

**TENTATIVE RULINGS
LAW & MOTION CALENDAR
Friday, January 23, 2026, 3:00 p.m.
Courtroom 16 – Hon. Patrick M. Broderick
3035 Cleveland Avenue, Suite 200, Santa Rosa**

**TO JOIN “ZOOM” ONLINE,
Courtroom 16
Meeting ID: 161-460-6380
Passcode: 840359**

<https://sonomacourt-org.zoomgov.com/j/1614606380?pwd=NUdpOEZ0RGxnVjBzNnN6dHZ6c0ZQZz09>

**TO JOIN “ZOOM” BY PHONE,
By Phone (same meeting ID and password as listed above):
(669) 254-5252 US (San Jose)**

The following tentative rulings will become the ruling of the Court unless a party desires to be heard. If you desire to appear and present oral argument as to any motion, YOU MUST notify the Court by telephone at **(707) 521-6725**, and all other opposing parties of your intent to appear by 4:00 p.m. the court day immediately before the day of the hearing. Parties in motions for claims of exemption are exempt from this requirement.

PLEASE NOTE: The Court WILL NOT provide a court reporter for this calendar. If there are any concerns, please contact the Court at the number provided above.

**ANY REQUESTS TO APPEAR WILL BE HEARD MONDAY,
JANUARY 26, 2026, AT 1:30 P.M.**

1. 23CV01351, Pierce v. WNJT Homes LLC, a California Limited Liability Company

This matter is on calendar for the final fairness hearing of the class action settlement agreement entered into between Plaintiff Sue Pierce and Defendant WJNT Homes, LLC, dba Monte Verde Home. On December 5, 2025, Defendant filed a joint request to continue this hearing to allow the parties extra time to properly ensure notice is correctly sent out with the right allocations and addresses. Based upon the parties’ request, **the final fairness hearing is CONTINUED to the next available date of May 20, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., in Department 16.**

2. 24CV06598, Haag v. Traboulsi

Defendant Charles M. Traboulsi (“Defendant”) moves for an order (1) compelling Plaintiffs Eric Haag and Valerie Ferrari-Haag (“Plaintiffs”) to provide responses to (1) Defendant’s First Set of Form Interrogatories— Construction Litigation; (2) Request for Admissions, Set One; (3) Form Interrogatories— Construction Litigation; Set Two; and (4) Special Interrogatories, Set Two. Defendant requests sanctions in the amount of \$1,425.00.

On November 1, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a complaint for breach of contract, fraud, intentional tort, and negligence against Defendant, Pearson Properties Inc., and Meaghan Creedon. On June 20,

2025, Defendant served Plaintiffs with Form Interrogatories, Set One, and Requests for Admissions, Set One. (Johnson decl., ¶2.) July 2, 2025, Defendant served Plaintiff with Form Interrogatories, Set Two, Requests for Admission, Set Two, and Special Interrogatories, Set Two. (*Id.*, ¶3.) Despite requesting responses from Plaintiffs’ counsel, no responses have been forthcoming. (*Id.*, ¶¶4-8.)

Defendant’s counsel spent 1.5 hours drafting and reviewing this motion. (*Id.*, ¶9.) His hourly rate is \$395. (*Ibid.*) Defendant’s paralegal billed 2.5 hours assisting with the preparation of this motion. (*Ibid.*) Her hourly rate is \$225. (*Ibid.*) Partner Peter Simon spent 0.4 hours meeting and conferring with Plaintiffs’ counsel over late responses. (*Ibid.*) His hourly rate is \$675. (*Ibid.*) Sanctions are granted in the amount of \$1,425.00.

Defendant’s motion is GRANTED. Plaintiffs are ordered to provide responses, without objections, to Defendant’s Form Interrogatories, Set One and Set Two; Requests for Admissions, Set One and Set Two; and Special Interrogatories, Set Two, and to pay sanctions all within 30 days of the service of this order.

Defendant’s counsel is directed to submit a written order to the court consistent with this ruling.

3. 24CV07691, People of the State of California v. Ubaldi

Defendants Countryside MHP LLC and Ronald Ubaldi (“Defendants”) move for an order staying this action until final resolution of the related and first-filed action entitled *Countryside MHP LLC v. City of Cotati*, Case No. 24CV00804 (“First Action”).

