

**TENTATIVE RULINGS  
LAW & MOTION CALENDAR  
Friday, July 19, 2024 9:30 a.m.  
Courtroom 21 –Hon. Kinna Patel Crocker  
3055 Cleveland Avenue, Santa Rosa**

**TO JOIN “ZOOM” ONLINE:**

**Meeting ID: 160-223-6856**

**Passcode: 876992**

<https://sonomacourt-org.zoomgov.com/j/1602236856>

**TO JOIN “ZOOM” BY PHONE:**

By Phone (same meeting ID and password as listed above):

(669) 254-5252

The following tentative rulings will become the rulings 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 contact the department’s Judicial Assistant by telephone at (707) 521-6836 by 4:00 p.m. on the day before the hearing. Any party requesting an appearance must notify all other opposing parties/counsel of their intent to appear.

**1. SFL-085950, LeCompte Sr v. Sanchez**

Respondent’s Request for Order filed 5/14/24 requests an order for Petitioner’s visits with the minor children to be professionally supervised. Respondent further requests the Court enforce a provision in the parties’ Judgment filed 12/16/22 that Petitioner is to pay Respondent \$4,800 as and for his share of job-related childcare expenses previously paid by Respondent.

**Request for Supervised Visitation**

On 3/11/24, the Court set a hearing to review the parties’ visitation orders on 5/22/24. At the hearing on 5/22/24, the Court set a subsequent hearing to review visitation orders on 7/19/24. In the time between the hearings of 3/11/24 and 5/22/24, Respondent filed the instant Request for Order on 5/14/24 which raises the same visitation issues addressed at the two hearings noted above. The Request for Order was set on a Law and Motion date of 7/19/24 due to the enforcement request (addressed below), which is the same day as the review hearing on the visitation issues as noted above. Thus, the visitation issues will be addressed in the form of a review of the current orders, requiring appearances of the parties on **AUGUST 28, 2024 AT 1:30PM.**

### **Enforcing Judgment**

Neither party presents a memorandum of points and authorities, or any authority or legal analysis for the law and motion matter, Respondent's request that the court enforce a term of the Judgment. The parties accordingly fail to present to the Court the standards or basis applicable to this motion. The court notes that, according to California Rule of Court 3.1113, a party must serve and file a memorandum of points and authorities, which "must contain a statement of facts, a concise statement of the law, evidence and arguments relied on, and a discussion of the statutes, cases, and textbooks cited in support of the position advanced." The court "may construe the absence of a memorandum as an admission that the motion or special demurrer is not meritorious and cause for its denial...."

That said, the parties agree in pleadings that the amount of \$4,800 is due from Petitioner to Respondent. Respondent requests the amount to be paid with interest. Petitioner does not address the issue of interest in his Responsive Declaration.

There is sufficient dispute of facts in the pleadings with respect to Petitioner's ability to pay such that the Court requires oral argument, with a hearing date set on **AUGUST 28, 2024 AT 1:30PM.**