

**Tentative Rulings for December 5, 2024**  
**Department 503**

**For any matter where an oral argument is requested and any party to the hearing desires a remote appearance, such request must be timely submitted to and approved by the hearing judge. In this department, the remote appearance will be conducted through Zoom. If approved, please provide the department's clerk a correct email address. (CRC 3.672, Fresno Sup.C. Local Rule 1.1.19)**

---

---

There are no tentative rulings for the following cases. The hearing will go forward on these matters. If a person is under a court order to appear, he/she must do so. Otherwise, parties should appear unless they have notified the court that they will submit the matter without an appearance. (See California Rules of Court, rule 3.1304(c).) *The above rule also applies to cases listed in this "must appear" section.*

---

---

The court has continued the following cases. The deadlines for opposition and reply papers will remain the same as for the original hearing date.

---

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

# **Tentative Rulings for Department 503**

Begin at the next page

(27)

**Tentative Ruling**

Re: **Alicia Chavez v. Arnulfo Lopez**  
Superior Court Case No. 23CECG04210

Hearing Date: December 5, 2024 (Dept. 503)

Motion(s): (1) By Defendant City of Mendota to Compel Responses to Special Interrogatories, Set One, and for Sanctions against Plaintiff

(2) By Defendant City of Mendota to Compel Production of Documents, Set One, from and for Sanctions against Plaintiff

**Tentative Ruling:**

To grant defendants' motions to compel responses to the Special Interrogatories (Set One), and Request for Production of Documents (Set One). To grant the request for monetary sanctions in the amount of \$337.50. (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 2030.290, 2030.300.)

Plaintiff's responses, without objections, to the interrogatories and document requests are due 15 days from the date of service of this order. Sanctions are payable to moving counsel within 30 days of the date of service of this order.

**Explanation:**

Plaintiff's motions demonstrate that the subject discovery was served on plaintiff on January 8, 2024. (See Dillahunt, Decls. ¶ 2.) Plaintiff provided a response to one set of discovery, but wholly failed to provide responses to the special interrogatories and request for production. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.) Finally, no opposition has been filed to these motions, which effectively concedes moving counsel's recitation of the relevant events. Therefore, the motions are granted.

Plaintiff's motions are substantively identical and assert the same set of facts and law. Therefore, the court awards monetary sanctions in time expended to prepare one motion.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

**Tentative Ruling**

Issued By:         jyh         on         12/4/24        .  
(Judge's initials) (Date)