

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF VENTURA
VENTURA DIVISION**

TENTATIVE RULINGS

EVENT DATE: 12/12/2016

EVENT TIME: 08:20:00 AM

DEPT.: 43

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Kevin DeNoce

CASE NUM: 56-2016-00476697-CU-OE-VTA

CASE TITLE: TAITAI VS CITY OF PORT HUENEME

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited

CASE TYPE: Other employment

EVENT TYPE: Motion - Other (CLM) - to Continue Trial

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion to Continue Trial, 11/10/2016

The morning calendar in courtroom 43 will begin at 9 a.m. Cases including *ex parte* matters will not be called prior to 9 a.m. Please check in with the courtroom clerk by no later than 8:45 a.m. If appearing by CourtCall, please call in between 8:35 and 8:45 a.m.

With respect to the below scheduled tentative ruling, no notice of intent to appear is required. If you wish to submit on the tentative decision, you can send an email to the court at: Courtroom43@ventura.courts.ca.gov or send a telefax to Judge DeNoce's secretary, Hellmi McIntyre at 805-477-5894, stating that you submit on the tentative. Do not call in lieu of sending an email or telefax. If you submit on the tentative without appearing and the opposing party appears, the hearing will be conducted in your absence. This case has been assigned to Judge DeNoce for all purposes.

Absent waiver of notice and in the event an order is not signed at the hearing, the prevailing party shall prepare a proposed order and comply with CRC 3.1312 subdivisions (a), (b), (d) and (e). The signed order shall be served on all parties and a proof of service filed with the court. A "notice of ruling" in lieu of this procedure is not authorized.

For general information regarding Judge DeNoce and his courtroom rules and procedures, please visit: <http://www.denoce.com>

The court's tentative ruling is as follows:

The Court is inclined to grant Defendants' Motion for a Continuance of the Trial and continue the trial date for approximately ninety (90) days. (CRC 3.1332.) The legal issues in this case are complex and somewhat novel as evidenced by the law and motion pleadings. It has been necessary for the parties to litigate (and the Court to resolve) causes of action in the complaint thoroughly and in detail. In fact, Ds didn't answer the FAC until 11/9/16. Defendants' delay in taking the deposition of the Plaintiffs and in setting a summary judgment motion is somewhat understandable given the circumstances of this case.