

**DEPARTMENT TWENTY-TWO  
JUDGE ALESIA JONES  
707-207-7322**

**TENTATIVE RULINGS AND PROBATE  
PREGRANTS FOR  
MATTERS SCHEDULED FOR  
THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 2020**

**EFFECTIVE APRIL 8, 2019  
UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE**

- **Probate Staff E-Mail**

Due to temporary staffing reductions, the Probate Staff E-Mailbox will be unmonitored until further notice. Emails sent to the Probate Staff E-Mail address will not be read and no response will be sent.

- **Probate Notes – Department 22**

Due to temporary staffing reductions, until further notice, Probate Notes will no longer be posted on the Court's website.

- **Pregrants and Tentative Rulings – Department 22**

The Pregrant and Tentative Ruling procedure remains unchanged. Pregrants and Tentative Rulings will be posted for Department 22 the day before the hearing after 2:00 p.m.

Unless otherwise directed by the court, probate pregrants are not posted for guardianship matters or for ex parte petitions.

**PREGRANTS AND TENTATIVE RULINGS START ON  
NEXT PAGE**

**9:00 CALENDAR**

**IN RE THE ESTATE OF ANTONIO SANCHEZ, DECEASED  
FPR049332**

Petition for Final Distribution, For Attorney's Fees for Ordinary Services, and For Reimbursement of Costs Advanced

Supplemental Verified Declaration to Petition for Final Distribution

**PREGRANT ORDER**

The court on its own motion continues the hearing to June 3, 2020, at 9:00 a.m., in Department 22. Pending the continued hearing, the petitioner shall resolve the following issues:

1. After review of the Supplemental Verified Declaration filed on January 8, 2020, the math is unclear. The petition states that the amount on hand for distribution is \$384,344.23. However, the amount on the inventory and appraisal, minus the expenses related to the sale, plus the gains from the sale and proceeds received by the estate show the total amount on hand should be \$403,227.46. No creditor claims were paid per the petition. The discrepancy of \$18,883.23 is unexplained.

---

**9:03 CALENDAR**

---

**KUNZ v. SOLANO COUNTY, ET AL.  
FCS052527**

**HYBRID**

Motion for Disclosure of Peace Officer Personnel Records

**TENTATIVE RULING**

Plaintiff's motion for discovery of peace officer personnel records is granted in part.

Plaintiff has adequately established good cause for in camera review of some of the personnel records sought. (Evid. Code § 1043(b)(3); *Warrick v. Superior Court* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1011, 1026-1027.) Defendants concede that prior complaints against Defendant Speakman for sexual harassment or sexual assault within five years of Plaintiff's alleged harassment, records from the investigation of Plaintiff's complaint filed with the Department, and records of the resulting discipline should be produced for in camera review.

In all other respects, the motion is denied. Plaintiff has not demonstrated good cause for in camera review of records pertaining to Defendant Speakman's training or performance reviews, complaints of discrimination, retaliation, or misconduct relating to dishonesty

against Defendant Speakman, any personnel records of Sheriff Ferrara, any personnel records of Undersheriff DeWall, or complaints of sexual harassment by dispatchers against unidentified “members” of the Solano County Sheriff’s Department. The court notes that nothing in amended Penal Code section 832.7 allows the disclosure of complaints concerning conduct occurring more than five years before the event that is the subject of the litigation that is not already made public by the statute.

---