

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF VENTURA

Tentative Ruling

---

2024CUBC024653: CLAY STEVENS, et al. vs GENERAL MOTORS, LLC

04/15/2026 in Department 44

**Motion to Compel RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS,  
SET TWO**

Effective **January 5, 2026**, Judge Charmaine H. Buehner and all cases previously assigned to Department J4 at the Juvenile Justice Center in Oxnard transferred to Department 44, located at the Hall of Justice, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California 93009.

**Department Rules.** Parties and counsel shall follow the Department 44 rules and Zoom protocols, available at <https://www2.ventura.courts.ca.gov/Courtroom/C44>.

**Remote Appearances.** The Court allows Zoom appearances as a courtesy to parties and counsel. The Court does not accommodate Court Call appearances. **You MUST register by 4:00 p.m. the court day before your hearing or you will be DENIED entry to the hearing:**

**ZOOM Registration Link:**

<https://ventura-courts-ca.zoom.us/meeting/register/iqN7uhQSQMuOqs-9TQXgEQ>

No advance notice is required to appear in person.

**Tentative Rulings.** Oral argument should address the tentative decision. To submit on the tentative decision, email [courtroom44@ventura.courts.ca.gov](mailto:courtroom44@ventura.courts.ca.gov) before 8:00 a.m. on the hearing date, copying all other parties, Use the subject line “SUBMISSION ON TENTATIVE”, [Case Number], [Case Title] and [Party]. If not all parties submit, the hearing will proceed, and the tentative ruling may change.

The Court may adopt, modify or reject the tentative ruling after hearing. The tentative ruling has no legal effect unless and until adopted by the Court.

**Motion:** General Motors LLC’s Motion to Compel Responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set Two

**Tentative Ruling:**

Defendant’s Motions are DENIED as moot.

Defendant’s motion should have been filed as two motions; Plaintiff separately failed to respond to two sets of discovery at issue. Defendant should have paid two filing fees. (See generally *Townzen v. County of El Dorado* (1998) 64 Cal.App.4th 1350 [interpreting ambiguous Government Code provision providing for “total fee” for first paper to apply to each of several defendants who had jointly filed a demurrer and motion to quash service of summons]; see also Code Civ. Proc., § 2031.300 [absence of language permitting combination of similar motions and using the singular throughout the statute]; Gov. Code, § 70617, subd. (a)(4) [\$60 filing fee

for discovery motions] and id., subd. (f) [“Regardless of whether each motion or matter is heard at a single hearing or at separate hearings, the filing fees required by subdivisions (a), (c), (d), and (e) apply separately to each motion or other paper filed.”].) Going forward, Defendant should file separate motions and pay both fees in similar circumstances.

With regard to the motions, they are DENIED on mootness grounds. Plaintiffs’ counsel asserts that responses were served on April 2, 2026. (Perks Decl., ¶ 4.) Although no copies of the responses were attached to Plaintiffs’ counsel’s declaration, Defendant has not filed a reply memorandum arguing to the contrary.

Counsel for Defendant is ordered to give notice of the Court’s ruling.