

**Judge Mosbarger – Law & Motion – Wednesday, June 4, 2025 @ 9:00 AM  
TENTATIVE RULINGS**

**1. 22CV00643 MINOR, ROCHELL V. NPH MEDICAL SERVICES ET AL**

*EVENT: Status Conference*

Based on the Declaration of Jennifer Forst, filed May 21, 2025, the Court finds that the required disbursements have been completed in compliance with the Final Order and the Settlement Agreement, this matter is off calendar, and no appearances are required.

**2-3. 23CV01517 ESTRADA, SUNNI V. RENEWABLE ENERGY LIVING, LLC ET AL**

*EVENTS: (1) Plaintiff's Motion to Request Extension*

*(2) Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case*

Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case is denied as moot, Plaintiff having subsequently indicated in her Motion to Request Extension that she is now receiving the agreed upon payments pursuant to the settlement agreement and implying therein that she does not wish to proceed with the instant motion at this time. The Court notes that this denial is without prejudice to the Plaintiff reasserting her claim under *Code of Civil Procedure* §664.6 at a later date if necessary.

**4. 25CV00631 SPEROW, BENJAMIN C V. FRITZ, KAI ET AL**

*EVENT: Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice (Jonathon N. Fazzola)*

The application to be admitted pro hac vice is granted. Jonathon N. Fazzola is permitted to appear as counsel pro hac vice on behalf of Plaintiff Benjamin Sperow in this matter. The Court will sign the form of order submitted by counsel.

**5-7. 25CV01669 CONNELL, ZACKARY V. CRAFT, SHEILA ET AL**

*EVENTS: (1) Motion for Preliminary Injunction to Temporarily Disqualify Melissa Crick from Holding Public Office*

*(2) Defendant Melissa Crick's Motion to Quash Service of Summons*

*(3) Defendant Sheila Craft's Motion to Quash Service of Summons*

In weighing the factors to determine whether to issue a preliminary injunction, Courts typically engage in a two-part analysis that evaluates: (1) whether the party is likely to prevail on the merits; and (2) a comparison of the harm suffered by the party if the injunction is not issued compared to the harm suffered to the defendant if it is. *IT Corp v. Imperial* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 63, 69-70; see also *Smith v. Adventist Health System/West* (2010) 182 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 729, 749. Here, the Court finds that while Plaintiff has established

a reasonable probability of prevailing on his claims, the balance of harm weighs in favor of Defendant. Therefore, Plaintiff's request for preliminary injunction is denied.

In regard to the Motions to Quash Service of Summons filed on May 28, 2025 by Defendants Melissa Crick and Sheila Craft, there is no Proof of Service for either Motion. As such, the Court is unable to determine whether sufficient notice was provided as required by *Code of Civil Procedure* §1005, notice is deemed insufficient, and the Motions are denied.