

**Judge Mosbarger – Law & Motion – Wednesday, January 7, 2026 @ 9:00 AM  
TENTATIVE RULINGS**

**1-2. 18FL00026 MARTIN, THERESA V. MARTIN, JUAN**

*EVENTS: (1) Petitioner's Request for Order to Set Aside Judgment*

*(2) Order to Show Cause re Contempt*

The Court will hear from counsel.

**3. 23CV03421 STONEBARGER, SCOTT ET AL V. WENTZ, ROBERT J ET AL**

*EVENT: Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint to Allege Punitive Damages*

The Court will hear from counsel regarding Defendant Oroville Hospital's bankruptcy filing and whether this case should be stayed.

**4. 25CV02563 ROBINSON, ANDREW V. DEAL, MONTE ET AL**

*EVENT: Review Hearing (Status of Filing of Panel's Final Proposal)*

The Proposal is approved by the Court and the Panel is directed to proceed as contemplated in the Proposal. Additionally, as to the request for a supplemental order regarding derivative claims, the Court directs the Panel to include the valuation of the derivative claims asserted in this action in its valuation of the Company. The Court sets this matter for a Review Hearing on May 27, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. for status of the filing of the final valuation report and any objections/responses thereto.

**5-6. 25CV02798 TYLER, MATHEW V. STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL**

*EVENTS: (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Notice (Vol. I); Decisional, Privileges, or Immunities and Federal Supremacy*

*(2) Plaintiff's Supplemental Motion for Judicial Notice (Vol. II); Civil Rights Statutes, Standards of Review, and Liberal Construction*

There is no proof of service in the Court's file therefore the Court cannot confirm whether notice complies with *Code of Civil Procedure* §1005 or *Evidence Code* §453. Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Notice and Supplemental Motion for Judicial Notice are denied.

///

**7. 25CV04054 BLOW, TRAVIS ET AL V. MENTUS, ANDREY ET AL**

*EVENT: Specially Appearing Defendant Andrey Mentus' Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay Proceedings*

The Court finds that due to the non-arbitrable claims and non-signatory parties, as well as the risk of inconsistent rulings, the Motion is denied. See, *Lindemann v. Hume* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 556. Counsel for the Plaintiffs shall submit a form of order consistent with this ruling within two weeks.