Defendants filed the First Action on February 9, 2024. That action seeks declaratory and injunctive relief that the City of Cotati’s Ordinance establishing the Senior Mobilehome Park Overlay Zone (“Ordinance”) is invalid as violative of the Fair Housing Amendments Act and the Fair Employment and Housing Act. Trial in the First Action is set for July 24, 2026. The parties’ competing motions for summary judgment are set for April 29, 2026.

Defendants argue staying this action would prevent duplicative discovery and motion practice, the risk of inconsistent rulings, and would reduce the burden on the court. Defendants argue that the First Action will resolve the issue of the validity of the Ordinance, which will have a bearing on this case. The City argues a stay this action will allow Defendants to continue to violate the City’s valid Ordinance.

The City of Cotati (“City”) filed this action on December 18, 2024 (“City Action”). Its complaint alleges Defendants are violating the Ordinance, which constitutes a nuisance and a violation of Business & Professions Code section 17203.

On January 10, 2025, Defendants filed a petition for a writ of administrative mandamus in another related case, *Countryside MHP LLC v. City of Cotati*, 25CV00163 (“Petition Action”). The Petition Action seeks a writ commanding the City to set aside its December 17, 2024, decision wherein the Administrative Hearing Office found Defendants violated the Ordinance.

In the Petition Action, the parties agreed to a stay. The stay order states: “Upon the inquiry of the Court regarding the parties’ position on a stay of this proceeding in light of this proceeding being related to Sonoma County Superior Court Cases 24CV00804 and 24CV07691, the parties agreed to a stay in this proceeding to reduce litigation costs and Court resources.” (August 16, 2025, Order Re Stay of Proceedings.)

On April 11, 2025, in the City’s Action, the City filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. That motion was denied on September 5, 2025, and the decision is currently on appeal. Until resolution of the appeal, any proceeding based upon the issues in the September 5, 2025, order are stayed. (CCP section 916.) Neither party has provided authority on the effect of a stay of this action

on the City's appeal and any potential reversal of the decision on the motion for a preliminary injunction.

A stay is appropriate in the Petition Action as the issue of the validity of the Ordinance must first be determined prior to determining whether the decision of the Administrative Hearing Office should be set aside. The necessity or appropriateness of a stay in this action is not so clear. There are no pending motions in this action, and it is effectively stayed due to the City's appeal. Therefore, this court finds Defendants' argument unpersuasive.

The motion is DENIED. The City's counsel is directed to submit a written order to the court consistent with this ruling and in compliance with Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.1312.

4. **25CV01793, Lorenzini v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.**

1. Motion to Compel Responses to Form Interrogatories

Defendant Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. ("Defendant") moves for an order compelling Plaintiff Sabrina Michelle Lorenzini ("Plaintiff") to provide responses to Defendant's Form Interrogatories, Set One. Defendant requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,035.00.

On March 12, 2025, Plaintiff Sabrina Michelle Lorenzini ("Plaintiff") initiated this breach of warranty action alleging several defects with her 2023 Volkswagen Tiguan.

On September 12, 2025, Defendant served Plaintiff with its Form Interrogatories, Set One. (Phan decl., ¶ 3.) Despite reminding Plaintiff's counsel that responses were overdue, as of the filing of this motion, Defendant did not receive responses. (*Id.*, ¶4.)

Defendant's counsel states she spent "no fewer than 2 hours reviewing the docket and file, including conducting legal research and drafting and preparing this motion and related pleadings." (*Id.*, at ¶ 6.) Her hourly rate is \$395. (*Ibid.*)

Defendant's motion is GRANTED. Plaintiff is directed to provide responses, without objections, and to pay sanctions in the amount of \$790, within 30 days of the service of this order.

This court will sign the proposed order.

2. Request to Deem Admissions Admitted

Defendant Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. ("Defendant") moves for an order deeming admitted its requests for admissions served on Plaintiff Sabrina Michelle Lorenzini ("Plaintiff"). Defendant requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,035.00.

On September 12, 2025, Defendant served Plaintiff with its Requests for Admissions, Set One. (Phan decl., ¶ 3.) Despite reminding Plaintiff's counsel that responses were overdue, as of the filing of this motion, Defendant did not receive responses. (*Id.*, ¶4.)

Defendant's counsel states she spent "no fewer than 2 hours reviewing the docket and file, including conducting legal research and drafting and preparing this motion and related pleadings." (*Id.*, at ¶ 6.) Her hourly rate is \$395. (*Ibid.*)

Unless Plaintiff Sabrina Michelle Lorenzini provides verified responses, without objections, prior to the hearing on this motion, the motion will be GRANTED and Defendant's Requests for Admissions, Set One, will be deemed admitted. Plaintiff is directed to pay sanctions in the amount of \$790 within 30 days of the service of this order.

