



Superior Court of California,
County of Mendocino

Tentative Rulings

for

Ukiah Department E
Friday 9:00am & 9:30am Law & Motion Calendar

Calendar Date: October 19, 2018

Honorable Judge Jeanine Nadel presiding.

Prior to a Civil Law & Motion or Probate hearing, the Court may issue a tentative ruling pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.1308. Unless a party requests to appear and notifies both the opposing party and the court, no hearing will be held, and the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

A party wishing to appear to provide oral argument must advise the opposing party and the Court by phone or by e-mail no later than 4:00pm on the court day before the hearing.

Phone: (707) 468-2007, Option 2
E-mail: tr@mendocino.courts.ca.gov

If you do not notify the opposing party and the Court by 4:00pm on the court day before the hearing, no hearing will be held.

If you do not find information regarding your particular case, and you have not previously been informed that you are excused from the calendar, an appearance is required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

17-26809, Estate of James Tony Craig:	3
18-27083. Estate of Polson:	3
18-27089, In Re Conservatorship of Margaret Parducci:	3
18-27081, In Re Conservatorship of Pease:	3
16-68273, Calcaterra v. FCA US LLC:	3

Probate:

17-26809, Estate of James Tony Craig:

Approve Petition for Final Distribution. Counsel for Administrator to prepare and submit Order.

18-27083. Estate of Polson:

At the request of the parties this matter is continued to October 26, 2018.

18-27089, In Re Conservatorship of Margaret Parducci:

Petitioner has failed to submit a Notice of Hearing and Proof of Service.

18-27081, In Re Conservatorship of Pease:

Parties to appear.

Civil:

16-68273, Calcaterra v. FCA US LLC:

Civil Code Section 1794(d) allows the prevailing party in an action brought under the Song-Beverly Act to recover attorney fees “based on the actual time expended, determined by the court to have been reasonably incurred by the buyer in connection with the commencement and prosecution of such action.” To determine the amount of fees the court used the lodestar method. The court has reviewed the billings submitted and finds that the hours expended by the attorneys representing Plaintiff in this action to be reasonable and the hourly rate, while high for this locality, is also reasonable given the expertise in this area of law. The court however is unwilling to apply the multiplier requested in this instance because there was nothing unique about this specific case and the results achieved were not out of the ordinary. The court awards fees in the amount of \$66,147.50. The Motion to Tax Costs will be heard on November 9, 2018.