

Tentative Rulings for July 13, 2026

Department 1

**To request oral argument, you must notify Judicial Secretary
Crystal Marias at (760) 904-5722
and inform all other counsel no later than 4:30 p.m.**

This court follows California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1308 (a) (1) for tentative rulings (see Riverside Superior Court Local Rule 3316). Tentative Rulings for each law & motion matter are posted on the Internet by 3:00 p.m. on the court day immediately before the hearing at [Riverside Superior Court-Tentative Rulings](#). If you do not have Internet access, you may obtain the tentative ruling by telephone at (760) 904-5722.

To request oral argument, no later than 4:30 p.m. on the court day before the hearing you must (1) notify the judicial secretary for Department 1 at (760) 904-5722 and (2) inform all other parties of the request and of their need to appear remotely, as stated below. If no request for oral argument is made by 4:30 p.m., the tentative ruling **will become the final ruling** on the matter effective the date of the hearing. **UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, THE PREVAILING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE RULING.**

For information and instructions on remote appearances via **ZOOM**, visit the court's website at [Riverside Superior Court-Remote Appearances](#)

You may also make a Telephonic Appearance: On the day of the hearing, call into one of the below listed phone numbers, and input the meeting number (followed by #):

- Call-in Numbers: 1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free), 1-669-254-5252,
1-669-216-1590, 1-551-285-1373 or 1-646-828-7666
- Meeting Number: **160 638 4172**

Please **MUTE** your phone until your case is called and it is your turn to speak. It is important to note that you must call fifteen (15) minutes prior to the scheduled hearing time to check in or there may be a delay in your case being heard.

Riverside Superior Court provides official court reporters for hearings on law and motion matters only for litigants who have been granted fee waivers and only upon their timely request. (See General Administrative Order No. 2021-19-1) Other parties desiring a record of the hearing must retain a reporter pro tempore.

1.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2103146	BABBE vs MFI RECOVERY CENTER	MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Tentative Ruling: Appearances requested to discuss:

1. Confirm no relationship between defense counsel or defendant and the proposed cy pres.
2. Add to proposed order that if hearing on motion for final approval is continued, administrator will give notice to any class member who has objected to the settlement.
3. Add to proposed order the administrator will file declaration authenticating any objection for opt out forms received.
4. No declaration from defendant concerning class members' likely age, education, experience and ability to read the notice in English. But this may not be necessary; administrator is to translate notice into Spanish.
5. Add to notice the court's street and web addresses and the full title and date of filing of the document to which the settlement agreement is attached.
6. Confirm that LWDA was served with copy of settlement agreement.

2.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2103626	BITANGA vs NUFACTOR, INC.	MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Tentative Ruling: Appearances requested to discuss:

1. Notice indicates attorney fees are \$117,250—not \$184,744.66 as agreed upon.
2. Zakey declaration does not indicate if he is aware of other class/representative actions.
3. No declaration from defense counsel provided. CMO ¶¶ G.3.b
4. No declaration from Defendant provided. CMO ¶¶ G.3.k.
5. The notice does not indicate that the court has only determined that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, with any final determination decided at the final approval hearing. (CMO ¶¶ G.5.b.)
6. Request for Exclusion form states: "Exclusion from the Settlement will not result in exclusion from any Private Attorney General Act Settlement, if applicable." Is this necessary—there is no PAGA settlement, which makes this language confusing.

3.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2203570	MIDDLETON vs HOUSEHOLDER GROUP ESTATE AND RETIREMENT SPECIALIST, LLC	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Tentative Ruling: Appearances to discuss how motion applies to allegations of second amended complaint, the operative complaint, which was filed after the motion. It appears that the allegations have changed as they relate to the moving party, at least the allegations in the 10th cause of action.

4.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2301559	COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE vs CITY OF MORENO VALLEY	MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES

Tentative Ruling: No tentative ruling, appearances requested.

5.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2305704	BUSTILLO vs WILSON CREEK WINERY & VINEYARDS, INC.	MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Tentative Ruling: Appearances requested to discuss:

1. Settlement not signed by Defendant. (CMO ¶¶ G.1.a.)
2. The parties do not explain why they chose the proposed recipient compared to other potential recipients. (CMO ¶¶ G.3.c.ii.) Why is a veteran's organization a proper cy pres in a wage and hour action?
3. No declaration from defense counsel indicating a relationship between the parties (including officer, director or manager), counsel, their firm and the proposed recipient. (CMO ¶¶ G.3.c.iv.)
4. The proposed order does not provide that the objection and exclusion forms that are to be submitted to the settlement administrator (and not the Court). (CMO ¶¶ G.4.e – f.)
5. The proposed order does not indicate that the settlement administrator must submit a declaration to the court authenticating each exclusion form received. (CMO ¶¶ G.4.e – f.)
6. There is no defense declaration regarding the likely age, education, experience, and ability to read English. (CMO ¶¶ G.3.k.ii.)
7. The notice does not indicate where the class members can find the settlement (full title, filing date). (CMO ¶¶ G.5.c.)

8. No proof that parties served the LWDA a copy of the settlement. (Labor Code § 2699(s)(2).)

6.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVR12501059	ALVARADO vs TRI-VALLEY MEDICAL GROUP CORPORATION	MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION (SET ONE)

Tentative Ruling: No tentative ruling—parties were to file a joint report five court days in advance of the hearing, but no report is yet available.

7.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVR12501059	ALVARADO vs TRI-VALLEY MEDICAL GROUP CORPORATION	MOTION TO COMPEL DEFENDANT TO PROVIDE RESPONSES TO SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE

Tentative Ruling: No tentative ruling—parties were to file a joint report five court days in advance of the hearing, but no report is yet available.

8.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVR12600904	PACHECO vs FLEX LOGISTICS, LLC	JOINDER TO MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION

Tentative Ruling: See related tentative ruling.

9.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVR12600904	PACHECO vs FLEX LOGISTICS, LLC	MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION

Tentative Ruling: Appearances requested to discuss the evidence submitted with the reply (Declaration of Audrey Ruiz) and if it is to be considered what opportunity Pacheco should have to respond to it.

10.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVR12600904	PACHECO vs FLEX LOGISTICS, LLC	MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE AS TO FLEX LOGISTICS, LLC

Tentative Ruling: Grant; court will sign proposed order after hearing.