

**Judge Mosbarger – Law & Motion – Wednesday, September 3, 2025 @ 9:00 AM**  
**TENTATIVE RULINGS**

**1. 21CV02098 LONG, TONYA V. LARGENT, ALICIA ET AL**

*EVENT: Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendants' Production of Documents and Deposition of Person Most Knowledgeable*

Based on the parties having completed the deposition of Roger Halstead on August 11, 2025; and Defendants' Person Most Knowledgeable regarding driver training, driver safety, driver supervision, hours including regulations/policy on the number of hours a person may drive/work consecutively without rest or sleep, records, logs, and accident reporting between January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019 on August 27, 2025, the Motion is moot in relation to these two depositions and is denied in that regard.

As to the Person Most Knowledgeable employed by Defendant Anderson Merchandisers LLC regarding the applicable insurance policy, and Jennifer Kramb, the Court finds that Plaintiff has established a relevant and compelling need for this deposition and the Motion is granted. Defendants shall produce their Person Most Knowledgeable employed by Defendant Anderson Merchandisers LLC regarding the applicable insurance policy and Jennifer Kramb for a deposition within 14 days of this Order.

In regard to the Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Three, the Court finds that Defendants have failed to produce the entire employment file for Defendant Alicia Largent including employment hiring documents, job applications, resumes, job description of her position (Market Sales Manager), training records, and performance reviews. Likewise, in regard to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Four, the Court finds that Defendants have failed to produce the entirety of the insurance policy information that applies to the subject incident, which includes any and all self-insured policies, umbrella policies, eroding limits policy, defense-within-limits policy, etc. Therefore, the Motion is granted in this regard. Defendants are to provide further supplemental verified responses, including all responsive documents, to Responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Three and Set Four within 7 days of this Order. Plaintiff is awarded sanctions in the amount of \$3,000 against Defendants, which is to be paid within 30 days' notice of this order. Counsel for the Plaintiff shall submit a revised form of order within two weeks.

**2. 24CV00837 RAMOS, HECTOR JAVIER SIMENTAL V. JC FARM SERVICES, INC ET AL**

*EVENT: Defendants R.E. Merlo General Farming, Inc. and Rocque E. Merlo's Motion for Order Determining Good Faith Settlement*

As an initial matter, the Court in its discretion, has read and considered the arguments set forth in the untimely filed "Reply in Support of the Opposition to Motion for Good Faith Settlement", filed by Defendant JC Farm Services, Inc. Under *Code of Civil Procedure* §877.6, a motion for determination of good faith settlement requires consideration of several factors established in *Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 488, including a rough approximation of the plaintiff's total potential recovery and

the settling defendant's proportionate liability. However, this approximation does not demand a highly precise or detailed calculation as sought by JC Farm Services, Inc.; instead, it is for the purpose of ensuring the settlement amount is not grossly disproportionate to what a reasonable person would estimate the settler's liability to be. The evaluation avoids converting the process into a minitrial, relying on evidence submitted with the motion, or the judge's experience. Courts grant substantial latitude here, focusing on whether the figure falls within a reasonable range rather than requiring exactitude. The party contesting good faith bears the burden to prove the settlement is so far "out of the ballpark" as to undermine the statute's equitable goals. Here, the Court finds that the settlement between Plaintiff Hector Javier Simental Ramos and Defendants R.E. Merlo General Farming, Inc. and Rocque E. Merlo was made in good faith pursuant to *Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 488. Defendants R.E. Merlo General Farming, Inc. and Rocque E. Merlo's Motion for Good Faith Settlement is granted, and the Court will sign the form of order submitted by counsel.

**3. 24CV04338 TORRES, KIMBERLY V. PARK, WILLIAM**

*EVENT: William Park's Motion to Compel Kimberly Torres' Responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One*

William Park's Motion to Compel Kimberly Torres' Responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Set One, and Special Interrogatories, Set One is denied as moot, Defendant having subsequently received Code compliant responses. Defendant's request for sanctions is denied, the Court finding that Plaintiff has established substantial justification for the delay. Counsel for the Defendant shall submit a revised form of order consistent with this ruling within two weeks.