This court will sign the proposed order.

5. **25CV05246, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Campbell**

Plaintiff Wells Fargo Bank (“Plaintiff”) moves for judgment on the pleadings against Defendant Kyle T. Campbell (“Defendant”) on the grounds that the complaint and Defendant’s responsive pleading entitle Plaintiff to judgment as a matter of law.

On July 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed its complaint against Defendant alleging breach of contract and that Defendant owes Plaintiff \$6,092.38. On September 22, 2025, Defendant filed his answer admitting the allegations in the complaint are true.

A motion for judgment on the pleadings may be made upon the grounds that the complaint states facts sufficient to constitute cause(s) of action against the defendants and the answer does not state facts sufficient to constitute a defense to the complaint. (Code of Civil Procedure § 438(c)(1)(A).)

Plaintiff’s complaint alleges sufficient factual allegations to allege breach of contract: the parties entered into an agreement, Defendant breached the agreement, and Defendant owes Plaintiff \$6,092.38. Defendant’s answer admits these allegations. Accordingly, **the motion is GRANTED.** Judgment shall be entered in the amount of \$6,092.38, plus court costs of \$285, for a total judgment of \$6,377.38. This court will sign the proposed order and judgment.

6. **SCV-273492, Perez Robles v. Circustrix, LLC.**

1. Motion to Compel Responses to Form Interrogatories

Plaintiff Idan Kael Perez-Robles (“Plaintiff”) moves for an order to compel Defendant RJWN, LLC dba Rockin Jump Santa Rosa, CA, presently known as Sky Zone Santa Rosa, (“Defendant”) to provide responses to Plaintiff’s Form Interrogatories, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One. Plaintiff requests sanctions in the amount of \$2,560.00.

Plaintiff’s complaint was filed on June 8, 2023. On June 19, 2025, Plaintiff served Form Interrogatories, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One. (Norton Decl., ¶4.) Service was made on Defendant RJ Santa Maria, LLC dba Rockin’ Jump. (*Id.*, Exhibit 1.) As such, Plaintiff has not shown service was effectuated upon the proper party. In addition, Defendant’s counsel states that Defendant has now provided responses. (Matteson decl., ¶8.)

In reply, Plaintiff acknowledges the receipt of responses. He argues sanctions should still be granted because prior to filing opposition, Defendant’s counsel never raised the issue that service was not made on the proper party. Plaintiff’s reply argues that Defendant’s counsel represented that responses would be forthcoming, which is accurate as responses have been provided. No authority is provided that it is Defendant’s burden to inform Plaintiff of ineffective service.

The motion is MOOT. Sanctions are denied. Plaintiff’s request for the court’s guidance and instruction on Defendant’s “obstructive tactics” is denied.

Defendant’s counsel is directed to submit a written order to the court consistent with this ruling and in compliance with Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.1312.

2. Motion to Compel Responses to Request for Production of Documents

Plaintiff Idan Kael Perez-Robles (“Plaintiff”) moves for an order to compel Defendant RJWN, LLC dba Rockin Jump Santa Rosa, CA, presently known as Sky Zone Santa Rosa, (“Defendant”) to provide responses to Plaintiff’s Request for Production of Documents, Set One.

Plaintiff’s complaint was filed on June 8, 2023. On June 19, 2025, Plaintiff served Requests for Production of Documents. (Norton Decl., ¶4.) Service was made on Defendant RJ Santa Maria, LLC dba Rockin’ Jump. (*Id.*, Exhibit 2.) As such, Plaintiff has not shown service was effectuated

upon the proper party. In addition, Defendant's counsel states that Defendant has now provided responses. (Matteson decl., ¶7.)

In reply, Plaintiff acknowledges the receipt of responses. He argues sanctions should still be granted because prior to filing opposition, Defendant's counsel never raised the issue that service was not made on the proper party. Plaintiff's reply argues that Defendant's counsel represented that responses would be forthcoming, which is accurate as responses have been provided. No authority is provided that it is Defendant's burden to inform Plaintiff of ineffective service.

The motion is MOOT. Sanctions are denied. Plaintiff's request for the court's guidance and instruction on Defendant's "obstructive tactics" is denied.

Defendant's counsel is directed to submit a written order to the court consistent with this ruling and in compliance with Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.1312.