. CV2025-0979

Hearing Date: April 2, 2026 **Department Eleven** **9:00 a.m.**

The Court rules on plaintiffs Christopher Treadway and Justin Hernandez' evidentiary objections in support of their opposition to defendant Clark Pacific's demurrer to plaintiffs' amended PAGA representative complaint as follows:

- Plaintiffs' objections one through nine are **SUSTAINED**. (See *Ion Equip. Corp. v. Nelson* (1980) 110 Cal.App.3d 868, 881 [no extrinsic evidence can be considered upon demurrer]; *SKF Farms v. Superior Court* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 902, 905 [extraneous matters unconnected to the complaint may not be considered upon demurrer].)
- The Court declines to rule on objection ten as the Court did not rely upon the paragraph challenged in determining this demurrer.

The Court rules on defendant's request for judicial notice as follows:

- As to request numbers one and four through thirteen, the Court **DENIES** these requests because the proffered documents are not relevant to the Court's determination of this demurrer. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, 453; see *People v. Rowland* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 238, 268, fn. 6 [*Rowland*]; see also *Malek Media Group LLC v. AXQG Corp.* (2020) 58 Cal.App.5th 817, 825 [*Malek*]; *People ex rel. Lockyer v. Shamrock Foods Co.* (2000) 24 Cal.4th 415, 422 [a precondition to the taking of judicial notice in either its mandatory or permissive form must be relevant to a material issue].)
- As to request number two, the Court **GRANTS** defendant's request. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, 453.)
- As to request number three, the Court **DENIES** defendant's request. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, subd. (h), 453; see *The Travelers Indemnity Co. of Connecticut v. Navigators Specialty Ins. Co.* (2021) 70 Cal.App.5th 341, 354-355 ["The existence and terms of a private agreement are not facts that are not reasonably subject to dispute and that can be determined by indisputable accuracy."]; see also *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1145 - 1146.)

Plaintiffs' request for judicial notice is **DENIED** because the proffered documents are not relevant to the Court's determination of the demurrer. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, 453; see *Rowland, supra*, 4 Cal.4th at p. 268, fn. 6; see also *Malek, supra*, 58 Cal.App.5th at p. 825; *People ex rel. Lockyer, supra*, 24 Cal.4th at p. 422.)

Plaintiffs' objection to defendant's request for judicial notice is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Given that the Court sustained plaintiffs' objection to the admission of the collective bargaining agreement attached as Exhibit A the declaration of Kris Hansen and is not taking judicial notice

of that agreement, the demurrer is **OVERRULED**. (Code Civ. Proc., § 430.10, subd. (e); Labor Code section 2699.6.)

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: **Walker v. County of Yolo**
 Case No. CV2026-0322

Hearing Date: **April 2, 2026** **Department Fourteen** **9:00 a.m.**

On the Court’s own motion, petitioners Edward G. Walker and Reverend Heidi Grossman-Lepp’s motion for order staying enforcement of administrative decision, defendant County of Yolo’s demurrer to and motion to strike petitioners’ petition, and the hearing on petitioners’ first amended petition for writ of administrative mandamus and alternative statutory administrative appeal are **CONTINUED** to **May 14, 2026**, at 9:00 a.m. in Department Fourteen.