

Tentative Rulings for July 13, 2026 Department 4

**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 4 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: **160 533 0910**

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
CVRI2203789	PROTECTIVE INSURANCE COMPANY vs FNS TRANSPORT INC.	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND 3RD AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT

Tentative Ruling:

GRANT

Defendant FNS Transport Inc. to file and serve the Fourth Amended Cross-Complaint within 5 days.

2.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2400029	HIGH SAND DESERT, LLC vs HULSTROM	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON CROSS-COMPLAINT

Tentative Ruling:

GRANT

3.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2403445	FIGUEROA vs VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC	MOTION TO COMPEL
CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2403445	FIGUEROA vs VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC	MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF MARIA FIGUERO AND REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS

Tentative Ruling:

GRANT

Plaintiffs are Ordered to appear for remote deposition within 15 days of today's date. The parties are to meet and confer regarding the deposition dates before this hearing. If the parties can agree on a date or dates, they should request oral argument so that the dates can be Ordered as part of the court's Minute Order.

Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel are sanctioned in the sum of \$1,461, payable to Defense counsel within 30 days, for both motions (i.e., *not* each).

4.

CASE #	CASE NAME	HEARING NAME
CVRI2504963	RODRIGUEZ vs FERGUSON CAPITAL GROUP, INC.	MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Tentative Ruling:

DENY

CCP § 2017.030 permits the court to issue a protective order if: (1) the discovery “is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive”; or (2) the discovery “is unduly burdensome or expensive, taking into account the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, and the importance of the issues at stake in the litigation.”

Here, Plaintiff has filed a declaration of necessity stating why Plaintiff needs to propound in excess of 35 Special Interrogatories in this wrongful termination case. On a motion for protective order challenging a declaration of necessity, the propounding party has the burden of justifying the excess number of requests. The court finds that Plaintiff has met his burden by identifying and explaining the core issues in the case. With the excess requests justified, the burden now shifts to the Ferguson Defendants to show that the undue burden of discovery clearly outweighs the likelihood that the information sought will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. (*Emerson Elec. Co. v. Superior Court* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1101, 1110.) The Ferguson Defendants, however, fail to provide a specific factual showing of the quantum of work required to respond to Plaintiff’s SROGs in support of their argument of undue burden. (*West Pico Furniture Co. v. Superior Court* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 407, 417.) The Ferguson Defendants’ remaining arguments are not persuasive.

Motion is Denied.

No Sanctions.