

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

**TENTATIVE RULINGS**

EVENT DATE: 12/01/2015                      EVENT TIME: 08:20:00 AM                      DEPT.: 43  
JUDICIAL OFFICER: Kevin DeNoce

CASE NUM: 56-2014-00453806-CU-PA-VTA  
CASE TITLE: LINDSAY VS. CHRISTIAN

CASE CATEGORY:    Civil - Unlimited    CASE TYPE: PI/PD/WD - Auto

EVENT TYPE: Motion to Compel - Motion to Compel Defendant to Provide Further Supplemental Responses et al  
CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion to Compel, 10/28/2015

---

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 may submit a telefax to Judge DeNoce's secretary, Hellmi McIntyre at 805-662-6712, stating that you submit on the tentative. Do not call in lieu of sending a telefax, nor should you call to see if your telefax has been received. 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.

---

**The court's tentative ruling is as follows:**

**Grant** Plaintiff's motion to compel further responses to form interrogatories as to form interrogatory 17.1 as it pertains to RFAs 15 and 23. The court acknowledges the confusion surrounding these RFAs but holds that the spirit of the court's prior rulings was that Christian's assertion of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment was well-taken at the time but that further responses would be required later. As such, the court requests that Christian supplement his RFA 23 response. No sanctions will be awarded against defendant at this time as a result.

Deny the remainder of the motion. Plaintiff's objections are not to the form interrogatory responses but to the RFA responses and those are addressed in the companion motion. In short, Christian's RFA responses were not unqualified admissions and he provided proper form interrogatory responses. No snactions are awarded.