

## Tentative Rulings for July 21, 2026 Department 3

**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 3 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: **161 692 7358**

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                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CVRI2400035 | HARRIS vs RAMIREZ | MOTION TO COMPEL ANSWERS TO FORM INTERROGATORIES, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS ANSWERS TO FORM INTERROGATORIES |

**Tentative Ruling:**

The moving papers were untimely served. They were due to be served no later than 16 court days prior to the scheduled hearing, which was 6/26/26. Adding the additional two court days for electronic service, the motion was filed 6 calendar days late. As such, the motion is denied.

2.

| CASE #      | CASE NAME         | HEARING NAME                              |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| CVRI2400035 | HARRIS vs RAMIREZ | MOTION FOR ORDER TO DEEM MATTERS ADMITTED |

**Tentative Ruling:**

The moving papers were untimely served. They were due to be served no later than 16 court days prior to the scheduled hearing, which was 6/26/26. Adding the additional two court days for electronic service, the motion was filed 6 calendar days late. As such, the motion is denied.

3.

| CASE #      | CASE NAME      | HEARING NAME                                                                                                 |
|-------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CVRI2600665 | LUNA vs TORRES | MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO OBTAIN COUNSEL AND/OR STAY CIVIL PROCEEDINGS PENDING RELATED CRIMINAL MATTER |

**Tentative Ruling:**

Complaint filed on January 27, 2026 for: (1) Negligence – Vehicular; (2) Negligent Entrustment; and (3) Battery against moving Defendant Jeralyn Dominguez and co-Defendant John Paul Torres, Jr.

\* \* \*

Defendant Domingues now moves for an order: (1) extending time to retain legal counsel and respond to the Complaint; (2) staying this civil action, including all responsive pleading deadlines and discovery obligations, pending the resolution of the

related criminal investigation and/ or criminal proceedings arising from the same underlying incident involving co- defendant John Paul Torres.

This Motion is made pursuant to the Court' s inherent authority to control its proceedings and docket, including CCP §§ 1054 and 128( a), and on the grounds that (a) Defendant is currently attempting in good faith to retain legal counsel; (b) The allegations in this civil action substantially overlap with an ongoing criminal investigation and/or criminal proceedings arising from the same incident; (c) Proceeding with this matter at this time may substantially prejudice Defendant' s constitutional and procedural rights, including rights relating to self-incrimination and due process; and (d) A temporary stay would promote judicial economy, avoid inconsistent proceedings, and prevent undue prejudice to the parties.

In Opposition, Plaintiff contends that The Motion fails for two simple reasons. First, Defendant Dominguez is not an attorney. She is entitled to represent herself in this action, but she cannot seek relief on behalf of co-defendant John Paul Torres, Jr. ("Torres"), who has filed no motion of his own. To the extent the Motion seeks a stay or any other relief as to Torres, it must be denied. Second, as to Defendant Dominguez, herself, the criminal matter on which the Motion rests involves Torres alone. Defendant Dominguez has not been charged with any crime arising from this incident. She therefore faces no self-incrimination dilemma, and there is no basis to stay-or further delay Plaintiff's claims against her.

\* \* \*

### **Analysis**

This motion is denied.

First, Defendant Dominguez cannot seek relief for Defendant Torres, who has not filed a motion. No person may practice law in California unless the person is an active licensee of the State Bar. (Bus. & Prof. Code. § 6125.) A party may appear in propria persona on her own behalf, but a person who is not an attorney has no authority to appear for, or seek relief on behalf of, another. (*J. Fly: V. Superior Court* (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 958, 965; *Ziegler v. Nickel* (1998) 64 Cal.App.4th 10 545. 547.)

Defendant Dominguez, appearing in propria persona, is free to file responsive papers and motions on her own behalf. She is not free to move this Court for a stay of the proceedings against Defendant Torres. If Defendant Torres believes he is entitled to a stay pending the criminal matter against him, he must seek that relief himself, through his own filings or through counsel of his own. He has filed no such motion. Accordingly, to the extent the Motion seeks an extension of time, a stay, or any other relief as to Defendant Torres, the Motion must be denied

Second, there is apparently no criminal proceeding against Defendant Dominguez, and therefore no basis for a stay as to her. The entire premise of the requested stay is a "related criminal matter" arising from the underlying incident. But by Defendant Dominguez's own account, that criminal matter involves Defendant Torres

alone: her declaration describes only a criminal investigation and/or criminal proceedings arising from the same underlying incident involving "co-defendant John Paul Torres, Jr." (Dominguez Decl., ¶¶ 3-4.) Dominguez has not been charged with any crime arising from this incident, and she does not contend otherwise.

As noted in the Opposition, at trial court has discretion to stay a civil action where a party faces a parallel criminal proceeding and would otherwise be forced to choose between asserting the privilege against self-incrimination and defending against the civil claims, although even then a stay is not constitutionally required. (*Avant! Corp. v. Superior Court* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 876, 882, 885.) In the present matter, the predicate is entirely absent. Defendant Dominguez faces no criminal charge and no self-incrimination dilemma. The privilege against self-incrimination is personal to its holder; it supplies no basis for Defendant Dominguez to halt Plaintiff's negligent entrustment claim against her based on another person's potential criminal exposure. Plaintiff, meanwhile, has a substantial interest in proceeding expeditiously with his claims while evidence and witness recollections remain fresh. The request for a stay as to Defendant Dominguez is denied.

Third, there is no good cause for an open-ended extension of time, which Defendant Dominguez requests as alternative relief. The present Motion identifies no concrete efforts to retain counsel and proposes no date certain by which Defendant Dominguez will respond to the Complaint. Instead, Defendant Dominguez asks that proceedings be paused "until the related criminal matter has sufficiently progressed or concluded" (Motion, p. 7), a criminal matter to which she is not a party. Plaintiff is right: the requested "extension" is simply the requested stay by another name, and it is denied for the same reasons.